WEBVTT

- NOTE duration:"00:52:07"
- NOTE recognizability:0.836
- NOTE language:en-us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:00:00.000 \rightarrow 00:00:01.836$ And welcome to the grand rounds
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}00{:}01.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}03.985$ that's sponsored by the Division of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}00{:}03.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}05.725$ Women's Behavioral Health Research.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:00:05.730 --> 00:00:07.518 The Department of Psychiatry.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:00:07.518 --> 00:00:09.306 I am Carolyn Missouri.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:00:09.310 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.770$ As the director of the division,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:00:11.770 --> 00:00:13.834 it's a pleasure to welcome members
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:00:13.834 --> 00:00:15.970 of the Department of Psychiatry,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:00:15.970 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.110$ some of whom we've said
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:00:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:00:18.022$ hello to this morning.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:00:18.030 --> 00:00:20.320 Harvey, Heathers,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}00{:}20{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}22{.}595$ and it's a pleasure to also welcome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:00:22.595 \rightarrow 00:00:24.549$ colleagues from other key departments,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}00{:}24.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.205$ both across the medical school

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}00{:}26.205$ --> $00{:}00{:}27.529$ and across the university,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}00{:}27.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}29.490$ as well as collaborators that we have in

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:29.490 \rightarrow 00:00:31.508$ a variety of settings clinical settings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:00:31.510 --> 00:00:33.920 Search settings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:33.920 \rightarrow 00:00:36.854$ The division is designed to bring

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:36.854 \rightarrow 00:00:39.248$ together investigators who study the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:39.248 \rightarrow 00:00:41.384$ health of women and the influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:41.384 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.863$ of sex and gender on mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}00{:}43.863 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.088$ health and on the intersection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}00{:}46.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}48.796$ Of mental health with a wide

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:48.796 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.600$ variety of other disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:50.600 \dashrightarrow 00:00:53.162$ We also have the opportunity to

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:53.162 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.443$ invite outstanding scientific

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}00{:}54.443 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}56.537$ leaders to speak with us about

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:00:56.537 \rightarrow 00:00:58.142$ critical issues in the field.

 $00:00:58.150 \rightarrow 00:01:00.810$ And so it's my privilege to introduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:00.810 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.961$ today's grand round speaker who is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:03.961 \rightarrow 00:01:05.897$ outstanding and accomplished researcher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:05.900 \rightarrow 00:01:09.688$ At a translational epidemiologist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:09.690 \dashrightarrow 00:01:12.330$ She focuses on understanding the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:12.330 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.442$ etiology and epidemiology of

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:14.442 \rightarrow 00:01:16.300$ neurodegenerative and aging related

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:16.300 \rightarrow 00:01:18.405$ diseases and sex specific differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}01{:}18.405 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.249$ as well as gender differences in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:21.249 \rightarrow 00:01:25.430$ risk and progression of these diseases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:01:25.430 --> 00:01:26.774 In particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:01:26.774 --> 00:01:29.462 Doctor Michelle Milky focuses

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:29.462 \longrightarrow 00:01:31.478$ on identifying biomarkers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}01{:}31{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}34{.}819$ For accelerated aging and for the diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:01:34.820 \rightarrow 00:01:35.445$ prediction,

- $00:01:35.445 \rightarrow 00:01:38.570$ and progression of Alzheimer's disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:01:38.570 --> 00:01:40.635 And she does this really for the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:01:40.635 \rightarrow 00:01:42.030$ purpose of enhancing precision
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:01:42.030 \rightarrow 00:01:43.814$ medicine initiatives and providing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}01{:}43.814 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}47.460$ better care for both women and men.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:01:47.460 --> 00:01:47.783 Previously,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:01:47.783 --> 00:01:49.721 Doctor Milky was a professor at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:01:49.721 --> 00:01:51.135 the Department of Quantitative
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}01{:}51{.}135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}53{.}090$ Health Sciences in the division
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:01:53.090 \rightarrow 00:01:54.654$ of Epidemiology and Professor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:01:54.716 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.552$ of Neurology at the Mayo Clinic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:01:56.552 \rightarrow 00:01:57.470$ College of Medicine.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:01:57.470 --> 00:01:57.844 Today,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}01{:}57.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01.210$ April 1 marks the start of her new position,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:01.210 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.306$ which is at Wake Forest School of Medicine,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:04.310 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.694$ where she is now the chair of the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:02:06.694 --> 00:02:09.140 Department of Epidemiology and Prevention.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}02{:}09{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}11.420$ As well as professor of Epidemiology,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:11.420 \rightarrow 00:02:14.020$ Gerontology and geriatric medicine,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:14.020 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.320$ and neurology.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:15.320 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.981$ So you can already tell there's a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:02:18.981 --> 00:02:20.550 very significant interdisciplinary
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:20.628 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.350$ flavor to Michelle's work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:23.350 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.440$ Doctor Milky received her bachelor's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:25.440 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.112$ degree in neuroscience from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:02:27.112 --> 00:02:29.129 the University of Pittsburgh.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:29.130 \rightarrow 00:02:31.265$ She then went on to Johns Hopkins
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:31.265 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.996$ University to the Bloomberg School
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:32.996 \rightarrow 00:02:35.642$ Public Health where she received her pH.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}02{:}35{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}38{.}146$ D and she did a postdoctoral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:02:38.146 \rightarrow 00:02:40.167$ fellowship in the epidemiology of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:02:40.167 \rightarrow 00:02:43.014$ aging and then subsequently was

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:02:43.014 --> 00:02:45.578 awarded elidia against Gillespie

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:02:45.578 --> 00:02:48.039 Postdoctoral Fellowship in Psychiatry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:02:48.040 --> 00:02:50.140 Among her many achievements

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:02:50.140 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.715$ in leadership positions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:02:51.720 \rightarrow 00:02:52.842$ she is currently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:02:52.842 \rightarrow 00:02:55.086$ I'll just mention the current ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:02:55.086 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.619$ in which she is very involved in

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}02{:}57.619 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}59.854$ the broader scheme of understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:02:59.854 --> 00:03:01.398 Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:03:01.400 --> 00:03:03.404 Doctor Melki is currently a member

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

00:03:03.404 --> 00:03:05.323 of the Alzheimer's Drug Discovery

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}323 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}07{.}399$ Foundation Scientific Review Board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:03:07.400 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.137$ The Alzheimer's Association

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00{:}03{:}09{.}137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}11{.}453$ International Society to advance

NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905

 $00:03:11.453 \rightarrow 00:03:13.950$ Alzheimer's Research and treatment.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:03:13.950 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.298$ The global Biomarker Standardization
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}03{:}16.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18.646$ Consortium and the standardization
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:03:18.646 \dashrightarrow 00:03:21.049$ of Alzheimer's blood biomarkers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:03:21.050 \dashrightarrow 00:03:24.386$ She's also on the CDC's World Trade Center,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}03{:}24{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}26{.}510$ Cognitive aging and impairment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:03:26.510 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.100$ scientific working group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:03:28.100 > 00:03:30.580 And finally, one other example.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:03:30.580 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.198$ She's one of the members of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}03{:}33.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35.139$ External Advisory Board for Brigham
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- 00:03:35.140 --> 00:03:38.788 Harvard's NIH funded U 54 score,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}03{:}38.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}41.358$ which studies neural processing of stress,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00{:}03{:}41{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}43{.}715$ which is strongly linked to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.921264905
- $00:03:43.715 \dashrightarrow 00:03:46.070$ health outcomes in aging women.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- 00:03:46.070 --> 00:03:47.855 She also served on many NIH as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:03:47.855 \rightarrow 00:03:50.325$ well as FDA and DoD review panels
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:03:50.325 \dashrightarrow 00:03:51.965$ focusing on Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00{:}03{:}51{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}54{.}310$ Research has done extensive mentoring in

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:03:54.310 \rightarrow 00:03:57.647$ this area with a large number of students.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:03:57.650 --> 00:03:59.876 And she has provided service on

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00{:}03{:}59{.}876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}01{.}850$ a variety of editorial board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:04:01.850 --> 00:04:03.222 She's a member of the editorial board

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:04:03.222 --> 00:04:05.211 of the journal, Neurology and senior

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:04:05.211 -> 00:04:07.546 editor of Alzheimer's and dementia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:04:07.550 --> 00:04:10.182 the Journal of Alzheimer's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00{:}04{:}10.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}12.156$ the Alzheimer's Association.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:04:12.160 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.569$ Consistently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:04:12.569 \dashrightarrow 00:04:14.614$ she's been funded throughout her

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:04:14.614 \rightarrow 00:04:16.600$ career with multiple oral ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:04:16.600 --> 00:04:17.876 You owe one RF,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00{:}04{:}17.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.398$ one NIH grants on topics such as

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:04:20.398 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.542$ reproductive risk factors for

- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- 00:04:22.542 --> 00:04:24.188 Alzheimer's disease, dementia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:24.188 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.460$ and pathology, and sex.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- 00:04:26.460 --> 00:04:29.245 Specific effects of endocrine disruption
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:29.245 \rightarrow 00:04:32.030$ on aging and Alzheimer's disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.330$ Most notably to me, however,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- 00:04:34.330 --> 00:04:36.002 beyond her many achievements
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- 00:04:36.002 --> 00:04:36.838 and contributions,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:36.840 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.910$ is the quality of her work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:38.910 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.150$ As well as the strength of her
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:41.150 \rightarrow 00:04:42.649$ commitment in informing our view
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00:04:42.650 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.107$ on the influence of sex and gender
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00{:}04{:}45{.}107 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}47{.}150$ on human health and behavior,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- 00:04:47.150 --> 00:04:49.250 we're thrilled to have doctor Milky
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00{:}04{:}49{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}52{.}534$ here today to talk about sex and gender
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111
- $00{:}04{:}52{.}534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}54{.}350$ differences in Alzheimer's disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

00:04:54.350 --> 00:04:57.402 Epidemiology, risk factors, genetics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00{:}04{:}57{.}402 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}59{.}738$ brain structure and pathologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:04:59.738 \dashrightarrow 00:05:02.366$ And with that, I turn it over to you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805797796111111

 $00:05:02.370 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.080$ Doctor milk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:04.470 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.030$ Well, thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:06.030 \rightarrow 00:05:09.310$ Doctor Missouri really appreciate that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:09.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.350$ The wonderful opportunity to present

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

00:05:11.350 -> 00:05:14.290 with you to you today and again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00{:}05{:}14.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}16.228$ I, I apologize. As you mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00{:}05{:}16{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}18{.}350$ it's my first day and so we're we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:18.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.008$ hiring out a lot of the kings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:20.010 \dashrightarrow 00:05:22.920$ It is my background too loud.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:22.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.946$ No, you're good. I'm good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:24.946 \rightarrow 00:05:27.627$ OK, alright great so hopefully there won't

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00{:}05{:}27.627 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}30.656$ be any more interruptions and and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:30.660 \rightarrow 00:05:32.730$ I apologize.

