## WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:58:31" NOTE recognizability:0.806

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.85747489

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:04.340$  Very kind introduction. By the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85747489

 $00:00:04.340 \dashrightarrow 00:00:06.510$ you didn't hold me back in residency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85747489

 $00{:}00{:}06.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}08.940$  except for maybe the the raucous

NOTE Confidence: 0.85747489

00:00:08.940 --> 00:00:11.790 Halloween party. So I think that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.85747489

 $00:00:11.790 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.830$  a topic for another. OK. Number.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84460116

 $00:00:23.250 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.620$  So just get this reset.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:00:43.130 --> 00:00:47.798 OK, and you can see the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:00:47.800 --> 00:00:51.242 See. OK everyone OK, great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:00:51.242 --> 00:00:55.090 Well you all I I think have varying

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:00:55.204 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.084$  degrees of familiarity with with

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}00{:}58.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}01.700$  what I'm going to talk about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}01{:}01{:}00{:}01{:}00{:}01{:}04{:}01$  You know in particular the the recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:04.514 --> 00:01:06.878 controversy in the news about the

00:01:06.878 --> 00:01:09.121 first so-called disease modifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}01{:}09.121 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}11.629$  the rapies for Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:11.630 --> 00:01:13.580 Back in 2021, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:13.580 --> 00:01:15.524 they came to the news I'd you can't

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:15.530 \longrightarrow 00:01:18.160$  approved the first disease modifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:18.160 --> 00:01:20.264 therapy for Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:20.270 --> 00:01:21.850 But then immediately, well wait,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:21.850 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.670$  it wasn't full approval.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:23.670 \longrightarrow 00:01:26.980$  It was accelerated approval based on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:26.980 --> 00:01:29.470 biomarker and that's plaque clearance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8618545933333333

 $00{:}01{:}29.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}30.630$  And immediately there was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}01{:}30.630 \longrightarrow 00{:}01{:}34.129$ you know, a huge controversy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:34.130 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.280$  Culminating about 10 months later in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:37.280 --> 00:01:40.650 decision by CMS not to pay for the drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:40.650 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.770$  And then as the dust settled for that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:43.770 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.356$  we started to hear about lacanada

00:01:46.356 --> 00:01:48.483 different drug that actually appeared

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}01{:}48.483 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51.147$  to meet the bar for full approval in

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:51.147 --> 00:01:53.987 in a in a more straightforward manner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:01:53.990 \longrightarrow 00:01:55.922$  although as we're going to see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:55.922 --> 00:01:57.562 Kanab has its own uncertainties

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:57.562 --> 00:01:59.806 and some of its own controversies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:01:59.810 --> 00:02:02.050 But all of that is what I'm going

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:02.050 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.130$  to be talking about today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:02:04.130 --> 00:02:05.710 Now this is my disclosure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:02:05.710 --> 00:02:08.202 I'm going to be talking mainly about

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:08.202 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.029$  the drugs aducanumab and lichen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333 00:02:10.030 --> 00:02:10.402 amab, NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}02{:}10.402 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}12.634$  Yale and I received grant support

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:12.634 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.569$  for the conductive conduct of

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:14.569 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.065$  trials with these drugs.

 $00:02:16.070 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.182$  And I'm also a paid consultant

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:18.182 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.418$  to Asahi who makes like canaman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:20.418 \dashrightarrow 00:02:23.123$  I don't have any any financial stake

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:23.123 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.827$  in the in the success of these drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:25.830 \longrightarrow 00:02:28.098$  And almost all of what I'm going to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:02:28.098 --> 00:02:30.366 you is from peer reviewed publication,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:30.370 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.182$  mainly that the New England Journal

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:32.182 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.448$  article there about 2 exceptions to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:02:34.450 --> 00:02:37.040 And I'll try to show you mention

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:37.040 \longrightarrow 00:02:39.097$  when I'm showing you something

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:39.097 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.257$  that is not peer reviewed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:02:41.260 --> 00:02:44.316 Well, so in in talking about like Canada,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:44.320 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.278$  I think we need to go back to the the whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:48.278 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.094$  controversy with the earlier drug aducanumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:52.100 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.076$  So there it was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:02:55.076 --> 00:02:56.500 June 7, 2021,

 $00:02:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.200$  a day that would live.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333 00:02:58.200 --> 00:02:59.138 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:02:59.138 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.952$  in something I'm almost concerned that

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:01.952 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.358$  they waited a day so they didn't try

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:05.358 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.740$  to eclipse the anniversary of D-Day,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:07.740 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.736$  but it was, it was huge news,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:10.740 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.375$  but then almost.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:12.375 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.555$  Instantaneously came the backlash,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:14.560 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.600$  the controversy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:03:15.600 --> 00:03:18.720 You know, that this was only,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:03:18.720 --> 00:03:20.916 you know, approval based on biomarker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:20.920 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.539$  not full approval.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}03{:}23.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}25.492$  And I'm going to go into more of

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}03{:}25.492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}27.358$  what the controversy was about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:27.360 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.522$  But I think to do that I need to do a

 $00:03:30.522 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.960$  little background on the pathogenesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}03{:}32.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}36.500$  and mechanisms that underlie these drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8618545933333333

 $00:03:36.500 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.224$  and then more detail about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:39.224 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.800$  actual evidence for and against.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333 00:03:41.800 --> 00:03:43.766 You can't, NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:03:43.766 --> 00:03:44.749 amab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:03:44.750 --> 00:03:47.130 So by way of background you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:47.130 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.868$  these these are anti amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00{:}03{:}48.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51.854$  drugs and we need to look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:51.854 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.750$  mechanism of amyloid production.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

00:03:54.750 --> 00:03:58.126 So what we're looking at here is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:03:58.126 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.089$  production of the toxic abeta peptide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:04:01.090 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.813$  I think you can see my cursor

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:04:03.813 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.190$  from the the amyloid precursor

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:04:06.190 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.526$  protein over here on the left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:04:09.530 \longrightarrow 00:04:14.786$  So this AP spans the the cell membrane then.

 $00:04:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.568$  The neuronal membrane in this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:04:17.570 \longrightarrow 00:04:20.132$  And it is cleaved by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861854593333333

 $00:04:20.132 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.840$  enzymes beta and gamma

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:21.932 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.924$  secretase to form the toxic a beta fragment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:25.930 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.930$  And exactly where it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.330$  cleave makes a difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:31.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.390$  where it's clear by gamma secretase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:34.390 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.580$  And the main major forms as

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:36.580 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.946$  we'll see are in a beta 42,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:38.946 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.210$  a little longer form.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:40.210 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.801$  And 40 it's a beta 42 that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:43.801 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.373$  particularly malignant, amyloidogenic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:04:45.373 --> 00:04:48.088 prone to aggregate into the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00{:}04{:}48.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.370$  Into the more toxic species

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:50.370 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.194$  and what are those?

 $00:04:52.200 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.984$  Well, a lot of evidence is that those

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:55.984 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.123$  toxic species are soluble aggregated

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:04:59.123 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.672$  species oligomers and and larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:02.672 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.950$  oligomers referred to as proto fibrils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:06.950 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.350$  And all of these forms you know do

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:10.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:13.109$  also aggregate further into plaques.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:05:13.110 --> 00:05:14.174 And overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:14.174 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.366$  the goal of these therapies though

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:17.366 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.270$  is to alter the balance between

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:21.270 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.685$  production and clearance so the

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00{:}05{:}24.685 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}27.837$  antibodies aim to clear amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:05:27.837 --> 00:05:30.792 and alter the balance favorably.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:30.800 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.058$  And what what are these antibodies?

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:34.060 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.795$  Such as Lacan Amab and I do cannab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445 00:05:37.800 --> 00:05:38.176 Well, NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:38.176 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.808$  that's that's shown here in in a

 $00:05:40.808 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.639$  somewhat busy table that I that I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:43.639 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.990$  really want to simplify a great deal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.966$  So these are in the case of aducanumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:50.970 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.134$  this is a an actual human antibody

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:54.134 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.883$  was donated by 100 year old

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:05:56.883 --> 00:05:59.469 Swiss woman a few years back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:05:59.470 \longrightarrow 00:06:02.510$  Been cloned and mass produced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.270$  And now it's administered every four

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:05.270 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.950$  weeks intravenously as a treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:07.950 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.866$  Of note is that it's what we call an

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:06:10.870 --> 00:06:15.886 n-terminal antibody and the a beta

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:15.890 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.585$  42 is shown down here in purple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00{:}06{:}18.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}21.726$  You know the 42 amino acid structure and

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:21.726 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.956$  the end terminal is on the left side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:06:24.960 --> 00:06:27.648 And so how'd you can't remember

00:06:27.648 --> 00:06:29.612 by buying certain amino acids

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:29.612 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.340$  3 through 6 on the left side?

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00{:}06{:}32.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}35.112$  What's important about that is that even

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:35.112 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.080$  when amyloid is aggregated as oligomers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

00:06:38.080 --> 00:06:39.088 proto fibrils,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:39.088 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.592$  plaques.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:39.592 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.616$  This portion of the of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:42.616 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.390$  peptide is visible to antibodies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00{:}06{:}45.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}47.034$  so they will still they will

NOTE Confidence: 0.786859445

 $00:06:47.034 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.709$  still target it and clear it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:06:50.870 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.187$  And over on the in the right

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00{:}06{:}53.187 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55.467$  columns you can see the big red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:06:55.470 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.126$  yes for all of them are in fibral.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00{:}06{:}58.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}59.929$  So if it's an end terminal antibody,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:06:59.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.746$  that's why it targets

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:07:01.746 \dashrightarrow 00:07:03.108$  these aggregated species.

00:07:03.110 --> 00:07:05.330 It actually doesn't target

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:07:05.330 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.105$  target monomers to speak of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:07:08.110 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.988$  And we can't. Amap is similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00{:}07{:}09.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}11.438$  It's different but similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:07:11.438 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.248$  So it's a humanized antibody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

00:07:13.250 --> 00:07:14.468 It's, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

00:07:14.468 --> 00:07:16.904 derived from a mouse antibody but

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00{:}07{:}16.904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}19.160$  fully humanized and structure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

00:07:19.160 --> 00:07:21.340 It's also end terminal binding

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

00:07:21.340 --> 00:07:23.520 amino acids one through 16,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00:07:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.926$  and so it also binds oligomers

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

00:07:25.926 --> 00:07:28.480 and proto fibrils in particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865366352857143

 $00{:}07{:}28.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.290$  and to some extent fibrils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00{:}07{:}34.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39.034$  Now moving back to Umm aducanumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:07:39.034 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.330$  and the aducanumab story.

00:07:42.330 --> 00:07:44.836 So this drug, you know, was, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:07:44.836 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.248$  developed over the last several years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:07:47.250 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.190$  These are data from the original,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00{:}07{:}50.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}52.570$  one of the original phase one studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:07:52.570 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.254$  a Phase 1B study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:07:54.254 --> 00:07:57.478 And what we're looking at actually are

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:07:57.478 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.543$  individual PET scans from individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:00.543 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.935$  participants who received you know either

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00{:}08{:}03.935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07.215$  place bo or progressively higher doses of

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:07.215 \longrightarrow 00:08:10.575$  aducanumab over the over a one year trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:10.580 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.616$  And these images are horizontal transaxial

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:08:13.616 --> 00:08:16.961 through the brain and and high amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:16.961 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.480$  binding is shown in red followed by yellow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:20.480 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.685$  So for example this person on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:22.685 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.179$  top row was in the placebo group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:25.180 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.724$  And you can see that their baseline and

00:08:27.724 --> 00:08:30.147 one year scans look pretty similar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:08:30.150 --> 00:08:33.870 not much change being on placebo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:08:33.870 --> 00:08:36.118 but with progressively higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:08:36.118 --> 00:08:37.804 doses of aducanumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:08:37.810 --> 00:08:40.298 3 megs per keg, 6 megs per keg,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:40.300 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.756$  10 megs per keg administered again as as

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:43.756 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.317$  in infusions every four weeks you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00{:}08{:}47.317 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}49.927$  progressively more clearance of amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:08:50.011 --> 00:08:53.027 signal and in fact in the bottom row,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:53.030 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.334$  the 10 milligram per kilogram dose which.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:56.340 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.976$  Is the clinically relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:08:57.976 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.430$  dose when all of sudden done,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00{:}09{:}00.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}02.075$  this person scan is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:02.075 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.469$  normal at the end of the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:04.470 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.166$  The bit of yellow you see here is

 $00:09:06.166 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.269$  in the white matter and it's what

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:08.269 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.889$  we would call nonspecific binding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:09.890 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.948$  But if if they entered the study

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:11.948 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.830$  with the scan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:12.830 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.720$  they would have not been allowed because

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:14.720 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.956$  they didn't have evidence, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:16.956 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.267$  of of amyloid on their pet scan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:09:20.270 --> 00:09:22.260 So very dramatic plaque clearance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00{:}09{:}22.260 \longrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23.580$  So this is something that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:23.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.830$  had never ever seen before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

00:09:24.830 --> 00:09:25.610 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73357914

 $00:09:25.610 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.780$  until this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:29.050 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.756$  And and you know Biogen was

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:31.756 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.109$  understandably very excited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:33.110 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.710$  They actually skipped phase two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:34.710 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.158$  They went right from

 $00:09:36.158 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.968$  phase one to phase three,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:37.970 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.906$  but maybe a mistake as we'll see later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00{:}09{:}40.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}43.148$  Now these now flash forward are

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

00:09:43.148 --> 00:09:46.153 data from one of the two pivotal

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

00:09:46.153 --> 00:09:48.533 phase three trials called emerge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:48.540 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.746$  Um and. What we're looking at here

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

00:09:51.746 --> 00:09:54.740 again is amyloid plaque clearance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:54.740 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.106$  but now we're looking at it quantitatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:57.106 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.649$  and this is now over a year and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:09:59.649 \dashrightarrow 00:10:01.878$  half instead of a year 78 week trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00{:}10{:}01.880 \to 00{:}10{:}04.225$  You can see that the place bo group

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:04.225 \longrightarrow 00:10:06.352$  doesn't have much change in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00{:}10{:}06.352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}08.458$  amyloid binding over the 18 months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

00:10:08.460 --> 00:10:11.160 but the relevant high dose group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

00:10:11.160 --> 00:10:14.044 mostly 10 megs per kig in purple

 $00:10:14.044 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.160$  has dramatic plaque clearance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00{:}10{:}16.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}18.300$  And again without going into

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:18.300 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.012$  the quantitation in detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:20.020 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.176$  suffice it to say that most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:22.176 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.289$  these people had normal appearing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:24.290 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.748$  Pet scans visually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:25.748 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.150$  quantitatively at the end of the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:29.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.230$  But the question then is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:30.230 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.308$  is that associated with clinical benefit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781168396666667

 $00:10:33.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.438$  so at least in the case of the?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8079185533333333

 $00{:}10{:}38.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41.598$  Emerged study, the answer was yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

00:10:41.600 --> 00:10:44.952 So here we're looking at the primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:10:44.952 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.258$  outcome of this study called the Cdr SB,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8079185533333333

 $00:10:48.260 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.612$  the clinical Dementia Rating scale some

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

00:10:50.612 --> 00:10:53.969 of boxes and for for the many of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:10:53.969 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.401$  who aren't familiar with that what that

00:10:56.401 --> 00:10:58.977 is is it's very commonly used now as

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00{:}10{:}58.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}01.976$  the primary outcome in in these trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:01.980 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.620$  It's based on an interview with a partner

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:05.620 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.309$  caregiver as well as the patient participant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:09.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.222$  Themselves, and it generates