00:05:32.730 --> 00:05:34.900 So yes, I'm I'm really excited to

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00{:}05{:}34{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}37{.}160$ talk with you today and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:37.160 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.735$ talk after this as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:38.740 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.840$ Focus today will be on sex and

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:40.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.440$ gender differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:41.440 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.858$ but as Doctor Missouri had mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:43.860 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.652$ I do do quite a bit with blood

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:45.652 \rightarrow 00:05:46.100$ based biomarkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

00:05:46.100 --> 00:05:48.100 which I'm not going to talk about today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

00:05:48.100 --> 00:05:49.850 but I'm happy to have a call

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00:05:49.850 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.215$ with anybody to talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.815164174

 $00{:}05{:}51{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}52{.}877$ those down the road as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94192168

 $00{:}05{:}58{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}59{.}970$ And these are my disclosures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}02{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05{.}539$ So what I thought I would do today was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}05{.}539 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}07{.}691$ to give more of a a general outline

00:06:07.691 --> 00:06:09.528 covering a variety of topics and ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}09{.}528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}12{.}026$ in which we need to think about sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:06:12.026 --> 00:06:13.816 and gender differences in Alzheimer's NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:13.816 \rightarrow 00:06:15.971$ disease and related dementias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}15{.}971 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19{.}553$ From incidents to understanding of brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:06:19.553 --> 00:06:21.276 structure and neuropathology's genetics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:21.276 \rightarrow 00:06:23.664$ as well as risk factors including

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}23.664 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}25.949$ both sex differences in the risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}25{.}949 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28{.}091$ factors and sex specific risk factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:28.100 \dashrightarrow 00:06:31.524$ And as you, I'm sure all can understand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:06:31.530 --> 00:06:32.688 You know, once you start to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:32.688 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.750$ dive deeper in this topic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:33.750 \rightarrow 00:06:36.468$ you realize that there are a lot of areas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}06{:}36{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}38{.}495$ a lot of gaps, a lot of things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:38.495 \rightarrow 00:06:40.958$ are not yet understood and, and I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:06:40.958 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.730$ I hope to put forward that the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:06:43.730 \dashrightarrow 00:06:46.506$ appreciation of that today and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:06:46.506 \rightarrow 00:06:49.696$ need for much additional research.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- 00:06:49.700 --> 00:06:52.382 So the first thing I'm going to start
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}06{:}52{.}382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55{.}480$ with is are women affected by a D more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:06:55.480 \rightarrow 00:06:59.024$ than men and or women are at greater risk?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}06{:}59{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}02{.}014$ A lot of times we hear through the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:07:02.014 \rightarrow 00:07:05.070$ media as well as some of the top.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- 00:07:05.070 --> 00:07:06.902 Newspapers, New York Times,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}07{:}06{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}07{.}818$ Washington Post.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}07{:}07{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10{.}420$ Variety of others that women are at greater
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:07:10.420 \rightarrow 00:07:12.943$ risk and sometimes I've even heard that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- 00:07:12.943 --> 00:07:15.820 Alzheimer's disease is is a woman's disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:07:15.820 \dashrightarrow 00:07:19.726$ But I think when you start to look at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:07:19.726 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.876$ the numbers and also how you define risk,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:07:22.880 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.556$ this is a little bit questionable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.890$ So if we start to talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:07:26.890 - 00:07:28.019 the frequency of the disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}07{:}28.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.600$ so that's the the count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:29.600 \rightarrow 00:07:31.959$ The number of people with a diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:31.960 \dashrightarrow 00:07:35.114$ It's absolutely true that more women can have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:07:35.114 --> 00:07:37.376 a clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:37.380 \dashrightarrow 00:07:40.250$ and this graph here comes from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:07:40.250 --> 00:07:41.860 Alzheimer's Association awhile back,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}07{:}41.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}44.670$ but it generally has maintained

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}07{:}44.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}46.800$ throughout the past ten years that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:46.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.600$ about 2/3 of those with the diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:49.600 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.780$ of Alzheimer's disease are women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:07:51.780 --> 00:07:52.181 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:07:52.181 --> 00:07:54.186 when we think of frequency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:54.190 \rightarrow 00:07:56.800$ essentially any aging related disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:07:56.800 \rightarrow 00:07:59.808$ there's more women than men at older ages.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:07:59.810 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.127$ And so there's going to be more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}08{:}02{.}127 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}05{.}264$ women than men with most chronic and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:05.264 \rightarrow 00:08:08.799$ conditions and aging related diseases.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:08.800 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.284$ So what about when we think
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:11.284 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.526$ about the prevalence?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}08{:}12.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}16.738$ So this is a graph that was published
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:16.738 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.800$ in The Lancet by the GBS 2016
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:19.800 \dashrightarrow 00:08:22.800$ Dementia Consortium and I just want
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}08{:}22{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25{.}742$ to highlight here that women are in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:25.742 \longrightarrow 00:08:28.594$ blue and men are in red and this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- 00:08:28.594 --> 00:08:30.229 is looking at Alzheimer's disease
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00{:}08{:}30{.}229 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}32{.}759$ as well as other related dementias.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:32.760 \dashrightarrow 00:08:35.432$ And there is a higher prevalence so the NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:35.432 \rightarrow 00:08:37.875$ number of women for example with the NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075
- $00:08:37.875 \rightarrow 00:08:40.390$ disease divided by in a certain age
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:08:40.390 \rightarrow 00:08:42.987$ group divided by the number of women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}08{:}42{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}44{.}206$ In that age group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:08:44.206 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.660$ So when we take that into account,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:08:46.660 \rightarrow 00:08:48.560$ there is slightly higher prevalence

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}08{:}48.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}50.080$ for women than men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

00:08:50.080 --> 00:08:50.388 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00{:}08{:}50{.}388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}52{.}852$ there's a lot of overlap and and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.9321223075

 $00:08:52.852 \rightarrow 00:08:55.040$ it's not statistically significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

 $00{:}08{:}57{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59{.}649$ So then the next question then is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

00:08:59.650 -> 00:09:00.950 are women at greater risk?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

00:09:00.950 - 00:09:03.434 Do they have a greater incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

 $00:09:03.434 \rightarrow 00:09:05.090$ of developing Alzheimer's disease?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

 $00{:}09{:}05{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}07{.}706$ And what's really interesting is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

00:09:07.706 --> 00:09:10.362 when you start to look at various

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

 $00:09:10.362 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.186$ countries and regions of the world,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438418

 $00:09:12.190 \dashrightarrow 00:09:14.620$ we start to see different answers.

 $00:09:14.620 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.330$ So if we look at the top of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:18.690 \rightarrow 00:09:20.314$ This is kind of covering this up

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:20.314 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.576$ it so I I think it's a stock home,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:22.580 \rightarrow 00:09:25.622$ the UK, Southwest France as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}09{:}25.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}28.682$ as the pooled eurodam data we we

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}09{:}28.682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}30.649$ do see that there is a greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:30.649 \rightarrow 00:09:32.577$ incidence for women compared to men,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.632$ and this generally starts

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:34.632 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.197$ around the age of 85.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.640$ However, when we look at some

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:09:38.640 --> 00:09:39.980 studies in the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}09{:}39{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}41{.}846$ including the Framingham Heart study as

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}09{:}41.846 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}45.041$ well as some early work that was done in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:09:45.041 --> 00:09:46.900 Rochester Epidemiology project in Rochester,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}09{:}46{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}50{.}644$ MN, we don't see it a sex difference.

 $00:09:50.650 \rightarrow 00:09:52.852$ Now, you'll probably notice right away

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:52.852 \rightarrow 00:09:55.558$ that this paper was published in 2002,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}09{:}55{.}558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}58{.}414$ and there's been a lot of additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:09:58.414 \rightarrow 00:10:00.599$ epidemiological studies in the past 20 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}00{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}03{.}344$ I I'd like to show this because it

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:03.344 \rightarrow 00:10:05.784$ does split it out by country and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:05.784 \dashrightarrow 00:10:08.699$ and show some of these differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:08.700 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.800$ But for the vast majority

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:10.800 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.760$ of studies since 2002.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:13.760 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.148$ Particularly in the US,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}15{.}148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}18{.}101$ we do not see sex differences in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:18.101 \rightarrow 00:10:20.507$ of the incidence of Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:20.510 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.808$ and these are just some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:22.808 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.810$ the studies listed down here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}24.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.498$ The only one that I'm aware of in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:10:26.498 --> 00:10:28.300 the US is Cache County study of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125
- 00:10:28.300 --> 00:10:30.050 memory and aging in Cache County,

00:10:30.050 --> 00:10:30.576 Utah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:30.576 \rightarrow 00:10:33.732$ which did identify a greater incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:33.732 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.630$ for women after the age of 85.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:10:36.630 --> 00:10:37.037 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}37.037 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.886$ the 90 plus study recently in California

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:39.886 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.558$ had did not find that difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:10:42.560 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.190$ When we look at systematic

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:10:45.190 --> 00:10:47.294 reviews and meta analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}47{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}49{.}844$ there was one that was funded by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:10:49.844 --> 00:10:51.279 Canadian government feast at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}51{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}54{.}004$ which is a compilation of more

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}54.004 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}55.820$ than 20 different studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}55{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}58{.}220$ The vast majority of them in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}10{:}58{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}00{.}428$ North America and again for both

 $00:11:00.428 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.836$ the prevalence and incidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}11{:}01{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}03{.}737$ They did find a trend for women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:11:03.740 --> 00:11:05.840 but it wasn't statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:11:05.840 \rightarrow 00:11:07.940$ significant and by statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}11{:}07{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}10.658$ significant the P values were about .6,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:11:10.660 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.725$ so it's it wasn't even that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:11:12.725 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.020$ it was necessarily close.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:11:14.020 --> 00:11:14.828 But interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}11{:}14.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}17.656$ roughly a year after this was funded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:11:17.660 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.236$ or this was published,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}11{:}19{.}236 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}21{.}206$ there was another meta analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

00:11:21.206 --> 00:11:22.878 completely of European studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00{:}11{:}22.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.917$ And again they did show that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:11:24.917 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.584$ was a higher incidence overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.7290100603125

 $00:11:26.584 \rightarrow 00:11:28.768$ for women as compared to men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00:11:31.560 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.620$ So what about trends overtime?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- 00:11:34.620 --> 00:11:36.335 Here we're showing the cognitive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}11{:}36{.}335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38{.}540$ function and aging studies one and two.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00:11:38.540 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.820$ So the first incident wave was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- 00:11:40.820 --> 00:11:44.920 between 1989 and 19, roughly 92,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}11{:}44{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47{.}464$ and the 2nd incidence wave was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00:11:47.464 \rightarrow 00:11:50.402$ between 20 or 2008 and 2011,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00:11:50.402 \rightarrow 00:11:53.172$ and there's some some interesting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- 00:11:53.172 --> 00:11:56.130 findings in the United Kingdom.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}11{:}56{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}58{.}506$ Man on the left and women on the right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}11{:}58{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}00{.}534$ And of course the first wave is in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00:12:00.534 \rightarrow 00:12:02.630$ blue and the 2nd wave is in purple.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}12{:}02{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04{.}485$ And what we can see to start
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}12{:}04{.}485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}06{.}438$ with was that the incidence was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00{:}12{:}06{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}08{.}622$ actually higher in men than women.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555
- $00:12:08.630 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.606$ During this first wave.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

00:12:10.606 --> 00:12:11.576 However, interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

00:12:11.576 --> 00:12:13.480 about 20 years later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00{:}12{:}13.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15.951$ during the second wave there was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

00:12:15.951 - 00:12:18.153 a large decrease in the incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00{:}12{:}18{.}153 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20{.}394$ of dementia for men and an

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00{:}12{:}20{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}22{.}429$ increase or maintenance for women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00:12:22.430 \longrightarrow 00:12:23.965$ And So what happened subsequently

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00:12:23.965 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.825$ was that the incidence for women

NOTE Confidence: 0.95060555

 $00:12:25.825 \rightarrow 00:12:27.445$ ended up being higher than men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

 $00:12:30.460 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.518$ Now when we look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

00:12:32.518 --> 00:12:34.150 Framingham Heart study here again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

 $00{:}12{:}34{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}36{.}250$ we do find that the trends for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

 $00:12:36.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.452$ dementia and this is all caused

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

00:12:38.452 --> 00:12:39.920 dementia have decreased overtime,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

 $00{:}12{:}39{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}42{.}480$ but the decrease has been much sooner and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644298666666667