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:11.222 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.090$  scores in each of 6 domains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:14.090 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.570$  Three of them are cognitive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:15.570 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.394$  three of them have to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

00:11:17.394 --> 00:11:18.306 with daily functioning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00:11:18.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.310$  They're all scored zero to three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

 $00{:}11{:}21.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}25.250$  So the overall Cdr SB score is 0 to 18,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

00:11:25.250 --> 00:11:27.890 with higher scores being worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807918553333333

00:11:27.890 --> 00:11:29.606 A 0 is a perfect score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:31.670 --> 00:11:34.127 And people in this early AD group

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:11:34.127 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.633$  that tend to be bunched with

 $00:11:36.633 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.794$  scores between 0.5 and about 6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:38.794 --> 00:11:40.660 What you can see in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:40.737 --> 00:11:42.329 in this study though,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:11:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.390$  is that the placebo group worsens

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:45.390 --> 00:11:47.406 over the course of a year and a half,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:11:47.410 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.996$  to the tune of about 1.75.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:49.996 --> 00:11:53.764 And the at height, the high dose side,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:53.764 --> 00:11:54.708 you can't imagine group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:11:54.710 --> 00:11:58.130 which is the relevant group, worsens as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:11:58.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.550$  but about .39 less than the placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.446$  So that's the delta and that that is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:12:05.450 --> 00:12:09.010 you know, statistically significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:09.010 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.348$  And Umm and this, this is a positive study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:13.350 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.734$  Now the problem is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:14.734 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.750$  is that the FDA requires two such studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00{:}12{:}17.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.430$  and Biogen had skipped phase two.

00:12:19.430 --> 00:12:22.090 They might have gotten an opportunity there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00{:}12{:}22.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}24.176$  but they were required to have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:12:24.176 --> 00:12:26.031 sister study in phase three and

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:26.031 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.694$  that was that was called engage

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:28.694 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.650$  and here are the data for engage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:32.650 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.744$  These are the data with the Cdr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:35.750 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.166$  By the way engage also showed very robust.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:12:39.170 --> 00:12:42.138 The amyloid plaque clearance on PET scan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.758$  when it came to the clinical measure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:44.760 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.120$  the primary outcome, it was a total bust.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:12:48.120 --> 00:12:51.110 You know, there's nothing here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:12:51.110 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.952$  The the worst line in purple

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00{:}12{:}52.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54.600$  is the high dose side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:12:54.600 --> 00:12:56.324 You can't amab group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:12:56.324 --> 00:12:58.048 although it's trivially different

 $00:12:58.048 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.929$  from the placebo group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00{:}12{:}59.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}02.918$  So you know one positive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:13:02.918 --> 00:13:04.910 one very negative study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

 $00:13:04.910 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.800$  Now, what to make of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:13:06.800 --> 00:13:07.382 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76115661

00:13:07.382 --> 00:13:08.837 how could that possibly be?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:10.980 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.125$  So. This is before I really go into

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:13:15.125 --> 00:13:17.269 this very scary looking figure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}13{:}17.270 \longrightarrow 00{:}13{:}20.294$ let me give you just a little background

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:13:20.294 --> 00:13:23.346 that these studies emerge in again and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:23.346 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.389$  engage really went through quite an ordeal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:26.390 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.886$  One that many of you know is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:28.886 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.011$  they were actually halted prematurely

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:13:31.011 --> 00:13:33.849 for a futility analysis which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:13:33.849 --> 00:13:36.837 done commonly in our field where an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}13{:}36.837 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}38.988$  interim analysis looks at the data

00:13:38.988 --> 00:13:41.060 fully up to a certain point and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}13{:}41.125 \to 00{:}13{:}43.393$  a judgment has made us about whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:43.393 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.490$  there's any chance chance of success.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:45.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.154$  And the futility analysis indicated that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:48.154 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.755$  that they were in fact futile and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:51.755 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.634$  studies were stopped and all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:13:54.634 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.589$  participants were brought in termination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}13{:}56.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}59.530$  Visits and so on and and it was a it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}13{:}59.618 \to 00{:}14{:}02.350$  was a complete mistake, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:02.350 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.050$  the futility analysis because

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:04.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.430$  when all the data came in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:06.430 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.555$  and particularly there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}14{:}07.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}10.180$  there were three more months that had

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:10.250 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.562$  elapsed from the data cut point to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:12.562 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.178$  time all the data stopped being gathered.

00:14:15.180 --> 00:14:18.237 And and obviously emerge will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:14:18.237 --> 00:14:21.459 emerge emerged as a positive study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:21.460 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.452$  So and and without going into all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:24.452 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.465$  the the reasons why the BIOSTATISTICIANS

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:14:27.465 --> 00:14:31.160 messed up which they which they did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:31.160 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.146$  There is yet another thing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:33.146 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.451$  happened to these studies that was very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:14:35.451 --> 00:14:37.380 unfortunate and that is that Biogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:37.380 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.780$  determined that the dosing they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:39.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:42.542$  using for the studies was really not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:42.542 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.550$  not optimal and actually did a midstream.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:45.550 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.798$  Changing of dose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:14:46.798 --> 00:14:49.294 And with that involved is originally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:14:49.294 --> 00:14:51.968 they had not felt everybody could

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:14:51.968 --> 00:14:54.153 safely tolerate the high relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:14:54.227 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.919$  dose of 10 megs per kig.

 $00:14:55.920 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.594$  That's the dark blue in this figure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642 00:14:58.600 --> 00:14:58.892 So,

00:14:58.892 --> 00:15:01.884 so a lot of people who carry the APOE 4

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:01.884 --> 00:15:04.870 gene were only going up to six megs per keg,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:04.870 --> 00:15:05.994 which is, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:05.994 --> 00:15:07.118 ultimately determined to be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:07.120 --> 00:15:08.314 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:08.314 --> 00:15:08.911 subtherapeutic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:08.911 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.842$  So they made a midstream adjustment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:12.842 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.578$  now what you would want now what what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}15{:}15.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.547$  these with this figure is showing you is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:18.550 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.842$  Individual level dosing for the high

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:20.842 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.317$  dose arm of the study and only those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:24.317 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.647$  people assigned to active treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:26.650 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.686$  not placebo.

 $00:15:27.686 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.312$  So what you really wanna see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:31.312 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.048$  is that from 24 weeks onward,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:34.048 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.750$  they should just be all dark blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:36.750 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.730$  That would be the ideal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:37.730 --> 00:15:39.486 Apart from early discontinuations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:39.486 \longrightarrow 00:15:43.188$  it should just be a sea of dark blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:43.190 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.140$  But it's not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:45.140 --> 00:15:46.196 The yellow, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}15{:}46.196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47.780$  a lot of people who who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:47.780 --> 00:15:49.604 you know were early terminated for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}15{:}49.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51.548$  futility and all of these lighter

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:51.548 --> 00:15:53.534 shades are people who were still,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:15:53.540 --> 00:15:54.334 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:54.334 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.922$  mucking around with subtherapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:55.922 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.900$  doses for a long time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:15:57.900 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.400$  And the argument Biogen made

 $00{:}16{:}00.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03.418$  to the FTA is that, Umm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:16:03.418 --> 00:16:04.454 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642 00:16:04.454 --> 00:16:04.972 is, NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:04.972 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.562$  is that this differentially impacted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:07.562 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.717$  the two studies because in emerge

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.072$  29% of people receive the full

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:13.072 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.490$  complement of the 10 milligram.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:15.490 \longrightarrow 00:16:18.521$  Kilogram doses and engage only 22%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:18.521 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.849$  Did you know is that a big difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}16{:}20.849 \longrightarrow 00{:}16{:}23.106$  this had to do with the fact that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:23.106 \longrightarrow 00:16:24.972$  that engage was an earlier timeline

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

00:16:24.972 --> 00:16:26.940 study and so it didn't benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00{:}16{:}26.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.866$  as much from the modifications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8920642