 $00:12:42.480 \rightarrow 00:12:44.666$ much greater in women compared to men.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- 00:12:47.570 --> 00:12:50.378 So I I just showed you a lot of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:12:50.378 \rightarrow 00:12:53.130$ discrepancies, a lot of questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:12:53.130 \rightarrow 00:12:55.650$ For me. This is actually really exciting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}12{:}55.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}58.248$ because as an epidemiologist it suggests
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:12:58.248 \rightarrow 00:13:01.134$ that if we're seeing differences by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:13:01.134 \rightarrow 00:13:03.818$ countries or even by regions of countries.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:13:03.820 \rightarrow 00:13:06.520$ Potentially modifiable risk factors
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- 00:13:06.520 --> 00:13:09.220 and possibilities to intervene,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}13{:}09{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}11{.}278$ and so I get really excited about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:13:11.278 \rightarrow 00:13:13.251$ this and and thinking about what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:13:13.251 \rightarrow 00:13:15.297$ some of the causes might be,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}13{:}15{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}17{.}226$ and whether there are some biases
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:13:17.226 \rightarrow 00:13:19.794$ that may play a role in interpreting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}13{:}19.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}21.406$ some of these results.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:13:21.410 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.842$ So I mean, one thing we we do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:23.842 \rightarrow 00:13:26.420$ have to keep in mind is that from

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}13{:}26{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}28{.}100$ the studies that I did show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:13:28.100 - 00:13:29.660 there was a sex difference in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:13:29.660 --> 00:13:30.605 particularly in Europe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:30.605 \rightarrow 00:13:33.240$ it tends to be after the age of 80,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:33.240 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.164$ and by that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:13:34.164 --> 00:13:37.470 Point in time nobody is going to have peer

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:37.470 \rightarrow 00:13:39.618$ Alzheimer's disease dementia anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:39.620 \rightarrow 00:13:41.699$ It's going to generally be mixed pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:41.700 \rightarrow 00:13:43.416$ so you might have vascular dementia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:13:43.420 --> 00:13:45.664 Lewy bodies, Alzheimer's pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}13{:}45{.}664$ --> $00{:}13{:}50{.}152$ TDP 43 and and also general brain aging

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}13{:}50{.}152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}53{.}224$ that are are being mixed together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:53.230 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.568$ That there is the possibility that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:55.568 \rightarrow 00:13:58.610$ could be a differential diagnosis by sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:13:58.610 \rightarrow 00:14:00.506$ and this is something that I I will

- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- 00:14:00.506 --> 00:14:02.686 go into a little bit more depth later,

 $00:14:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.518$ but it does.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:03.518 \rightarrow 00:14:05.174$ It is something that worries me

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:05.174 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.921$ when we see all these headlines

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:06.921 \longrightarrow 00:14:08.670$ of women are at greater risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:14:08.670 --> 00:14:10.770 Melissa Murray from Mayo Clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:14:10.770 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:14:12.445 Jacksonville had published a paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}12{.}445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}14{.}867$ where they looked in the Florida brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:14.867 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.290$ bank and about 3000 different brains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:17.290 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.954$ And they compared both the clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:19.954 \rightarrow 00:14:22.480$ diagnosis and the pathological diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:22.480 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.666$ And interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:23.666 \rightarrow 00:14:26.631$ they found for men generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}26{.}631 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}29{.}709$ between the ages of 60 and 70.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:29.710 \rightarrow 00:14:32.722$ There were men were more likely

 $00:14:32.722 \rightarrow 00:14:34.814$ to have Alzheimer's pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}34{.}814 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}37{.}998$ but to have a different dementia

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}37{.}998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40{.}806$ diagnosis so they they weren't clinically NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:14:40.806 --> 00:14:43.154 diagnosed as Alzheimer's disease despite

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}43.154 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}45.410$ the theology and then at older ages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}45{.}410$ --> $00{:}14{:}48{.}074$ there were generally past the age of 80 NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}48.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}51.100$ that tend to be is like over clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:51.100 \rightarrow 00:14:53.170$ diagnosis for women compared to men,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}53{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}55{.}794$ and so women were a little bit more

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}14{:}55{.}794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}57{.}279$ automatically determined to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:14:57.279 --> 00:14:58.428 Alzheimer's disease clinically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:58.430 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.180$ even though pathologically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:14:59.180 \longrightarrow 00:15:00.930$ That may have not been the case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:15:00.930 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.577$ or it was a very mixed apology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:15:04.580 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.540$ And then you know lastly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:15:06.540 \rightarrow 00:15:09.078$ and I think a very important

- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:09.080 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.684$ consideration here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}15{:}09{.}684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}11{.}194$ as we're looking at these,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}15{:}11{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}12{.}830$ is that these sex differences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:12.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.828$ across the regions of the world
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:14.828 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.658$ is that there are many social,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- 00:15:16.660 --> 00:15:17.185 cultural,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:17.185 \rightarrow 00:15:20.860$ and historical events that have taken place.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:20.860 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.000$ Certainly the women,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}15{:}22.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}24.280$ for example in the United States,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- 00:15:24.280 --> 00:15:26.400 experience World War Two much
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}15{:}26{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}28{.}520$ differently than those in Europe
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:28.595 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.460$ did similarly to the Cold War.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:30.460 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.370$ And I really like to discuss
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00{:}15{:}33{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}34{.}825$ with Walter Rocha.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002
- $00:15:34.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.918$ Who's at mail clinic as well?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}15{:}36{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}39{.}472$ His family grew up in Italy and hearing

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:15:39.472 --> 00:15:41.704 about kind of Faustus was regime and

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}15{:}41.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}44.049$ the effect and the the stress and

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:15:44.049 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.293$ and implications on that on disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}15{:}46{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}48{.}628$ And certainly that plays a role

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:15:48.628 --> 00:15:51.263 for women and men right now that

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:15:51.263 --> 00:15:53.429 are at greatest risk of dementia

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00:15:53.429 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.068$ and older age ranges.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

 $00{:}15{:}55{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}57{.}056$ So a question is whether some

NOTE Confidence: 0.841066002

00:15:57.056 --> 00:15:58.380 of these European countries

NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889

 $00{:}15{:}58{.}441 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}00{.}401$ will see similar sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889

 $00:16:00.401 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.577$ in future generation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889

 $00:16:01.580 \longrightarrow 00:16:03.008$ And we also have to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889

 $00{:}16{:}03.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03.990$ other countries and regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889

 $00{:}16{:}03{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}05{.}170$ There's a variety of countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889

 $00:16:05.170 \rightarrow 00:16:09.180$ They're going through stressful situations.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- 00:16:09.180 --> 00:16:13.030 Wars, variety of other things as well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00:16:13.030 \longrightarrow 00:16:16.336$ And in addition, there are one of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00{:}16{:}16{.}336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}17{.}770$ the things we're thinking about.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00{:}16{:}17.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}19.755$ These country differences is that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- 00:16:19.755 --> 00:16:21.740 there are social cultural factors
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00:16:21.803 \longrightarrow 00:16:24.060$ that the impact of gender that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- 00:16:24.060 --> 00:16:26.080 particularly affect risk and that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- 00:16:26.152 --> 00:16:28.546 differ across regions of the world,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00:16:28.550 \rightarrow 00:16:30.566$ but that also differ, for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00:16:30.570 \rightarrow 00:16:31.742$ within the United States.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00:16:31.742 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.500$ So we think about North versus
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852782003888889
- $00{:}16{:}33{.}554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}35{.}019$ South in terms of education.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00{:}16{:}37{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}40{.}580$ So as we're thinking about these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:16:40.580 --> 00:16:41.900 gender differences historically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:16:41.900 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.060$ Women have had less access to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

00:16:44.060 --> 00:16:45.500 education compared to men,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}16{:}45{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}46{.}660$ and as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:16:46.660 \rightarrow 00:16:48.758$ this does vary by different or does

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}16{:}48.758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}51.264$ differ by country as well as culture,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}16{:}51{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}53{.}790$ but also region within the USI know

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:16:53.790 \rightarrow 00:16:56.670$ some states women were able to get high NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:16:56.670 \rightarrow 00:16:59.460$ school education sooner than other states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}16{:}59{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02{.}076$ There was a nice study that was recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

00:17:02.076 --> 00:17:03.802 published in Lancet public health

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}17{:}03.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}06.313$ by Bloomberg ET al using two studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

00:17:06.313 --> 00:17:09.300 from England consisting of over 15,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:09.300 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.362$ participants born between 1930 and 1955

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

00:17:12.362 --> 00:17:15.596 who had over 19 years of follow-up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:15.600 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.288$ and they found that there have

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:18.288 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.080$ been significant trends in

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:20.080 \rightarrow 00:17:22.474$ memory performance overtime.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:17:22.474 --> 00:17:24.070 So historically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:17:24.070 > 00:17:26.005 women tended to perform better
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:17:26.005 \rightarrow 00:17:27.166$ on verbal memory,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:17:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:17:30.150$ which is generally well known,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00{:}17{:}30{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31{.}785$ but the performance was much
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:17:31.785 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.843$ better for those that were later
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:17:33.843 > 00:17:35.628 born compared to earlier born.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:17:35.630 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.162$ And the memory decline was actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00{:}17{:}38{.}162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41{.}284$ faster in men versus women after
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:17:41.284 \rightarrow 00:17:43.996$ considering these educational differences.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:17:44.000 00:17:45.580 So these results further suggest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00{:}17{:}45{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}47{.}652$ a role of education and secular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- $00:17:47.652 \rightarrow 00:17:49.797$ changes in education in determining
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:17:49.797 --> 00:17:51.513 cognitive performance and women.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444
- 00:17:51.520 --> 00:17:52.268 And it, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:52.268 \rightarrow 00:17:54.060$ as we think about in the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}17{:}54.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}55.830$ where now there are more women

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:55.830 \longrightarrow 00:17:57.959$ than men in four year colleges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:17:57.960 \rightarrow 00:18:00.272$ it will be interesting to see how this

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}18{:}00{.}272 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}02{.}226$ might affect the sex differences in

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:18:02.226 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.200$ terms of the incidence of dementia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00{:}18{:}04{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}05{.}385$ particularly Alzheimer's disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.83504296444444

 $00:18:05.385 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.570$ down the road.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:08.910 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.700$ Another aspect that is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:10.700 \rightarrow 00:18:12.132$ really important to consider,

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:12.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:14.185$ but until recently there have

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:14.185 \longrightarrow 00:18:16.720$ been a few studies on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:16.720 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.646$ Is the effect of work and family

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:19.646 \rightarrow 00:18:22.229$ experience on subsequent risk of dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}18{:}22{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}24{.}710$ And made it all and made a colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

00:18:24.710 --> 00:18:27.298 using the health Retirement Study examined

 $00:18:27.298 \rightarrow 00:18:30.148$ the life course patterns of employment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:30.150 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.590$ marriage and childbearing between

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:31.590 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.210$ the ages of 16 and 50 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:34.210 \rightarrow 00:18:37.585$ And then memory decline after the age of 55.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:37.590 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.411$ And overall what they found was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}18{:}40{.}411 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}42{.}920$ women who worked outside the home

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:42.920 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.768$ had less decline after the age of 55.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:45.770 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.690$ Whether it's memory decline or

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}18{:}47.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}50.488$ or even global cognitive decline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:50.488 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.840$ Now this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:18:51.840 \rightarrow 00:18:53.946$ It impact was regardless of whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}18{:}53{.}946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}56{.}470$ women took time off to have their

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}18{:}56{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}58{.}927$ children and went back into IT workforce.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

00:18:58.930 --> 00:19:01.178 Some women took up to 20 years off,

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}19{:}01{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}03{.}637$ went back and and still had benefits,

 $00:19:03.640 \rightarrow 00:19:06.504$ and it was also regardless of marital status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}19{:}06{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}08{.}540$ so there there was some concern that

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:08.540 \rightarrow 00:19:10.803$ those women who were single that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

00:19:10.803 --> 00:19:12.473 also raising families and working

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}19{:}12{.}473 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}14{.}707$ that would result in more stress and

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}19{:}14.707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}16.243$ more negative impact on cognition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:16.243 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.061$ But that actually was not found

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:18.061 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.320$ to be the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

00:19:19.320 --> 00:19:20.439 And so again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:20.439 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.677$ you know in terms of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00{:}19{:}22.677 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.000$ culture and gender experiences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:25.000 \rightarrow 00:19:27.856$ gender roles these are changing over

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:27.860 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.667$ time and the impact of those on

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:30.670 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.956$ cognitive decline and risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.934070618888889

 $00:19:32.956 \rightarrow 00:19:35.266$ dementia still need to be examined further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768

00:19:37.670 --> 00:19:40.196 So I I've given you, you know,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:19:40.196 --> 00:19:42.044 obviously it's not a straight answer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}19{:}42.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}43.709$ Are women at greater risk than men?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:19:43.710 \dashrightarrow 00:19:47.850$ There does appear to be a lot of caveats.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:19:47.850 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.860$ I have been asked multiple times
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}19{:}49{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}52{.}828$ that if women are not at greater risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:19:52.828 \rightarrow 00:19:54.768$ of Alzheimer's disease than men,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:19:54.770 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.338$ why do we have to look at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:19:56.338 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.740$ sex and gender differences?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:19:57.740 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.068$ And this you know particularly bothers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:00.068 --> 00:20:02.659 me because you shouldn't have to have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:02.659 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.615$ a greater prevalence or incidence in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}04.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}06.705$ one sex forces another in order to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:06.705 \rightarrow 00:20:09.004$ look at sex and gender differences.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:09.004 --> 00:20:11.914 I mean, if we take.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:11.920 --> 00:20:14.172 We take cardiovascular disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768

- $00:20:14.172 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.298$ for example.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}15{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}16{.}845$ Cardiovascular disease is the number
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:16.845 00:20:18.839 one killer for both women and men,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:18.840 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.760$ but we know that there are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:20.760 --> 00:20:21.720 different risk factors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}21.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}24.285$ There are differences in terms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:24.285 --> 00:20:26.337 of morbidity and mortality.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}26{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}28{.}280$ There are differences in terms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}28{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}29{.}816$ of heart attack symptoms.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}29{.}816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}31.726$ There are differences in terms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:31.726 --> 00:20:33.319 of response to treatment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}33{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35{.}126$ and so even if the prevalence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:35.126 \rightarrow 00:20:36.700$ and incidence is the same,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}36{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}38{.}572$ there still are a lot of other factors
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:38.572 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.269$ that we need to think about in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:40.269 \rightarrow 00:20:42.110$ terms of sex and gender differences.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:42.110 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.302$ Both for the incidence,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00{:}20{:}44{.}302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47{.}042$ prevalence and treatment of Alzheimer's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:47.042 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.369$ disease and related dementias.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- 00:20:49.370 --> 00:20:51.278 So I'm next going to transition
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:51.278 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.310$ to talking about what some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:53.310 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.710$ these differences might be,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:54.710 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.223$ and so one is potential sex differences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:57.223 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.502$ in brain structure as well as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.935304768
- $00:20:59.502 \rightarrow 00:21:01.397$ different types of neural pathologies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118
- $00{:}21{:}03.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06.230$ So it is well known that men have a larger
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118
- $00:21:06.290 \rightarrow 00:21:08.698$ head size and through volume than women,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118
- $00{:}21{:}08{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11{.}046$ and this has historically been put
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118
- $00:21:11.046 \rightarrow 00:21:13.798$ forth as women having a smaller brain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118
- $00{:}21{:}13.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}15.792$ Therefore, they're more susceptible
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118
- $00{:}21{:}15.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}18.282$ to Alzheimer's disease and other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

00:21:18.282 --> 00:21:21.080 types of of dementia, but really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}21{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23{.}520$ among cognitively normal individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00:21:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.248$ men have greater age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}25{.}248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}26{.}976$ associated brain volume decline

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}26.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}28.328$ as compared to women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}28{.}328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}30{.}760$ There are also some differences in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}30.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}32.818$ Gray and white matter percentages such

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00:21:32.818 \rightarrow 00:21:34.836$ that women have a higher percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

00:21:34.836 --> 00:21:37.650 of brain matter and men tend to have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}37.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}39.630$ higher higher percentage of white matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

00:21:39.630 --> 00:21:42.335 However, how these differences contribute

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00:21:42.335 \rightarrow 00:21:45.040$ to susceptibility of dementia and

NOTE Confidence: 0.859801465294118

 $00{:}21{:}45{.}117 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}47{.}499$ dementia types are not yet clear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:21:49.550 \rightarrow 00:21:51.560$ To further highlight some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:21:51.560 - 00:21:54.360 sex differences, I I'd like to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:21:54.360 \dashrightarrow 00:21:57.090$ this particular study by Kotani ET al.

 $00{:}21{:}57.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}00{.}114$ Looking at language lateralization so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}22{:}00{.}114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}04{.}070$ they brought in a group of men and women

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:04.070 \rightarrow 00:22:07.085$ looking to understand whether language

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:07.085 \rightarrow 00:22:10.792$ lateralization tended to be at strong,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:10.792 --> 00:22:13.648 left, or bilateral, and in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:13.648 \rightarrow 00:22:15.484$ what they thought or what they

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:15.484 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.149$ found among all individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:17.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.662$ Was that about 2/3?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}22{:}18.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}22.020$ Had a strong left lateral is ation and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:22.020 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.835$ about 20% either had bilateral with left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:25.840 --> 00:22:28.268 predominant or bilateral symmetrical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}22{:}28.268 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}31.303$ both right and left lateralization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:31.310 \rightarrow 00:22:33.566$ But what was interesting is when they met,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}22{:}33.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36.878$ then looked at sex differences so men

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:36.878 \rightarrow 00:22:39.550$ are in blue and women are in pink.

00:22:39.550 --> 00:22:42.154 They found that men were primarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:42.154 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.890$ strong left lateral isation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:43.890 --> 00:22:46.515 whereas women were pretty much split equally

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00:22:46.515 \rightarrow 00:22:48.699$ between these three different groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:48.700 --> 00:22:49.526 So again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}22{:}49{.}526 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}52{.}004$ how this might predispose women versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:52.004 - 00:22:54.938 men to certain types of dementias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:54.940 --> 00:22:56.468 such as primary progressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

00:22:56.468 --> 00:22:58.378 aphasia is not understood yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}22{:}58{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}00{.}242$ but could be a reason for some

NOTE Confidence: 0.7981560725

 $00{:}23{:}00{.}242 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}01{.}569$ of these differences or risks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333

00:23:03.870 --> 00:23:07.086 In terms of biomarkers of amyloid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333

 $00{:}23{:}07{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}09{.}710$ there are really no consistent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333

 $00:23:09.710 \rightarrow 00:23:12.038$ consistently reported sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333

00:23:12.038 --> 00:23:16.457 in amyloid pet CSF amyloid beta 42 or

NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333

00:23:16.457 - 00:23:18.983 even blood amyloid beta 42 levels.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:18.990 \rightarrow 00:23:20.930$ However, there have recently been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:20.930 \longrightarrow 00:23:22.870$ a couple studies that suggest,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- 00:23:22.870 --> 00:23:27.028 for a given CSF amyloid beta level,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:27.030 \rightarrow 00:23:29.808$ women have greater declines in memory
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:29.808 \rightarrow 00:23:32.229$ and hippocampal volume that men do.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- 00:23:32.230 --> 00:23:35.296 It may also have a greater increase
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:35.296 \rightarrow 00:23:37.870$ in CSFP tell now again the results
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- 00:23:37.870 --> 00:23:40.499 are not consistent and I I can say
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:40.499 \rightarrow 00:23:42.844$ within the Mayo Clinic study of Aging.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:42.850 \rightarrow 00:23:45.027$ We do not find that pattern either,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:45.030 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.238$ but it could depend on the samples that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:47.238 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.214$ are used and it's certainly something
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00:23:49.214 \rightarrow 00:23:51.829$ to consider because if that is the case,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00{:}23{:}51{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}54{.}014$ this could have an effect on cut points
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333
- $00{:}23{:}54{.}014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}56{.}321$ and there could be a need for sex
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884554223333333

 $00:23:56.321 \rightarrow 00:23:58.239$ specific cutpoints in terms of prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

00:24:01.040 --> 00:24:02.960 Richard Buckley and and colleagues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

00:24:02.960 - 00:24:04.820 as well as several other groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:04.820 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.836$ have really been looking at sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00{:}24{:}06{.}836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}09{.}100$ differences in terms of Tau pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

00:24:09.100 --> 00:24:11.450 Of course, Tau, being associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00{:}24{:}11{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}12{.}860$ with neurofibrillary tangles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:12.860 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.080$ The other homework pathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:15.080 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.745$ of Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:16.750 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.372$ and again here there are some

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:19.372 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.640$ conflicting results what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:20.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.980$ He has has suggested was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:22.980 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.384$ for a given level of amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00{:}24{:}25{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}28{.}557$ women do have Tau in more Tau and

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

00:24:28.557 --> 00:24:31.047 some brain regions than men do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:31.050 \rightarrow 00:24:34.350$ and these are highlighted up here in red

- NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454
- $00:24:34.350 \rightarrow 00:24:36.750$ such that female have greater levels.

 $00:24:36.750 \longrightarrow 00:24:38.700$ Now there's been another study

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:38.700 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.650$ that has not replicated this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:40.650 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.878$ and there's currently an

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

00:24:42.878 --> 00:24:44.549 ongoing meta analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00{:}24{:}44{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}46{.}720$ Buckley is leading combining a

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:46.720 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.432$ variety of our studies and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:49.432 \rightarrow 00:24:51.030$ hopefully by combining and increasing

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00{:}24{:}51{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53{.}082$ the sample size will be able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00{:}24{:}53.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54.222$ really understand whether there

NOTE Confidence: 0.71135454

 $00:24:54.222 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.059$ is a sex difference or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}24{:}59{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01{.}992$ In addition, there are sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

00:25:01.992 --> 00:25:03.860 in cerebral vascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}03.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}07.595$ and so this is a courtesy of my colleague

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

00:25:07.595 --> 00:25:10.699 Prashanti Burberry and has been published,

00:25:10.700 --> 00:25:12.640 and I, I believe neurology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

00:25:12.640 --> 00:25:14.800 but looking within our population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:14.800 \rightarrow 00:25:18.320$ we find that women have a greater probability

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:18.320 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.278$ of having white matter intensities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}21{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}22{.}868$ Hyper intensities across ages

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}22{.}868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25{.}250$ and a greater number of white

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}25{.}319$ --> $00{:}25{:}27{.}539$ matter hyperintensities than men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:27.540 \rightarrow 00:25:28.012$ Interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}28.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}30.704$ when we look at subcortical infarcts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}30{.}704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}33{.}116$ we don't see a sex difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}33{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35{.}696$ But when we look at cortical infarcts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}35{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}37{.}350$ there are more cortical infarcts

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}37{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}39{.}760$ among men than there are among women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}39{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}42{.}394$ Some further research that I haven't

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:42.394 \rightarrow 00:25:45.510$ shown here is using DTI and assessing

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:45.510 \rightarrow 00:25:48.054$ white matter integrity and we do

- NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927
- $00:25:48.054 \rightarrow 00:25:49.884$ see less white matter integrity

 $00:25:49.884 \rightarrow 00:25:52.380$ or or more problems in that area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:52.380 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.150$ typically across the age for

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00:25:54.150 \rightarrow 00:25:55.920$ women as compared to men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}55{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}57{.}738$ But again it it does specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.74323927

 $00{:}25{:}57{.}738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58{.}950$ depend on the region.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:26:01.640 --> 00:26:03.845 So next time I'm going to discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:03.845 \longrightarrow 00:26:06.269$ some of the genetic differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}06{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}08{.}526$ And of course, we all know that Apple