 $00:16:28.866 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.260$  But in any case the argument

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:31.330 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.990$  Biogen really tried to make

 $00:16:32.990 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.890$  to the FDA and the FDA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}16{:}34.890 \to 00{:}16{:}36.990$ you know to some extent you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:36.990 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.244$  agreed was that if you just looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:39.244 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.467$  at people who received the full

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:16:41.467 --> 00:16:43.447 complement of doses both both

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}16{:}43.447 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}45.648$  studies you know should benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:45.650 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.468$  Unfortunately that's not how it works.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:47.470 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.290$  When you talk about a phase three

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:16:49.290 --> 00:16:50.479 registration trial with the FDA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:50.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.800$  you don't get to do these

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}16{:}51.800 --> 00{:}16{:}53.090$  you know post doc things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:16:53.090 --> 00:16:54.548 You've got to, you've got to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:16:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:16:56.668$  you've got to pre specify and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:16:56.668 --> 00:16:59.575 you've got to meet your aims and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:16:59.575 --> 00:17:02.070 clearly you know one study did not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.955$  So then just to summarize the aducanumab

 $00:17:05.955 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.122$  controversy here in this slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:08.122 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.540$  you know we had FDA approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:10.624 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.192$  June of 21 via the accelerated

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:17:13.192 --> 00:17:15.830 pathway based on the biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:15.830 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.910$  That was unvalidated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:17:16.910 --> 00:17:19.987 You know to that point this was completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:19.987 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.885$  against the recommendation of the FDA

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:17:22.885 --> 00:17:25.599 Advisory Committee who voted 8 to one

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}17{:}25.599 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}27.538$  against many of them resigned you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:27.540 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.546$  in protest after the approval and then you

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:31.546 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.099$  go ten months later and and CMS does a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}17{:}35.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37.823$ you know a fairly unusual makes a

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}17{:}37.823 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}40.052$  fairly unusual decision not to pay

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}17{:}40.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}42.020$  for the drug despite FDA approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:42.020 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.128$  and they indicate they're only

 $00:17:44.128 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.836$  going to even consider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}17{:}45.840 --> 00{:}17{:}46.271 \ {\rm Traditional},$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:46.271 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.564$  full traditional approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:47.564 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.288$  based on clinical measures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:49.290 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.660$  not biomarkers and only under in

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:17:51.660 --> 00:17:54.708 in in a research context coverage

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}17{:}54.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}56.787$  with evidence development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:17:56.790 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.480$  So that's where that stood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:17:59.480 --> 00:18:01.850 And you know Biogen then subsequently

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:01.850 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.259$  you know launched yet another study

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}18{:}04.259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}06.556$  which you know which they they

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:06.556 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.884$  really needed to call Envision and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:08.884 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.156$  this is the attempt to have a second

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:12.156 --> 00:18:14.680 positive study that's done under the

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:14.680 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.260$  accelerated pathway as a confirmatory study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}18{:}17.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}18.955$  Although practically in this case

 $00:18:18.955 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.399$  it's really you know and I think an

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:21.399 \longrightarrow 00:18:23.374$  attempt to have a redo on on full

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:23.374 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.954$  approval and so they're they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:24.954 --> 00:18:27.651 trying to do this you know fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:27.651 --> 00:18:29.559 launch it fairly rapidly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:29.560 --> 00:18:32.233 And then at the end of this past year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:32.240 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.920$  many of you may have seen that

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}18{:}33.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}35.899$  there was a congressional report.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:35.900 \longrightarrow 00:18:38.665$  That found the whole process

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}18{:}38.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}40.877$  was rife with irregularities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:40.880 --> 00:18:42.530 I mean the FDA and Biogen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:42.530 --> 00:18:43.534 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}18{:}43.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}45.507$  we're really investigated including

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00:18:45.507 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.842$  that there was this unusual

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

 $00{:}18{:}47.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}50.245$  collaborative work stream where FDA

00:18:50.245 --> 00:18:52.560 officials met repeatedly with Biogen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778

00:18:52.560 --> 00:18:54.600 you know, to analyze trial data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778 00:18:54.600 --> 00:18:55.766 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.847965362777778 00:18:55.766 --> 00:18:56.349 mutually. NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:18:58.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.144$  All right. Well, and so it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:01.144 \longrightarrow 00:19:04.295$  in the wake of all of this that

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:04.295 \longrightarrow 00:19:06.780$  along came the news last fall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

00:19:06.780 --> 00:19:09.228 you know, initially kind of quietly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

00:19:09.230 --> 00:19:11.575 That a similar drug lacanau

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

00:19:11.575 --> 00:19:13.920 amab appeared actually to meet

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00{:}19{:}14.003 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}16.427$  the bar for full approval.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:16.430 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.593$  You know, based on on results those

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:18.593 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.460$  press released in late September,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.470$  fully presented at the end of November

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

00:19:23.470 --> 00:19:26.289 and appeared online in the New England

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00{:}19{:}26.289 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}29.002$  Journal at around that time at the

 $00:19:29.002 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.287$  print publication just January 5.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.442$  And for the rest of this talk I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:33.442 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.266$  really going to focus on you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:35.270 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.565$  this publication you know and

NOTE Confidence: 0.889060043333333

 $00:19:36.565 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.860$  and the data in it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:19:40.450 --> 00:19:43.370 So the Kanab, you know one more time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:19:43.370 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.708$  this is a a busy slide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:19:44.710 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.038$  I'm really just focusing on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:19:47.038 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.705$  lower right and the red font that

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}19{:}49.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}52.106$  lichen amab you know again is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:19:52.184 --> 00:19:54.982 humanized IG1 monoclonal antibody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:19:54.982 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.798$  It's selectively binds to

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}19{:}57.798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}59.910$  soluble aggregated species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:19:59.910 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.310$  you know oligomers and proto fibrils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:02.310 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.810$  It's got 1000 fold selectivity for those

 $00:20:05.810 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.493$  species over monomers and it even has

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}20{:}08.493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.026$  a tenfold selectivity over fibrils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}20{:}10.026 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}12.540$  That are in plaque so that we know it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:12.540 \longrightarrow 00:20:14.636$  It binds plaques because as you'll see it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:14.640 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.648$  it clears amyloid plaque on a PET scan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:20:18.650 --> 00:20:21.476 Here's the Clarity AD study design

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:20:21.476 --> 00:20:25.710 and and by the way I one thing I

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:20:25.710 --> 00:20:27.840 should I should probably provide

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:27.840 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.150$  clarity on which is that I'm only

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:30.150 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.128$  going to show you one study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:20:32.130 --> 00:20:33.618 I'm not going to show you

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:33.618 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.610$  two studies right now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:34.610 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.870$  Why is that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:35.870 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.810$  And it's because in this case you

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:20:38.905 --> 00:20:41.360 know the Canada went through very

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:20:41.360 --> 00:20:43.853 extensive phase two testing and their

00:20:43.853 --> 00:20:46.587 phase two study done in you know 850

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}20{:}46.587 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49.506$  people which was actually a positive study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:49.510 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.598$  Still not a registration trial and so it

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:52.598 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.558$  was accepted as as a first positive study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.474$  So in this case the cannonade

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:57.474 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.422$  really needed to confirm that with

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:20:59.422 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.234$  with a single large phase three

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:01.234 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.258$  trial and that that's the reason.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:03.260 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.748$  So in this study you can see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:21:06.748 --> 00:21:10.196 there were 1795 people who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:10.196 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.772$  randomized with early Alzheimer's

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}21{:}12.772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}17.534$  and that means MC I you know or

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}21{:}17.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}19.578$  prodromal Alzheimer's or mild.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:21:19.578 --> 00:21:22.332 Alzheimer's dementia but the but the

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:22.332 \longrightarrow 00:21:26.010$  they had to be confirmed for Alzheimer's

 $00:21:26.010 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.200$  pathogenesis by any amyloid PET scan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:29.200 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.600$  They were randomized 1 to one