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:08.526 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.816$ we for a Leo is the greatest risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:26:10.816 --> 00:26:13.444 factor for us or genetic risk factor

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}13.444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}15.388$ for sporadic Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:15.390 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.660$ But interestingly, there are some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}17.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}20.599$ sex differences in in terms of risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:20.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:22.802$ So here, when the first papers

 $00:26:22.802 \rightarrow 00:26:25.060$ that were published on this by

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}25{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26{.}668$ far and colleagues up here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}26{.}668 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29{.}129$ we have men and women with two E 4

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}29{.}129 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}31{.}676$ alleles and down here with one E 4 allele.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}31{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}34{.}713$ And here in the diamonds we can see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:34.713 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.285$ women have a greater odds of having NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:26:37.285 --> 00:26:39.879 dementia with two E 4 Leos compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:39.879 \rightarrow 00:26:42.810$ to men starting around the age of 60.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:26:42.810 --> 00:26:45.680 And even for one E 4 allele,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:45.680 \rightarrow 00:26:49.740$ women have a greater odds of having

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}49{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52{.}209$ Alzheimer's disease compared to men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}26{:}52{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}54{.}530$ Now there has been a lot more work

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:26:54.530 -> 00:26:57.040 on this and there you know further

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:57.040 \rightarrow 00:26:58.584$ in terms of prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:26:58.590 \rightarrow 00:27:00.605$ So among cognitively normal individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}27{:}00{.}605 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}03{.}561$ it's also found that women with an E4

 $00:27:03.561 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.612$ allele compared to men are at greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:27:05.675 --> 00:27:07.810 risk of developing mild cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:27:07.810 --> 00:27:10.530 impairment and also progressing from Mayo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:27:10.530 \rightarrow 00:27:12.850$ cognitive impairment to dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:27:12.850 --> 00:27:13.861 Now of note,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}27{:}13.861 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}16.692$ pretty much all of these studies has have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}27{:}16.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}19.104$ been done on white Caucasian samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:27:19.110 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.512$ and the role of appellee in risk of dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

00:27:22.520 --> 00:27:24.896 Non African Americans and some Hispanics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:27:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.320$ depending on origin are appearing to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00:27:28.320 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.710$ be less so whether we would see similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}27{:}31{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}33{.}974$ sex differences and those racial and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9094644766666667

 $00{:}27{:}33{.}974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}36{.}050$ ethnic groups is not yet known.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}27{:}39{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41{.}224$ Most of the genetic work that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}27{:}41{.}224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}43{.}490$ been done for Alzheimer's disease,

 $00:27:43.490 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.028$ if they look at sex differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:27:46.030 \rightarrow 00:27:48.476$ it's been primarily focused on Autozone's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:27:48.476 -> 00:27:50.924 There is very little work to date that

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:27:50.924 \rightarrow 00:27:53.184$ have focused on the X or Y chromosomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:27:53.190 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.248$ and obviously as you can see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:27:55.250 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.408$ looking at some of the factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:27:58.408 \rightarrow 00:28:00.490$ and genes on the X chromosome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:00.490 \rightarrow 00:28:02.625$ there are several that affect the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}02{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}04{.}315$ There are also several that

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:28:04.315 --> 00:28:04.989 affect cardiovascular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:28:04.990 --> 00:28:06.484 endocrine and immunological

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}06{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}08{.}476$ function which themselves can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:08.480 \longrightarrow 00:28:10.520$ Also contribute to Alzheimer's disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:10.520 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.872$ and other types of of dementia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}12.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}13.940$ and so there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:13.940 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.726$ There's certainly a very important need to

00:28:16.726 --> 00:28:20.018 look at some of these X chromosome genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:20.020 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.724$ and even more importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:21.724 \rightarrow 00:28:23.854$ or maybe not more importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:23.860 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.040$ but to go beyond that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:26.040 \rightarrow 00:28:29.280$ you know women are complex and in that way

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:28:29.280 --> 00:28:32.597 in terms of the role of X inactivation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}32.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}35.978$ where not all of the chromosomes will

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:35.978 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.884$ be inactivated for 1X versus the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:28:39.890 --> 00:28:41.350 But many of them are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}41{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44{.}476$ and it's that the randomization of

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:44.476 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.060$ the X chromosome that is inactivated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}48.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}51.217$ It is independent across a variety of

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}51{.}217 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54{.}869$ of tissues as well as organs and cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}28{:}54{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}58{.}104$ And so how this might play into

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:28:58.104 \rightarrow 00:28:59.490$ susceptibility of developing

 $00:28:59.569 \rightarrow 00:29:01.958$ cognitive impairment and dementia

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}29{:}01{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}04{.}926$ again is is not well understood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:04.926 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.510$ really has not been looked at yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:07.510 \rightarrow 00:29:09.940$ And just I'm going to put this out there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00{:}29{:}09{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}11.851$ This is something that I I saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:29:11.851 -> 00:29:13.060 a few years back,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:13.060 \rightarrow 00:29:15.433$ which I've been really intrigued in and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:29:15.433 --> 00:29:17.150 I've been encouraging my neuropathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:17.150 \longrightarrow 00:29:19.397$ colleagues to take a look at more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:19.400 \rightarrow 00:29:20.920$ There was a this one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:20.920 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.432$ this study here that was done in mice

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:23.432 \rightarrow 00:29:26.289$ looking at the laterality of X inactivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:29:26.290 --> 00:29:27.234 And interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:27.234 \rightarrow 00:29:30.066$ the the red dots indicate paternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

00:29:30.066 --> 00:29:32.582 inheritance and the green dots

NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333

 $00:29:32.582 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.085$ indicate maternal inheritance

- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.570$ and what was interesting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- 00:29:35.570 --> 00:29:37.050 particularly about this figure,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:37.050 \rightarrow 00:29:37.950$ is, as you can see,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:37.950 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.225$ is that there tend to be laterality
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:40.225 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.691$ in in terms of paternal and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00{:}29{:}42.691 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}44.110$ maternal her inheritance.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:44.110 \rightarrow 00:29:47.710$ And so whether this is a common aspect,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- 00:29:47.710 > 00:29:49.852 whether this is unique and really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:49.852 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.286$ how this might affect risk of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:52.286 \rightarrow 00:29:54.158$ cognitive decline and Alzheimer's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:54.158 \rightarrow 00:29:56.030$ disease is completely unknown.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:56.030 \rightarrow 00:29:57.794$ But something that absolutely
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914228080833333
- $00:29:57.794 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.558$ needs to be investigated.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:30:02.520 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.620$ Next thing or more lastly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:30:04.620 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.573$ I'll talk a little bit more about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:06.573 \rightarrow 00:30:08.744$ sex and gender differences in risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}08.744 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}10.956$ factors for Alzheimer's disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

00:30:10.956 --> 00:30:13.744 before I dive into just talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:13.744 \rightarrow 00:30:15.554$ about some of these differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}15{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}18{.}665$ I do want to highlight that we're at a

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

00:30:18.665 --> 00:30:20.913 point where we need to move beyond just

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}20{.}913 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}22{.}863$ saying that there are sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:22.863 \dashrightarrow 00:30:25.019$ or there are gender differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}25{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}27{.}020$ But to understand what some

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:27.020 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.020$ of the overall impact is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:29.020 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.280$ So for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}30{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}32{.}750$ there are four different ways that

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:32.750 \dashrightarrow 00:30:35.340$ in terms of of frequency and effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:35.340 \rightarrow 00:30:37.796$ that there can be sex and gender differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}37{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}40{.}352$ So one or risk factor could have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:40.352 \rightarrow 00:30:42.499$ same frequency but a different effect.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}30{:}42.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}44.820$ And an example of that is what I've

 $00{:}30{:}44.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}47.039$ just shown with the Apple E4 allele.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:47.040 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.390$ The E4 allele.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:48.390 \rightarrow 00:30:50.640$ The frequency is exactly the

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

00:30:50.640 - 00:30:53.098 same for men versus women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

00:30:53.100 --> 00:30:55.417 but it looks like women with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:30:55.417 - 00:30:58.407 \to 4$ Leo may be at greater risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}30{:}58{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}00{.}810$ You can also have a factor that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:31:00.810 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.510$ the effect, but a different frequency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:31:03.510 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.800$ So in terms of education.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}31{:}06{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}09{.}240$ There's low education is similarly

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}31{:}09{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}11{.}680$ associated with risk of dementia

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00:31:11.762 \longrightarrow 00:31:13.437$ for both men and women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}31{:}13{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}15{.}204$ However, as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302

 $00{:}31{:}15{.}204 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}17{.}409$ historically women have had less

- $00:31:17.409 \dashrightarrow 00:31:19.610$ access to education and therefore
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}31{:}19{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}21{.}760$ there's more women that are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:21.760 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.039$ affected by the risk factor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}31{:}24.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}26.644$ There can also be factors that have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:26.644 \rightarrow 00:31:28.540$ both different frequencies and effects,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- 00:31:28.540 00:31:30.528 and one interesting example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:30.528 \rightarrow 00:31:33.864$ there is brain trauma and there there's been,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- 00:31:33.864 --> 00:31:34.536 you know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}31{:}34{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}37{.}690$ Generally we think of TBI as being
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:37.690 \rightarrow 00:31:40.060$ more prevalent among men than women,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- 00:31:40.060 --> 00:31:41.728 particularly at younger ages,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:41.728 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.724$ although many of these studies do not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:44.724 \rightarrow 00:31:47.274$ take into account violence against women.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:47.280 \rightarrow 00:31:48.924$ But there is more research coming
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:48.924 \rightarrow 00:31:50.928$ out of at least college athletics
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:50.928 \rightarrow 00:31:53.053$ and soccer suggesting that women

- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:53.053 \rightarrow 00:31:54.699$ who sustained concussions actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- 00:31:54.699 00:31:56.577 have more long term effects on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}31{:}56{.}577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}59{.}420$ their brain than men do.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:31:59.420 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.503$ And then lastly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}32{:}00{.}503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}02{.}308$ there are those factors that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00{:}32{:}02{.}308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}03{.}760$ are restricted to one sex.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:32:03.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.665$ So such as pregnancy for ectomy for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.521500302
- $00:32:06.665 \dashrightarrow 00:32:09.988$ women and then such as prostate cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- $00{:}32{:}13.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}15.314$ So we were interested in a while back.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- $00:32:15.320 \rightarrow 00:32:17.434$ I'm trying to understand what some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- $00:32:17.434 \rightarrow 00:32:19.623$ the sex differences in risk factors were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- $00:32:19.623 \dashrightarrow 00:32:21.465$ for the development of mild cognitive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- 00:32:21.523 --> 00:32:23.747 impairment in the Mayo Clinic study of 18,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- $00:32:23.750 \dashrightarrow 00:32:26.336$ and this is among Olmsted County
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- $00{:}32{:}26{.}336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}29{.}129$ residents that were aged 70 and older,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}29{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}31{.}209$ and so we looked at factors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}31{.}209 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}32{.}590$ were equally important for both

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}32{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}35{.}397$ women and men and then those factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00:32:35.397 \longrightarrow 00:32:37.660$ that were unique for women or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}37.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}39.312$ And as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}39{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}43{.}039$ what we saw solo education was a risk factor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

00:32:43.040 --> 00:32:44.768 Memory concerns stroke

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00:32:44.768 \longrightarrow 00:32:46.496$ and a trial fibrillation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

00:32:46.500 --> 00:32:50.250 But really among women we found

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}50{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}52{.}125$ that midlife cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}52{.}125 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}54{.}809$ conditions had a greater risk for

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}54{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}57{.}375$ mild cognitive impairment in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}32{:}57{.}375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}00{.}426$ compared to men and among men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

00:33:00.426 --> 00:33:03.830 Some Kitty risk factors were obesity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00{:}33{:}03{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}06{.}174$ particularly with BMI greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875

 $00:33:06.174 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.350$ than 30 and those.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- 00:33:08.350 > 00:33:10.168 Of men that were never married
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88095397875
- 00:33:10.168 --> 00:33:11.380 or widowed or divorced.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:33:13.910 \rightarrow 00:33:16.934$ We subsequently start to look at this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}33{:}16{.}934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}20{.}238$ among earlier ages and I I I I do a lot
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}33{:}20{.}238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}23{.}350$ of work with Women's Health and and.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}33{:}23{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}26{.}438$ A passion of mine, but in Full disclosure,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:33:26.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.135$ both my father in law and his
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- 00:33:29.135 --> 00:33:30.960 father had Alzheimer's disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}33{:}30{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}33{.}312$ and so I've also been very interested in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}33{:}33{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}35{.}638$ trying to identify risk factors that might
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:33:35.638 \rightarrow 00:33:39.104$ be more specific for men and in mid life.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:33:39.104 \rightarrow 00:33:42.168$ Of course, men have more cardiovascular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- 00:33:42.168 --> 00:33:44.336 risk factors than women,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- 00:33:44.340 --> 00:33:47.436 and so I had a a postdoc fellow man,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}33{:}47{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}50{.}871$ Hugh, who then went on to examine, well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}33{:}50{.}871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}53{.}679$ men have a higher prevalence of all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

00:33:53.679 --> 00:33:55.450 cardiova
scular risk factors in midlife.

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}33{:}55{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}58{.}330$ Does that result in greater cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00:33:58.330 \rightarrow 00:34:01.968$ decline for them over that period of time?

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}34{:}01{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}04{.}441$ And as this shows, looking at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00:34:04.441 \rightarrow 00:34:07.428$ ages of 50 to 69 men had critters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

00:34:07.430 --> 00:34:09.310 factors of cardiovascular risk factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

00:34:09.310 --> 00:34:10.434 hypertension, diabetes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}34{:}10{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}13{.}806$ dyslipidemia as well as congestive heart

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00:34:13.806 \rightarrow 00:34:16.789$ failure and coronary artery disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

00:34:16.790 --> 00:34:17.852 But interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00:34:17.852 \longrightarrow 00:34:22.571$ we did not find a greater effect of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}34{:}22.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}25.397$ risk factors and conditions on men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}34{:}25{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}27{.}220$ We actually found that even though women

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00:34:27.220 \rightarrow 00:34:29.188$ were less likely to have these conditions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008

 $00{:}34{:}29{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}32{.}198$ those women that did in midlife had

- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:34:32.198 \dashrightarrow 00:34:34.470$ more cognitive decline overtime.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}34{:}34{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}38{.}020$ And I, I realized that this is is quite busy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- 00:34:38.020 --> 00:34:39.609 Just to Orient you a little bit,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:34:39.610 \longrightarrow 00:34:41.908$ the farther to the left indicates
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:34:41.910 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.611$ greater cognitive decline.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}34{:}43.611 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}47.572$ Red is women and the blue green is.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- 00:34:47.572 --> 00:34:48.418 With men,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:34:48.420 \rightarrow 00:34:52.018$ we especially saw differences in terms of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:34:52.018 \rightarrow 00:34:55.021$ language such that women with hypertension,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- 00:34:55.021 -> 00:34:55.532 dyslipidemia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}34{:}55{.}532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}58{.}598$ diabetes as well as coronary heart
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}34{:}58{.}598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}00{.}827$ failure all had greater declines
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00:35:00.827 \longrightarrow 00:35:03.101$ on language as well as some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.840992008
- $00{:}35{:}03{.}101 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}04{.}870$ global cognition and attention.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442
- $00{:}35{:}08{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}11{.}446$ So in addition to looking at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:11.450 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.508$ At sex, differences in in factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}35{:}13.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}15.814$ Of course there are also a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

00:35:15.814 --> 00:35:17.710 sex specific factors to consider,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}35{:}17.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}20.170$ and so for females this will

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:20.170 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.846$ include pregnancy, whether it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:21.846 \rightarrow 00:35:23.130$ hypertensive pregnancy disorders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:23.130 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.314$ number of pregnancies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:25.314 \rightarrow 00:35:27.811$ Gestational diabetes can include menopause,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

00:35:27.811 --> 00:35:29.546 so this could be early

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:29.546 \rightarrow 00:35:31.310$ menopause due to pre menopause,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:31.310 \dashrightarrow 00:35:33.385$ bilateral for ectomy or ovarian

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:33.385 \rightarrow 00:35:36.178$ insufficiency as well as the transition

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:36.178 \dashrightarrow 00:35:39.806$ through menopause and also hormone use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

00:35:39.806 - 00:35:41.558 So contraceptives which.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}35{:}41{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}44{.}410$ Have varied in in dose of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:44.410 \rightarrow 00:35:47.740$ medications over the last 4050 years,

00:35:47.740 - > 00:35:49.848 menopausal hormone therapy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}35{:}49{.}848 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}52{.}483$ also breast cancer treatments and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:52.483 \rightarrow 00:35:54.420$ prevention manage medications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:35:54.420 \dashrightarrow 00:35:56.650$ I I do want to know we have a paper NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

00:35:56.721 --> 00:35:58.835 that is just going to be submitted

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}35{:}58{.}835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}01{.}131$ now led by a postdoc fellow throughout

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}36{:}01{.}131 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}03{.}885$ car from our group looking at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}36{:}03.885 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05.960$ effects of Raloxi fene and tamoxifen

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}36{:}05{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}08{.}940$ on both cognition and brain structure

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:36:08.940 \rightarrow 00:36:12.188$ and we did not find any differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

00:36:12.190 --> 00:36:15.018 Or or really, any effect of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}36{:}15.018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}17.318$ drugs on cognition in our group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}36{:}17{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}19{.}329$ For today's purposes I'm I'm not going

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:36:19.329 \dashrightarrow 00:36:21.200$ to talk anymore about hormone use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:36:21.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.774$ but again,

 $00{:}36{:}21.774 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}23.496$ I'm happy to answer questions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00{:}36{:}23.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}25.319$ and talk more about that later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

00:36:25.320 --> 00:36:27.441 I will focus more on work being

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:36:27.441 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.270$ done with pregnancy as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.9018442

 $00:36:29.270 \dashrightarrow 00:36:30.974$ some of our work with menopause.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}36{:}33{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}35{.}160$ So historically, when you look

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:36:35.160 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.008$ in the literature and there have

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:36:37.008 --> 00:36:38.508 been more papers out recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:36:38.510 \dashrightarrow 00:36:40.770$ a greater number of pregnancies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}36{:}40.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}43.746$ with the exception of 1 paper have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}36{:}43.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}46.247$ associated with reduced risk of dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:36:46.250 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.530$ And so a question of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:36:48.530 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.570$ is is what is the mechanism?

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}36{:}50{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}52{.}398$ And most often when

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:36:52.398 \rightarrow 00:36:53.769$ discussing about pregnancies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}36{:}53.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}56.074$ the first thing that comes up is that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355
- $00:36:56.074 \rightarrow 00:36:57.586$ during pregnancies women have higher

 $00{:}36{:}57{.}586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}59{.}338$ estrogen levels and this must be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:36:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.140$ you know, one of the reasons for

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:02.140 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.163$ this reduced risk of dementia

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}04.163 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}06.104$ or other or Alzheimer's disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:06.104 \rightarrow 00:37:08.189$ and other types of dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:08.190 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.885$ But really we need to move beyond.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:37:10.890 --> 00:37:13.110 I mean, certainly hormones are important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}13.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}15.206$ but there are a lot of other factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:15.206 \longrightarrow 00:37:16.739$ that occur during pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:37:16.740 --> 00:37:19.180 That allow a woman to carry a baby,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}19{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}21{.}938$ and so there are significant changes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}21.938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}24.218$ inflammation in terms of blood volume.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}24.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25.316$ Vascular changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:25.316 \rightarrow 00:37:29.152$ There are also many stress related changes,

 $00:37:29.160 \rightarrow 00:37:31.584$ and so it's really important going

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}31{.}584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}34{.}001$ forward to understand some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:37:34.001 - > 00:37:36.185 effects and how they change over

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}36{.}185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}38{.}631$ the pregnancy period and how those

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}38{.}631 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}40{.}686$ changes might influence risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:40.686 \dashrightarrow 00:37:42.196$ cognitive impairment down the road.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}42.196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}44.225$ And in one case I I've worked

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:37:44.225 --> 00:37:46.139 quite a bit with Vesna Jarabeck,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:46.140 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.205$ who is an Afro Logest at Mayo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:37:48.210 --> 00:37:49.970 And I I really like the way she

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}49{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}51{.}882$ looks at this in terms of pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}37{:}51{.}882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}54{.}290$ being a stress test and so there may

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:54.290 \longrightarrow 00:37:57.040$ be women that go in that develop

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:57.040 \rightarrow 00:37:59.269$ hypertensive pregnancies that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:37:59.270 \longrightarrow 00:38:02.594$ because partly of this stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:38:02.594 \rightarrow 00:38:04.629$ that may have been predisposed,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355
- $00:38:04.629 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.644$ but otherwise would not have

 $00:38:06.644 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.450$ developed hypertension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:38:07.450 \longrightarrow 00:38:09.424$ This early and so in a way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:38:09.430 --> 00:38:11.302 it's it's a it can be seen as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

00:38:11.302 --> 00:38:12.775 positive because you can identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:38:12.775 \dashrightarrow 00:38:14.587$ those women that are having these

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00{:}38{:}14.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}16.332$ conditions under this stress as

NOTE Confidence: 0.914800355

 $00:38:16.332 \rightarrow 00:38:18.460$ potentially greater risk down the road.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873776116363636

 $00{:}38{:}20.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}23.442$ We have shown, as well as others that

NOTE Confidence: 0.873776116363636

00:38:23.442 --> 00:38:24.810 hypertensive pregnancy disorders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873776116363636

 $00:38:24.810 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.238$ both gestational hypertension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873776116363636

00:38:26.238 --> 00:38:29.094 The eclampsia is associated with worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.873776116363636

 $00:38:29.094 \rightarrow 00:38:30.963$ cognitive performance and low brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.873776116363636

 $00:38:30.963 \longrightarrow 00:38:33.260$ volume even in women in their 60s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:38:35.290 \rightarrow 00:38:37.250$ One question that has come up though,

 $00:38:37.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.154$ is what the result or what

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:38:40.154 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.090$ the mechanism might be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:38:42.090 \rightarrow 00:38:45.468$ Whether this is through vascular pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:38:45.470 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.286$ general brain aging or

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:38:47.286 --> 00:38:48.648 even Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}38{:}48.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}50.806$ and there have been a couple studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}38{:}50{.}806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}52{.}753$ that have looked at the placentas

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:38:52.753 \rightarrow 00:38:54.673$ of women who have had preeclampsia

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:38:54.673 - > 00:38:56.581 and they find amyloid plaques

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:38:56.581 \dashrightarrow 00:38:59.038$ within the placentas and so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}38{:}59{.}038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}01{.}435$ that kind of caused us to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:01.435 \rightarrow 00:39:02.950$ this a little bit further and say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:02.950 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.010$ well, you know is this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:04.010 --> 00:39:05.002 Indicative of maybe blacks

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:05.002 \rightarrow 00:39:06.242$ going on in the brain?

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:06.250 \rightarrow 00:39:08.330$ Or is there something there?