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:31.600 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.180$  to either like cannab or placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}21{:}34.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.862$ like cannab dosed as 10 milligram

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:21:36.862 --> 00:21:39.100 per kilogram every two weeks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:39.100 \longrightarrow 00:21:41.305$  So this is administered twice

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:21:41.305 --> 00:21:44.570 as often as that you can amount.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:44.570 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.138$  And that was an 18 month trial and

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:47.138 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.052$  that at the end of that you know there

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:50.052 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.453$  is an open extension trial which

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}21{:}52.453 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}55.262$  is very much ongoing and that means

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:21:55.262 --> 00:21:58.430 everybody in in this phase is on active drug,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:21:58.430 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.758$  no more placebo and I'm not going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:22:00.758 --> 00:22:03.081 the New England Journal paper doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:22:03.081 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.583$  cover the extension phase at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:22:05.590 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.438$  I'm only going to mention it when

 $00:22:07.438 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.880$  it comes to some of the you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00{:}22{:}09.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}11.830$  publicized you know safety issues that

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:22:11.830 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.937$  have come up in the extension phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:22:13.940 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.350$  And on the far right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:22:16.350 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.320$  the outcome measures and so on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:22:19.320 --> 00:22:20.336 I'm not going to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

 $00:22:20.336 \longrightarrow 00:22:21.860$  I'm going to go into these

NOTE Confidence: 0.72081560625

00:22:21.922 --> 00:22:24.118 individually over the next few slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:22:26.640 --> 00:22:31.784 But before that, the this shows the subject

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:31.784 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.469$  disposition and analysis populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:35.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.358$  So meaning that before we got to the 17195

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:39.358 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.686$  people who were randomized and treated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:41.690 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.910$  there were nearly 6000 who were screened.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:22:44.910 --> 00:22:47.558 Most of them were not eligible for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:47.558 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.946$  reasons shown in the screen failure box.

00:22:49.950 --> 00:22:53.526 You know, usually it's that they didn't have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:53.530 \longrightarrow 00:22:55.450$  you know, amyloid positivity on

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:55.450 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.194$  pat or even more commonly that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:22:58.194 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.456$  weren't quite in the right cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:00.456 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.630$  range for this early ad study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:02.630 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.134$  But in any case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:05.134 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.914$  The 1795 who are randomized and treated

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:07.914 \longrightarrow 00:23:09.773$  were then evenly divided between

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00{:}23{:}09.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}11.927$  the place bo and the lucama groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:23:11.930 --> 00:23:16.140 And in the placebo group 84.4 completed

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:23:16.140 --> 00:23:19.110 the full 18 month study but they

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:23:19.110 --> 00:23:21.030 can't amount Group A little less

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:21.030 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.232$  81.2 that's typical and the reason

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:23.232 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.670$  is because of more side effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:25.670 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.974$  more adverse events you know as

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:27.974 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.392$  shown in these boxes and the the

 $00:23:32.392 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.562$  populations of analysis are are

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00{:}23{:}34.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}37.486$  worth you know just mentioning for

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:23:37.486 --> 00:23:40.438 for all efficacy measures we looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:40.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.980$  at what's called the modified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:42.980 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.636$  Intent to treat population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:44.636 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.517$  And all that means is you have to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:23:48.517 --> 00:23:50.707 somebody who was randomized actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00{:}23{:}50.707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}54.118$  got at least a dose of the drug and

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:23:54.118 --> 00:23:55.986 actually had one follow-up assessment

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:23:55.986 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.807$  that you could you could analyze because

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00{:}23{:}58.807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}01.260$  not every body gets dosed gets there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:24:01.260 --> 00:24:03.297 They might have had to terminate early,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:24:03.300 --> 00:24:04.770 you know for a side effect and

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00{:}24{:}04.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}06.500$  never had a follow-up assessment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:24:06.500 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.930$  So that's the population used

 $00:24:08.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.460$  for efficacy measures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:24:10.460 --> 00:24:13.060 The safety population is everybody,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

00:24:13.060 --> 00:24:14.745 everybody who you know was

NOTE Confidence: 0.87420221

 $00:24:14.745 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.756$  randomized and dosed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:18.520 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.150$  Now here are the baseline

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:24:22.150 --> 00:24:25.392 characteristics of the 1795 people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:25.392 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.120$  As you can see, this was a global study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:24:29.120 --> 00:24:31.464 although a majority of them were in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}24{:}31.464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}33.789$  far right column in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:33.790 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.463$  And just a couple of things to touch on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}24{:}36.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38.948$  It was a broad age range about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:38.950 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.534$  I think 20% were underage 65

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:42.534 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.910$  and close to 15% were over 80.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:48.910 \longrightarrow 00:24:51.694$  The other thing of note here I want

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:51.694 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.789$  to call attention to is race and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:24:54.789 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.531$  ethnicity and and that's because in

 $00:24:57.531 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.967$  our field we've done really a bad

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:24:59.967 --> 00:25:03.184 job of including populations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:03.184 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.374$  represent the United States population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:25:07.380 --> 00:25:09.949 It's a it's a really, really important thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}25{:}09.949 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}14.109$  This trial actually did the best of any of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:25:14.109 --> 00:25:17.181 any such similar trial that I'm aware of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:17.190 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.675$  but still inadequate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}25{:}18.675 \longrightarrow 00{:}25{:}21.582$  So as an example, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:21.582 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.106$  in the United States 4.5%

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}25{:}24.106 \to 00{:}25{:}26.810$  of participants were black.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:26.810 \longrightarrow 00:25:28.102$  That's good for us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}25{:}28.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.717$  but it's it's woefully inadequate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:25:29.720 --> 00:25:30.910 This should be, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:30.910 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.334$  9 or 10% if you go by black

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:34.334 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.899$  seniors in the United States with.

00:25:37.900 --> 00:25:39.072 Hispanic ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:39.072 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.540$  we actually did well, this is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:42.540 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.271$  this is really good 22.5% because that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:25:46.271 --> 00:25:48.756 actually over represents Hispanics who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:48.760 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.539$  who in the senior senior age groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:51.539 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.396$  would again be in the order of 10%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:54.400 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.885$  But we still need to do better

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:56.885 \longrightarrow 00:25:59.389$  and it's an important issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:25:59.390 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.134$  With regard to other

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:01.134 \longrightarrow 00:26:02.006$  clinical characteristics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:02.010 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.034$  I won't go into all of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:05.040 --> 00:26:05.688 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:05.688 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.956$  most of these folks are really early,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:07.960 --> 00:26:08.808 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:08.808 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.776$  more MCI prodromal than they are dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:11.780 --> 00:26:13.761 Most of these people are are functionally

00:26:13.761 --> 00:26:15.558 independent at the start of the study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:15.560 --> 00:26:17.240 you know, people who drive a car,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:17.240 \longrightarrow 00:26:19.620$  who do their own finances,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:19.620 --> 00:26:22.020 who do cooking, manage their meds,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:22.020 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.100$  that's the majority of people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:24.100 --> 00:26:24.992 This is really quite,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:24.992 --> 00:26:26.342 you know, early stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:26.342 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.597$  although it includes some with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}26{:}28.597 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}31.140$ you know very mild dementia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:31.140 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.126$  What we for status is another

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:33.126 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.788$  important thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:33.790 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.350$  For those of you not familiar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}26{:}35.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}37.653$  April 4 is the major genetic risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:37.653 --> 00:26:39.170 factor for Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:26:39.170 --> 00:26:43.640 You know, late onset Alzheimer's and.