 $00:39:08.330 \rightarrow 00:39:08.718$ Interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:08.718 --> 00:39:11.434 we we are just finishing up these

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:11.434 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.868$ analysis now and we do not see

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:13.868 \rightarrow 00:39:15.983$ associations between pre clamp C or

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:15.983 --> 00:39:17.815 ge
stational hypertension with amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:17.815 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.505$ pathology either amyloid or Tau pet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:20.505 \rightarrow 00:39:23.270$ But we do with white matter hyper

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:23.270 \rightarrow 00:39:25.770$ intensities and we also do looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}39{:}25{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}27{.}815$ at diffusion tensor imaging and

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:27.815 \rightarrow 00:39:29.993$ white matter integrity and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:29.993 \rightarrow 00:39:32.103$ several key regions as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:32.110 --> 00:39:36.184 There is also a question about Nulliparity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}39{:}36{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}38{.}368$ Some studies suggest that women that

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:38.368 --> 00:39:40.700 are deliveries are at greater risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:40.700 - 00:39:42.560 Some studies suggest that they

 $00:39:42.560 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.232$ are at reduced risk in our data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:45.232 \rightarrow 00:39:47.990$ We're finding that it it really depends

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}39{:}48.075 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}50.706$ on education and of course no parity

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:39:50.706 - 00:39:53.002 can be due to inability to conceive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}39{:}53.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}55.635$ but then also many women that choose

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}39{:}55{.}635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}58{.}559$ not to have children and so in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:39:58.559 \rightarrow 00:40:01.760$ In our study there appeared to be a very.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:01.760 \rightarrow 00:40:06.860$ Significant education interaction such that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:06.860 \longrightarrow 00:40:08.696$ Who had a greater than a

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:08.696 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.614$ high school education?

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}40{:}09{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}11{.}558$ Who were nulliparous were not at

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:40:11.558 --> 00:40:13.468 any greater risk of developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:13.468 \rightarrow 00:40:15.660$ cognitive impairment or dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}40{:}15.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}17.375$ But women who had less than a

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:17.375 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.549$ high school education were no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:40:18.550 - 00:40:21.358 Liberals were at at greater risk,

 $00:40:21.360 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.173$ and so again it's it's much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}40{:}23.173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}24.572$ complicated than just staying at

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:24.572 \rightarrow 00:40:26.294$ whether somebody has children or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

00:40:26.300 --> 00:40:27.960 Trying to understand maybe some

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:27.960 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.982$ of the reasons behind that and

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00{:}40{:}29{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}31{.}800$ and some of the other societal

NOTE Confidence: 0.901764544285714

 $00:40:31.800 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.230$ and social factors at play.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895831857058824

 $00:40:36.080 \rightarrow 00:40:38.060$ Menopause transition has has gained

NOTE Confidence: 0.895831857058824

 $00{:}40{:}38.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}41.402$ a lot of attention and I I think is

NOTE Confidence: 0.895831857058824

 $00:40:41.402 \rightarrow 00:40:44.659$ is really important. There has been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895831857058824

 $00:40:44.660 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.488$ Some announcements or or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}40{:}48{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50{.}548$ Things that have come out suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:40:50.548 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.482$ that menopause may be a risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:40:52.482 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.806$ factor for Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}40{:}53.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}55.922$ and it's certainly true that there

 $00:40:55.922 \rightarrow 00:40:58.256$ are many changes over the menopausal

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}40{:}58.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}00.396$ transition in terms of cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}41{:}00{.}396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}02{.}690$ changes and fat redistribution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}41{:}02.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}05.210$ And it's still a bit unclear how

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}41{:}05{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}06.875$ these might affect subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}41{:}06.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}09.410$ cognitive decline down the road.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}41{:}09{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}12{.}533$ There's of course a lot of reports during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:41:12.533 --> 00:41:14.929 menopausal transition of cognitive changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:41:14.930 --> 00:41:16.630 but at least in Moscone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:41:16.630 --> 00:41:18.898 as as well as a lot of Pauline Mackey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:41:18.900 \rightarrow 00:41:21.700$ Works suggest for the majority of women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:41:21.700 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.766$ This does tend to be temporary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:41:24.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.746$ What time I think it's important to think

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:41:27.746 \rightarrow 00:41:29.870$ about menopause and the transitions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:41:29.870 --> 00:41:32.510 but I I don't like the idea of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:41:32.510 --> 00:41:34.285 say, menopause or risk factor

- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- 00:41:34.285 --> 00:41:36.060 for Alzheimer's disease or risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- 00:41:36.128 --> 00:41:38.168 factor for other types of diseases,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00:41:38.170 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.006$ because all women go through menopause.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- 00:41:40.010 --> 00:41:42.010 But not all women develop
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- 00:41:42.010 --> 00:41:42.810 Alzheimer's disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00{:}41{:}42.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}43.710$ And so again, I,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00:41:43.710 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.077$ I think this is a one of those advantages
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00:41:46.077 \rightarrow 00:41:48.970$ that we have with women similar to pregnancy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00{:}41{:}48{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}52{.}484$ where you've got this biological and and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00:41:52.490 \longrightarrow 00:41:54.700$ emotional transition kind of distress.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00{:}41{:}54{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}57{.}101$ Past and someone when we'll do better
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00{:}41{:}57{.}101 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}59{.}178$ over their transition than others will.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00{:}41{:}59{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}00{.}800$ And there might be clues during
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00:42:00.800 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.340$ that transition,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365
- $00:42:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.260$ such as more severe hot flashes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:03.260 \rightarrow 00:42:05.024$ more severe mood changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:05.024 \rightarrow 00:42:07.670$ other types of sleep abnormalities that

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:07.741 \rightarrow 00:42:10.660$ someone might have more severe than others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:10.660 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.840$ but this then might indicate who

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}42{:}13.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}16.080$ may be at greater risk of certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00{:}42{:}16.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}17.770$ diseases and those women that do

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:17.770 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.140$ have these more severe symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:42:19.140 --> 00:42:19.404 Hopefully,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:19.404 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.780$ if we can follow them up and treat them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.076$ then we can delay some of these diseases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.205$ so it is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

00:42:25.205 --> 00:42:27.455 It is also an exciting window

NOTE Confidence: 0.890277365

 $00:42:27.455 \longrightarrow 00:42:29.708$ of opportunity as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

00:42:31.780 --> 00:42:34.720 Now Walter Rocca, my colleague,

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:42:34.720 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.670$ and and I and several others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:42:36.670 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.426$ have suggested that early

- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:42:38.426 \rightarrow 00:42:40.621$ menopause is associated with later
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}42{:}40.621 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}42.638$ cognitive impairment and dementia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:42:42.640 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.858$ and this is a paper that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}42{:}43.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}46.244$ recently published using data in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:42:46.244 --> 00:42:48.332 the Mayo Clinic Study of Aging.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:42:48.340 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.196$ So red is global cognitive decline
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:42:51.196 \rightarrow 00:42:53.582$ among women who underwent bilateral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:42:53.582 \rightarrow 00:42:56.758$ reflect me less than the age of 40.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:42:56.760 \rightarrow 00:43:02.280$ Blue is 40 to 45 and orange is 46 to 49.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:43:02.280 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.800$ And generally what we see is that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:43:04.800 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.212$ for women who undergo bilateral for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:43:07.212 --> 00:43:09.570 ectomy prior to natural menopause,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:43:09.570 \longrightarrow 00:43:11.178$ less than the age of 45,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:43:11.180 --> 00:43:13.708 they have about a two fold greater risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}43{:}13.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.090$ of having mild cognitive impairment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:16.090 \rightarrow 00:43:18.330$ When we look at the less than 40 group we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:18.330 \rightarrow 00:43:21.284$ it's actually about a threefold greater risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

00:43:21.290 --> 00:43:25.100 And so you know, historically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:25.100 \rightarrow 00:43:27.290$ women who were undergoing or had

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00{:}43{:}27.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}29.148$ their uterus removed for fibroids

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:29.148 \rightarrow 00:43:31.128$ or or for several other conditions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00{:}43{:}31{.}128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}33{.}720$ also had their ovaries taken out at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:33.780 \rightarrow 00:43:36.167$ time because the general thought was that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00{:}43{:}36{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}37{.}458$ well, you're not going

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:37.458 \rightarrow 00:43:38.424$ through reproduction anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00{:}43{:}38{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}40{.}358$ You don't need the ovaries and so if

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

00:43:40.358 --> 00:43:42.262 you take out the ovaries then there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:42.262 \rightarrow 00:43:44.490$ no way you can develop ovarian cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:44.490 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.650$ But we're now finding that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:46.650 \rightarrow 00:43:48.090$ it's really critically important

NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

 $00:43:48.148 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.716$ to keep these ovaries ovaries

- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:43:49.716 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.260$ in particularly for women.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}43{:}51{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}53{.}696$ That are not at great family risk,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}43{:}53.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}56.280$ for example that have BRCA mutation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:43:56.280 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.076$ mutations in their family or have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:43:59.076 --> 00:44:01.578 strong family history and so it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}44{:}01{.}578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}03{.}774$ it's really important going forward to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:03.774 \rightarrow 00:44:06.026$ highlight the need to keep ovaries in.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:44:06.026 --> 00:44:06.408 Now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:44:06.408 --> 00:44:07.936 On a side note,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:07.940 \rightarrow 00:44:11.390$ interestingly to thinking about estrogen,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:11.390 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.970$ we often come back to memory
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}44{:}13.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}15.963$ performance and in our studies both
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:15.963 \rightarrow 00:44:18.589$ this study as well as a couple of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:18.589 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.369$ other cohorts we're looking at,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:20.370 \longrightarrow 00:44:21.889$ there really seems to be in effect.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614

- $00{:}44{:}21{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}24{.}410$ And attention as opposed to memory.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00{:}44{:}24{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}25{.}403$ And so again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:25.403 \rightarrow 00:44:27.720$ this kind of gets at the question
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:27.799 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.596$ of if bilateral refractory is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:29.596 \longrightarrow 00:44:31.666$ a risk factor for dementia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:44:31.670 --> 00:44:33.550 Is it through Alzheimer's pathways,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.650$ vascular pathways or other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:35.650 \rightarrow 00:44:37.225$ aging related pathways?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- 00:44:37.230 --> 00:44:38.850 And that's something that again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:38.850 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.085$ we're trying to look at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.515560614
- $00:44:40.085 \longrightarrow 00:44:41.073$ and understand right now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:44:44.060 --> 00:44:47.760 So I I talked a little bit about this work,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}44{:}47{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}50{.}240$ but we do have a grant right now with Mayo
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}44{:}50{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}52{.}756$ Clinic study of Aging where we've tried to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:44:52.756 \rightarrow 00:44:55.375$ take more much more of a lifespan approach.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:44:55.380 \rightarrow 00:44:57.403$ So historically in the literature you might

- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:44:57.403 \rightarrow 00:44:59.800$ see a paper on hypertensive pregnancies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:44:59.800 --> 00:45:02.392 You might see a paper on bilateral fracta me.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:45:02.400 \rightarrow 00:45:05.165$ Maybe just on the number of pregnancies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:45:05.170 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.564$ but if you think about a 56 year
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}07{.}564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}09{.}398$ old woman coming in and wine or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:45:09.398 --> 00:45:11.346 no at risk of future disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}11{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}13{.}718$ she is the accumulation of all the factors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:45:13.720 \rightarrow 00:45:16.393$ That she went through and when we look at,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}16{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}17{.}936$ for example, the Framingham risk score,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:45:17.940 \longrightarrow 00:45:19.140$ we know that it does not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:45:19.140 --> 00:45:22.700 Is not as good in women as compared to men,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}22.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}25.651$ and so our hope is that if we understand
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}25{.}651 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}28{.}388$ what some of these specific factors are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}28{.}388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}30{.}539$ and incorporate them into risk scores,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}45{:}30{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}32{.}720$ particularly for cognitive impairment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:32.720 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.990$ that will be better than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}45{:}36.073 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37.699$ current risk scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:37.700 \rightarrow 00:45:40.430$ Now it it has been very interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:40.430 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.538$ We have a a median medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:42.538 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.228$ records of about 45 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}45{:}44{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}47{.}342$ It took us over four years to go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}45{:}47{.}342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}49{.}406$ and abstract all the information from