 $00:26:43.640 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.232$  And typically about 69% of all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}26{:}48.232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}50.440$  participants carried the April 4 at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:50.519 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.144$  least one copy apply 4 allele that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:53.144 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.279$  that compares to about maybe 15

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:55.279 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.200$  to 20% in the general population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:57.200 \longrightarrow 00:26:59.749$  This is a very typical sample in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:26:59.749 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.240$  regard and we see that percent for you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:02.240 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.840$  people who carry one copy versus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}27{:}05.840 \to 00{:}27{:}07.470$  2 copies of the homozygotes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:07.470 \longrightarrow 00:27:09.402$  homozygotes for about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:09.402 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.978 15.5\%$  of the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:11.980 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.140$  And this is important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:27:13.140 --> 00:27:13.720 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:13.720 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.767$  as we'll see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:14.767 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.163$  particularly as it relates

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:27:16.163 --> 00:27:18.519 to some of the safety issues,

 $00:27:18.520 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.664$  about a little more than half of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:21.664 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.017$  were on an approved Alzheimer's drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:25.017 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.731$  like a cholinesterase inhibitor or memantine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.450$  So now I'm gonna jump into the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.290$  The top line efficacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:34.290 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.130$  endpoints for the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:36.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.464$  So again the primary endpoint is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:38.464 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.289$  just what it was for aducanumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:41.290 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.585$  it's the change from baseline

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:43.585 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.630$  at 18 months in the Cdr SB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00{:}27{:}46.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48.716$  I'm also going to show you most

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:27:48.716 --> 00:27:50.604 of the key secondary endpoints

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:50.604 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.448$  shown on the right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

 $00:27:52.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.795$  one of biomarker which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8517360675

00:27:54.795 --> 00:27:57.140 clearance of amyloid on PET

 $00:27:57.237 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.982$  scan and then clinical measures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785593378461538

00:27:58.982 --> 00:28:01.054 I'm, I'm only going to show you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785593378461538

 $00:28:01.060 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.446$  I'm not going to show you the

NOTE Confidence: 0.785593378461538

 $00:28:02.446 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.678$  adcoms for the sake of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785593378461538

 $00:28:03.680 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.920$  I'm going to show you the pure cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.785593378461538

 $00:28:05.920 \longrightarrow 00:28:07.350$  and functional measures though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

00:28:09.820 --> 00:28:12.220 So, so this is perhaps you know really

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

00:28:12.220 --> 00:28:15.455 the key slide you know of of the whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

00:28:15.455 --> 00:28:17.339 presentation regarding we can't amab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.094$  you know these are the results for the the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:20.100 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.268$  the primary outcome, the primary endpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.230$  This is what makes it a positive study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:26.230 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.251$  The CD RSB and you know this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:30.251 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.264$  this is similar to what we saw for

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

00:28:33.264 --> 00:28:35.776 aducanumab in emerge and engage except

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

00:28:35.776 --> 00:28:38.746 you'll remember that that you know

 $00:28:38.746 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.964$  the the directionality was different

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:40.964 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.860$  instead of you know up being bad now

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:43.938 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.809$  down is being bad and we we did that

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:46.809 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.068$  because that way you could look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:49.068 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.336$  all the slides I looked at all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:51.336 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.162$  figures in the study and down was

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:53.162 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.146$  always bad but in any case that's how

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:28:55.146 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.019$  it's graphed and what you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00{:}28{:}57.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}00.092$  Is that the place bo group worsens

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:29:00.092 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.750$  by 1.66 points over 18 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:29:02.750 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.928$  Not quite as much as in the end you

NOTE Confidence: 0.850666078636364

 $00:29:04.928 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.235$  can't map studies and the treated group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847906556

 $00{:}29{:}11.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}14.576$  1.22 with a difference of 0.45 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847906556

 $00:29:14.576 \longrightarrow 00:29:17.066$  which is highly highly statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.847906556

 $00{:}29{:}17.066 \rightarrow 00{:}29{:}20.085$  significant and it represents a 27%

 $00:29:20.085 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.115$  slowing of decline at 18 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847906556

 $00:29:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.460$  Drug placebo differences are evident

NOTE Confidence: 0.847906556

00:29:25.460 --> 00:29:29.317 as early as six months and they at

NOTE Confidence: 0.847906556

 $00:29:29.317 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.570$  least numerically widen. Thereafter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:29:33.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.056$  Now this is the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:29:35.056 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.520$  this is a non peer reviewed slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:29:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.288$  but I wanted to to show this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:29:40.288 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.703$  relation to these Cdr data because

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}29{:}42.703 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}45.693$ a lot of the controversy you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:29:45.693 --> 00:29:48.345 about these kind of results is

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}29{:}48.345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}50.386$  are they clinically meaningful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:29:50.386 --> 00:29:52.504 they're highly, highly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:29:52.504 --> 00:29:53.916 statistically significant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:29:53.920 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.308$  but are they meaningful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:29:55.308 --> 00:29:57.390 And I'm going to mention you

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:29:57.461 --> 00:29:59.453 know as I go two or three ways

 $00{:}29{:}59.453 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}01.984$  that at least I think about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}30{:}01.984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}03.556$  meaningfulness of the results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:03.560 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.926$  And one way that I would commonly

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:05.926 --> 00:30:08.930 explain to A to a patient or participant

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:08.930 \dashrightarrow 00:30:11.825$  is what's shown here and it has to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}30{:}11.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}13.932$  do with kind of a time savings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:13.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.268$  So that is that in the placebo group

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:17.268 --> 00:30:19.526 the amount of deterioration that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:19.526 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.340$  occurs at end of study at 18 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}30{:}23.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}25.698$  If the rates of decline continued

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:25.698 --> 00:30:28.803 after 18 months as they as they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}30{:}28.803 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}31.427$  to that point and that's that's an

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:31.427 \longrightarrow 00:30:34.003$  if that's a that's a big assumption.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:34.010 --> 00:30:35.314 The actively treated groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:35.314 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.270$  will get to the same point,

 $00:30:37.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.790$  but they will get there about

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:39.790 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.190$  7 1/2 months later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:41.190 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.030$  So in that sense it's like a 7 1/2

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:44.030 --> 00:30:46.350 month time saving of a certain level of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:46.350 --> 00:30:47.842 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}30{:}47.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}50.080$  cognitive daily functioning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:30:50.080 --> 00:30:52.726 A more conservative way by the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:52.726 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.949$  than extrapolating is to interpolate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:54.950 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.162$  And that's what shown in the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:30:57.162 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.550$  kind of blue line where you where

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}30{:}59.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01.608$  you asked the question at what

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:31:01.675 --> 00:31:03.811 point did the placebo people already

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:31:03.811 --> 00:31:06.086 get to the point where the lucama

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:06.086 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.408$  people did at 18 months and that and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:08.408 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.132$  then you go backwards 5.3 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:10.132 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.134$  So that would be a more conservative,

00:31:12.140 --> 00:31:14.150 you know estimate and probably maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:14.150 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.400$  the truth is somewhere in between one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:31:16.400 --> 00:31:18.476 One thing that's very clear though

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:18.476 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.130$  is that this kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:20.130 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.622$  Measure is very much related to how

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:22.622 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.723$  long you're on the drug, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:24.723 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.227$  So and as we'll see at the very

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:27.227 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.188$  end of this presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:31:29.190 --> 00:31:31.493 you know we start to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}31{:}31.493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}33.288$  treating people earlier and for many

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}31{:}33.288 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}31{:}35.402$  years we may be able to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:35.402 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.663$  much bigger effects than any of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}31{:}37.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}41.390$  But you know this is this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}31{:}41.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}44.860$  speculation now we're back to real data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:44.860 \longrightarrow 00:31:46.855$  And now I'm moving on to the

 $00:31:46.855 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.710$  key secondary outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:47.710 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.176$  starting with the biomarker amyloid pet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:31:52.180 --> 00:31:55.246 So just as we saw with aducanumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:55.250 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.098$  you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:56.098 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.370$  which dramatically clears

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}31{:}57.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}59.910$  fibrillar amyloid on a PET scan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:31:59.910 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.711$  the same is true with lacanada here

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:02.711 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.615$  in the 18 month study you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}32{:}06.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}09.105$  that people in the place bo group

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}32{:}09.105 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}12.512$  had you know at least a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:12.512 \dashrightarrow 00:32:15.230$  numerical increase in amyloid binding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:15.230 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.560$  whereas those on the kinomap,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:32:17.560 --> 00:32:21.100 you know steadily decreased.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:21.100 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.186$  There is the scale that I'm not

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:23.186 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.384$  going to explain to you called a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:25.384 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.244$  centroid scale that is being used.

 $00:32:27.250 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.308$  This is a way of standardizing you

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:32:29.308 --> 00:32:31.460 know Emily PET data across studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}32{:}31.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}34.044$  across scanners, across radiopharmaceuticals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:32:34.044 --> 00:32:38.361 But suffice it to say that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00{:}32{:}38.361 \longrightarrow 00{:}32{:}40.566$  know the drug place bo difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

00:32:40.566 --> 00:32:43.631 here was 59 centroids again highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:43.631 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.745$  significant but but to make to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:45.745 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.212$  to talk a little bit about what

NOTE Confidence: 0.88777143

 $00:32:48.212 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.417$  what center Lloyd's you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222 00:32:50.420 --> 00:32:50.918 Represent. NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

00:32:50.918 --> 00:32:54.902 Note that at the start of the study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:32:54.910 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.240$  people averaged about 76 centroids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00{:}32{:}59.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}02.480$  Note also that to get into the study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00{:}33{:}02.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}05.390$  the threshold of positivity was

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:05.390 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.358$  probably about \$0.30 Lloyds.

 $00:33:07.358 \longrightarrow 00:33:10.151$  And then note finally that at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

00:33:10.151 --> 00:33:13.157 end of the study those in the active

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:13.157 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.888$  group were at around 23 centroids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:15.890 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.176$  Most of them had normal scans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

00:33:18.180 --> 00:33:19.705 you know, visually and quantitatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:19.705 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.620$  at the end of the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:21.620 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.104$  And these these differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:23.104 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.217$  appeared very early,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:33:25.786$  as early as the very first

NOTE Confidence: 0.860418372222222

 $00:33:25.786 \longrightarrow 00:33:27.310$  pet scan at three months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:33:29.840 --> 00:33:30.884 Now moving on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:33:30.884 --> 00:33:32.972 you know to other key secondaries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:33:32.980 \longrightarrow 00:33:34.900$  this is the pure cognitive measure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:33:34.900 \longrightarrow 00:33:39.060$  the 8 US cog which is scored zero to 90.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:33:39.060 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.820$  Higher scores are worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:33:41.820 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.429$  And what you can see here is that at

 $00:33:45.429 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.592$  the end of the 18 months the drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:33:49.592 --> 00:33:52.280 placebo difference was 1.44 points

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:33:52.280 --> 00:33:55.720 between drug and placebo, again highly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:33:55.720 --> 00:33:58.665 highly significant representing a 26%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:33:58.665 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.935$  Slowing of decline and and significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:34:01.935 --> 00:34:04.418 differences were evident again as

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:04.418 \longrightarrow 00:34:07.099$  early as the six month time point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:07.100 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.907$  And finally, this is the pure functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:34:09.907 --> 00:34:11.642 measure relates to activities

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:34:11.642 --> 00:34:15.340 of daily living, the ACS MCIDL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:15.340 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.300$  This is, excuse me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:17.300 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.728$  squared zero to 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00{:}34{:}20.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}24.545$  In this case lower scores are better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:34:24.550 --> 00:34:26.046 But we graph it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:26.046 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.918$  you know the same direction for ease

 $00:34:28.918 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.030$  of understanding and and what you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.033$  see is that the placebo group worsens

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:35.033 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.417$  to the tune of about 5 1/2 points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:38.420 \longrightarrow 00:34:41.684$  The actively treated about two points

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:41.684 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.159$  less than that highly significant in

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:45.159 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.228$  this case representing a 37% slowing of

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:49.228 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.888$  decline with the treatment differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:34:51.888 --> 00:34:55.346 again evident as early as six months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:34:55.350 --> 00:34:57.480 And with regard to clinical meaningfulness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:34:57.480 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.256$  I would just I find at least in

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00{:}35{:}00.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}02.997$  in when people see these data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:03.000 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.961$  this is a measure that is more

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:05.961 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.360$  easily seen as meaningful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:08.360 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.892$  Because of what it is, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111 00:35:09.892 --> 00:35:10.174 Again, NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:10.174 \longrightarrow 00:35:12.430$  these are people who mostly start the study,

 $00:35:12.430 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.902$  able to drive a car, do finances,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00{:}35{:}14.902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}18.340$  you know, Cook, manage their medications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:35:18.340 --> 00:35:22.950 And they have, you know, a 37% slowing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:22.950 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.470$  you know, in the loss of such abilities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:25.470 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.568$  So, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

00:35:26.568 --> 00:35:29.684 it's hard not to think of such such

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:29.684 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.468$  kinds of effects as as meaningful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826227491111111

 $00:35:32.470 \longrightarrow 00:35:33.540$  you know, in real life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:36.820 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.916$  But with regard to clinical meaningfulness, I

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:38.916 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.600$  want to go on to yet another kind of measure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:35:41.600 --> 00:35:43.368 Now what I've shown you up until now

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:43.368 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.040$  are the top line, you know, results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:45.040 \dashrightarrow 00:35:48.680$  you know, the primary and the secondary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:48.680 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.408$  but there are other, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:50.410 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.164$  more exploratory measures that were done

 $00:35:53.164 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.386$  and one of them pertains to quality of life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:57.390 \dashrightarrow 00:35:59.966$  Quality of life which may not be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:35:59.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.666$  Fully measured with cognition and function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:03.670 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.154$  so in this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:05.154 --> 00:36:07.009 We're looking at four different

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:07.009 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.009$  scales that were administered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:09.010 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.258$  The two in the top row are both

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:12.258 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.423$  assessed quality of life for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:15.423 \longrightarrow 00:36:17.124$  patient participant themselves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:17.130 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.650$  The two in the bottom row of for the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:19.650 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.010$  you know the caregiver partner.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:22.010 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.670$  And without going into these in detail

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:24.670 --> 00:36:27.382 you know what you can see is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:27.382 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.910$  all four of them show statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:29.910 --> 00:36:32.856 significant benefit you know slowing of

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:32.856 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.149$  decline and and just as a poster child

00:36:35.149 --> 00:36:37.768 of these I will cherry pick the QOLA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:37.768 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.322$  Be subject because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:39.322 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.603$  Here is a a questionnaire that asked

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:43.603 --> 00:36:46.825 questions like how happy are you?

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:46.830 --> 00:36:48.986 How are your relationships with your family,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:48.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:49.707$  with your friends?

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:49.707 --> 00:36:51.750 How do you feel about where you're living?

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:36:51.750 --> 00:36:54.410 You're you know, your your overall health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:54.410 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.050$  And on this measure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00{:}36{:}56.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}58.100$  the Kanab is associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:36:58.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.860$  a 56% lower decline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00{:}36{:}59.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}02.110$  And comparison to the place bo

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:37:02.110 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.746$  group at the end of the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:37:04.750 \longrightarrow 00:37:07.350$  So again for those who think no clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

00:37:07.350 --> 00:37:09.289 meaningfulness in these kind of effects,

 $00:37:09.290 \dashrightarrow 00:37:12.093$  I mean I I would I would just ask to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.846598971666667

 $00:37:12.093 \dashrightarrow 00:37:14.424$  look at these these kinds of results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:18.290 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.215$  Now we're going to talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:37:20.215 --> 00:37:22.340 about safety of like Hannah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:22.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.316$  And to do that I need to introduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:26.316 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.620$  this funny term amyloid related

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:30.620 \dashrightarrow 00:37:33.900$  imaging abnormalities shortcut Aria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:33.900 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.625$  So it's a cute acronym.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:36.630 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.268$  I personally don't really like it

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:38.268 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.249$  a whole lot because it implies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}37{:}40.249 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}43.610$  these are only imaging abnormalities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:37:43.610 --> 00:37:45.410 you know, whereas they're real pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:45.410 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.178$  So I actually like to use the terms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:37:47.180 --> 00:37:49.352 you know, amyloid related,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:49.352 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.631$  you know, edema and hemosiderin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:51.631 \dashrightarrow 00:37:54.486$  And I'll slip into those, I'm sure.