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:49.406 \rightarrow 00:45:51.688$ the medical records for the women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}45{:}51{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53{.}832$ But we also realize the difficulty

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:53.832 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.850$ in terms of societal aspects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:45:55.850 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.984$ So for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}45{:}56{.}984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}59{.}630$ we found that tubal ligation attended to

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}45{:}59{.}702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}02{.}267$ be protective for Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:46:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.680$ and we couldn't figure out what

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}03.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}04.850$ the reason for that was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:46:04.850 \rightarrow 00:46:06.730$ Our concern was that with two ligation there,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:06.730 \longrightarrow 00:46:07.211$ maybe.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:46:07.211 --> 00:46:09.135 Manipulation of ovaries and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:09.135 \longrightarrow 00:46:11.059$ that could be detrimental,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:11.060 \rightarrow 00:46:12.859$ but we found it to be protective.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}46{:}12.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.086$ Well when we looked at it
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:15.086 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.010$ more and and what the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}46{:}17.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}18.822$ Medical practice was at the time
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:18.822 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.146$ at really women who had a lot of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:21.146 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.718$ children were the only ones that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:46:22.777 --> 00:46:24.523 were allowed to have tubal ligations
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:24.523 \rightarrow 00:46:26.704$ in the 50s or 60s in Rochester,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:46:26.704 --> 00:46:29.070 MN, and in fact actually if they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:46:29.143 --> 00:46:31.309 had it at Saint Mary's Hospital,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:46:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.080$ which was run by the Sisters
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:46:33.080 --> 00:46:34.260 of Saint Francis you're,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:46:34.260 \rightarrow 00:46:37.268$ you're never going to find tubal ligation or

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

00:46:37.268 --> 00:46:39.594 effective or prescription of contraceptives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:46:39.594 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.990$ If women were seen in that area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:46:42.990 \rightarrow 00:46:43.626$ so again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}43.626 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}45.534$ there's a lot of societal aspects

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:46:45.534 \rightarrow 00:46:47.560$ that have changed overtime that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}47{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}49{.}678$ We need to think about as

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}49.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}51.760$ we're looking at these factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

00:46:51.760 --> 00:46:54.938 Before I go into my final slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}54{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56{.}780$ I I am often asked ahead of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}56{.}780$ --> $00{:}46{:}59{.}174$ What about transgender men and women

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}46{:}59{.}174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}02{.}227$ and and what are the effects of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00{:}47{:}02.227 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}04.446$ hormones and and what not on on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

00:47:04.446 --> 00:47:06.700 risk of dementia down the road?

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

00:47:06.700 --> 00:47:07.748 And really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696

 $00:47:07.748 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.844$ there's very little information

- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:09.844 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.726$ out at this period at this time.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:12.726 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.560$ One of the reasons when I I've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:14.629 \longrightarrow 00:47:16.717$ talked to researchers historically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}47{:}16.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}20.650$ they've stated that you know hormone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}47{:}20.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}23.212$ Doses and things like that for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:23.212 \rightarrow 00:47:25.482$ transgender men or women have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:47:25.482 --> 00:47:27.406 not been uniform overtime,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:27.410 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.567$ and so trying to separate those doses
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}47{:}30{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}32{.}724$ and differences in hormone levels as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:32.724 \rightarrow 00:47:35.609$ well as all the stress that goes in.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00:47:35.610 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.590$ To get to the stage,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:47:37.590 --> 00:47:39.767 may
be to have surgery or decide to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- $00{:}47{:}39{.}767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}41{.}442$ become transgender really has a role NOTE Confidence: 0.799139696
- 00:47:41.442 --> 00:47:43.038 and and it's not clear what those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818
- $00:47:43.095 \rightarrow 00:47:45.425$ are yet. So there there's an absolute
- NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

00:47:45.425 - 00:47:47.170 need to understand those factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}47{:}47{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}49{.}530$ and I've been working with a group the

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:47:49.587 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.143$ diversity and disparities professional

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:47:51.143 \rightarrow 00:47:54.210$ interest area on sex and gender differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}47{:}54{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}56{.}310$ and have also been trying to put

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}47{:}56{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}58{.}427$ forward to think about sex and gender

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

00:47:58.427 --> 00:48:00.830 is not just being a binary construct,

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:48:00.830 \longrightarrow 00:48:03.508$ and so we certainly need to move

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}48{:}03.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}05.776$ forward there from a continuous aspect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}48{:}05{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}07{.}642$ And then also not just think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:48:07.642 \longrightarrow 00:48:09.839$ it from a US centric standpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}48{:}09{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}12{.}560$ because clearly these many cultures

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:48:12.560 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.960$ around the world are different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:48:13.960 \rightarrow 00:48:15.801$ There are some that are more accepting

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00{:}48{:}15{.}801 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}17{.}452$ some that are less accepting and

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:48:17.452 \rightarrow 00:48:19.328$ it's going to be important to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.878143208181818

 $00:48:19.386 \rightarrow 00:48:21.108$ at this from a global perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:23.720 \longrightarrow 00:48:25.953$ So in conclusion, as I first talked

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:25.953 \rightarrow 00:48:28.259$ about in terms of the epidemiology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.612$ more women than men have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:48:30.612 --> 00:48:32.180 diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:32.180 \longrightarrow 00:48:34.045$ However, the prevalence and incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}48{:}34{.}045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}36{.}820$ is a little bit more equivocal and

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:36.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.396$ may depend on area of the country

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:39.396 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.088$ as well as area of the world.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:48:42.090 --> 00:48:44.490 As a field I I do get concerned

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:48:44.490 --> 00:48:46.896 in terms of how we present this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}48{:}46{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}49{.}056$ because as an epidemiologist to and with

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}48{:}49.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}51.139$ the blood based biomarker work I do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:51.140 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.788$ I tend to think more from a primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}48{:}53.788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}56.068$ care perspective and so if primary care

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}48{:}56.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}58.764$ providers who are the ones that are are

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:48:58.764 \rightarrow 00:49:01.256$ going to see these dementia patients first.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:49:01.260 --> 00:49:02.740 If they automatically think oh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:49:02.740 --> 00:49:04.920 a woman memory impairment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.645$ it's probably Alzheimer's disease may

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}49{:}07.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}10.570$ be losing out on some other factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:10.570 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.620$ or treatments that could potentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:12.620 \rightarrow 00:49:15.758$ Help sustain their their cognitive decline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:49:15.760 --> 00:49:16.344 Similarly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:16.344 \rightarrow 00:49:21.016$ we don't want men to be misdiagnosed either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:49:21.020 --> 00:49:21.381 Overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}49{:}21{.}381 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}23{.}908$ there still are two few studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:23.908 \rightarrow 00:49:26.158$ examine sex and gender differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:26.160 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.272$ and the vast majority of studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:49:28.272 --> 00:49:30.399 still typically adjust for it instead,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:49:30.400 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.720$ and so it's it's not.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:31.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.869$ It would be difficult to do a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- 00:49:33.869 00:49:35.740 meta analysis until we would have,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- 00:49:35.740 --> 00:49:37.008 for example, uniform reporting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00{:}49{:}37.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}39.219$ and so it's possible that some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00{:}49{:}39{.}219 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}40{.}725$ the papers that are being reported
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00{:}49{:}40.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}42.364$ on with sex differences are that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:42.364 \longrightarrow 00:49:44.032$ they just happen to find it,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00{:}49{:}44.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}46.050$ and many other papers they didn't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:46.050 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.565$ look or or they they didn't see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:48.565 \rightarrow 00:49:51.148$ anything and so they didn't report it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:51.150 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.243$ So it really in need for whole
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00{:}49{:}53.243 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}54.990$ studies to report whether there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.950$ are sex or gender differences.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00{:}49{:}56{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}58{.}480$ And there's also a need for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385
- $00:49:58.480 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.245$ more diverse cohorts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:49:59.250 --> 00:50:00.165 As I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:00.165 \rightarrow 00:50:03.266$ most of this work has been done on White,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:50:03.266 --> 00:50:04.032 Caucasian,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:50:04.032 --> 00:50:06.330 European background cohorts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}06{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}08{.}166$ and I've been working with Nila

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}08.166 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}10.290$ major wall at Rush University in

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:10.290 \dashrightarrow 00:50:12.385$ the Chicago Healthy Aging project.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:12.390 \rightarrow 00:50:14.290$ Looking at pre menopausal bilateral

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}14.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}16.911$ reflect me on both white and black

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}16{.}911 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}19{.}214$ women and the average age of bilateral

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:19.214 \rightarrow 00:50:21.506$ for ectomy for white women was 49.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:21.510 \rightarrow 00:50:24.624$ And the average age for black women was 40,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}24.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}26.150$ and so there are some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:50:26.150 --> 00:50:27.310 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:27.310 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.385$ definite key differences that we need

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:30.385 \rightarrow 00:50:33.500$ to consider by race ethnicity as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:50:33.500 --> 00:50:35.135 As I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}35{.}135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}37{.}738$ even if there the prevalence of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}37.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}39.739$ disease is the same for men and women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:39.740 \rightarrow 00:50:42.556$ the mechanisms and factors can differ by sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:42.560 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.324$ and so we we shouldn't have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:44.324 \rightarrow 00:50:46.100$ say men are at greater risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:50:46.100 \rightarrow 00:50:48.436$ But women are at greater risk to really

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}48{.}436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{.}50{.}674$ look at sex differences and hone in

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}50{.}674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}53{.}200$ that we should be doing it regardless.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:50:53.200 --> 00:50:54.384 As I mentioned there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}54{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}56{.}934$ there is a need to examine more of

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}56{.}934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}59{.}151$ these sex and gender differences from

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}50{:}59{.}151 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}01{.}406$ a diversity and disparities culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}51{:}01{.}406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}03{.}750$ and social determinants of health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}51{:}03.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}08.090$ And as Doctor Missouri had mentioned earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

00:51:08.090 - 00:51:09.788 really important to look at these

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}51{:}09{.}788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}11{.}478$ sex differences from a precision

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:51:11.478 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.488$ medicine standpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:51:12.490 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.524$ But I I also want to argue that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}51{:}14{.}524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}16{.}977$ also important to look at it from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:51:16.977 \dashrightarrow 00:51:18.409$ socio cultural standpoint as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}51{:}18{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}22{.}146$ Because as we look at some of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00{:}51{:}22{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}23{.}560$ Look at dementia around the

NOTE Confidence: 0.846276524615385

 $00:51:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.970$ world and some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

 $00:51:25.030 \longrightarrow 00:51:26.622$ countries where women have

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

 $00:51:26.622 \rightarrow 00:51:28.214$ significantly less education and

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

 $00:51:28.214 \rightarrow 00:51:30.179$ their family roles are different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

 $00:51:30.180 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.660$ There are opportunities to change

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

 $00{:}51{:}32.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}34.694$ and lower their risk for more

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

 $00:51:34.694 \rightarrow 00:51:36.050$ of a sociocultural perspective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739

00:51:36.050 - 00:51:38.840 so both precision medicine and

- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:38.840 \rightarrow 00:51:41.820$ social medicine is is important.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00{:}51{:}41.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43.012$ So again, I'm I.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- 00:51:43.012 --> 00:51:44.502 I'm sorry I don't know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:44.502 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.097$ what the time frame is.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- 00:51:46.100 --> 00:51:48.300 I hope I didn't go over too much,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:48.300 \longrightarrow 00:51:49.148$ but I'm I'm very,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:49.148 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.921$ very happy to be here and have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- 00:51:50.921 --> 00:51:52.253 to answer questions I I don't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- 00:51:52.253 --> 00:51:54.037 have a Wake Forest email address,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:54.040 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.744$ but you can get a hold of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:55.744 \rightarrow 00:51:57.540$ me by my Gmail account.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.890772616521739
- $00:51:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.010$ Thank you.