00:37:54.486 --> 00:37:57.412 But in any case, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:37:57.412 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.420$  Aria, there are two types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:00.420 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.140$  There's the RE which refused to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:04.140 --> 00:38:08.736 which refers to effusions or edema,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:08.740 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.750$  and then there's the RH,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:10.750 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.642$  which refers to the deposition of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:13.642 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.570$  the blood product hemosiderin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}38{:}15.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}18.678$  Aria you seen typically on T2

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}38{:}18.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}22.064$  flare sequences on MRI and Aria H

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}38{:}22.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}24.349$  on the heme sensitive sequences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:24.350 \dashrightarrow 00:38:27.718$  Sequences such as, you know, grading, ECHO.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:27.718 --> 00:38:33.208 Umm or aswi, the so and by the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:33.210 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.730$  why do these occur at all?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:35.730 --> 00:38:38.278 It's not fully known but the leading

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:38.278 --> 00:38:41.090 view is that monoclonal antibodies,

00:38:41.090 --> 00:38:43.220 anti antibodies by clearing amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}38{:}43.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}45.757$  deposits in the blood vessels you

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}38{:}45.757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}48.137$  know that are in the endothelial wall

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:48.137 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.828$  will cause increased permeability

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:49.828 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.168$  of the blood brain barrier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:52.170 \longrightarrow 00:38:53.382$  which can cause,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:53.382 --> 00:38:54.190 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:54.190 --> 00:38:56.750 leakage of molecules that wouldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:38:56.750 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.774$  normally pass.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:38:57.780 --> 00:38:59.808 Drawing fluid osmotically that

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}38{:}59.808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}02.701$  that's the explanation for edema and

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:02.701 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.807$  then for hemosiderin you get actual

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:04.807 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.440$  breakage of of small vessels you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:07.440 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.702$  with with small bleeds for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:09.710 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.032$  But this slide shows what these

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}39{:}12.032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}14.349$  things look like on MRI scan.

00:39:14.350 --> 00:39:17.824 So Aria E for edema effusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:39:17.824 --> 00:39:22.489 is shown in a C&D and in a you

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:39:22.489 --> 00:39:24.967 know we're looking at you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:24.967 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.790$  the most robust maybe maybe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}39{:}27.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}32.746$  Obvious example of you know a parenchymal

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:32.746 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.780$  signal abnormality here in the right

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:36.780 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.570$  occipital lobe with some gyral swelling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:39:42.570 --> 00:39:43.682 In C,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:39:43.682 --> 00:39:48.130 we're looking at a more pure sulcal effusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:48.130 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.346$  which is another way that this can present

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}39{:}50.346 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}39{:}52.610$  not so much parenchymal as you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:52.610 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.549$  a sulcal effusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}39{:}53.549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}55.740$  And then in D we're looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:39:55.813 --> 00:39:57.669 A at A at a very subtle case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:39:57.670 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.450$  which we do see where just a wee bit of,

00:40:02.450 --> 00:40:02.980 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}40{:}02.980 \to 00{:}40{:}04.835$  gyral swelling is evident and a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:04.835 \longrightarrow 00:40:06.835$  bit of a circle effusion is evidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:06.840 \longrightarrow 00:40:10.064$  So that would be a very subtle case

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:10.064 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.938$  with regard to Aria H as we'll see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:12.940 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.980$  This can come in different forms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:14.980 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.506$  The one shown here is microhemorrhages

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}40{:}17.506 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}20.577$  and that's in panel B in the red

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}40{:}20.577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}22.539$  circle you see these three dots.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:22.540 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.880$  Micro hemorrhages are defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}40{:}23.880 \to 00{:}40{:}25.555$  as less than a centimeter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:40:27.090$  These are much smaller than that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:40:27.090 --> 00:40:28.370 you know, maybe 3 millimeters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:28.370 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.234$  So they tend to occur where edema

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:32.234 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.198$  has also occurred by the way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:35.200 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.396$  And we'll talk more about that.

 $00:40:37.400 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.200$  The the other forms of RH not shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}40{:}40.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43.032$  here are superficial siderosis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:40:43.032 --> 00:40:45.576 macro hemorrhage, which is you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:45.576 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.845$  to find us more than a centimeter

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:47.845 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.425$  and we'll talk more about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00{:}40{:}50.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}53.321$  So now going back to the safety

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

00:40:53.321 --> 00:40:56.097 data for Liquin amab in light of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:56.097 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.900$  in light of that first of all

NOTE Confidence: 0.92799218

 $00:40:58.900 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.700$  here we're looking at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:00.700 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.442$  The. We're looking at the the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:05.442 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.360$  serious adverse events that occur.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

00:41:07.360 --> 00:41:10.018 So for example, you know deaths,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

00:41:10.018 --> 00:41:13.560 deaths were fairly balanced 7 on placebo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:13.560 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.152$  6 on the Kanab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:15.152 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.220$  Next we look at serious adverse events,

 $00:41:18.220 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.245$  things that require for example

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

00:41:20.245 --> 00:41:22.270 hospitalization and and what I

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:22.341 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.493$  want you to see here is that the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:24.500 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.315$  it's really only three kinds

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:26.315 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.130$  of events that are occurring

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:28.202 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.176$  more on the Kanab than placebo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:30.180 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.390$  it's those that are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.667$  with these RERH.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

00:41:33.667 --> 00:41:35.989 And then the third category would

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:35.989 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.880$  be infusion related reactions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00{:}41{:}37.880 \to 00{:}41{:}41.330$  you know mild hypersensitivity reactions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

00:41:41.330 --> 00:41:44.108 All other SME's are actually you

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:44.108 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.770$  know quite balanced between drug and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:46.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.311$  placebo and and again as much as

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

00:41:49.311 --> 00:41:52.148 these essays are more common on drug,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00{:}41{:}52.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}54.046$  they're they're still not very common.

 $00:41:54.050 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.807$  I mean they're all in the order

NOTE Confidence: 0.6871895

 $00:41:55.807 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.970$  of 1% frequency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:41:59.460 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.023$  This slide shows you know common adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:03.023 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.939$  events now including non serious adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00{:}42{:}05.939 \rightarrow 00{:}42{:}09.462$  events and again I think the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:09.462 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.662$  real take home message is that it's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:12.662 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.440$  it's the ones in these three categories

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

00:42:15.440 --> 00:42:18.596 even for non serious AE that are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00{:}42{:}18.596 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}20.840$ more common on lecanu amab infusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:20.914 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.034$  related reactions RER AH everything

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:23.034 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.092$  else down at the bottom of the slide is

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

00:42:26.092 --> 00:42:28.570 is not is really not more common on Lebanon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:28.570 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.826$  So want to just take a moment to

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:30.826 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.821$  focus on infusion related reactions

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:32.821 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.999$  because I won't talk about these again.

 $00:42:36.000 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.292$  So 26.4% with like Kanab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:40.292 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.272$  7.4% with placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00{:}42{:}42.272 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}45.732$  These tend to be almost always

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:45.732 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.160$  mild to moderate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.383$  you know 96% of them are they tend to

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:49.383 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.357$  occur with the very first infusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877360036

 $00:42:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.370$  most commonly the only occur once.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:42:55.660 --> 00:42:59.070 And RE& amp; RHM going to talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00{:}42{:}59.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}01.282$  in the next slide, next slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:43:01.282 --> 00:43:04.978 So, so Ari E you know many of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00{:}43{:}04.978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}07.532$  us think this is really the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:43:07.532 --> 00:43:09.777 important toxicity of of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:09.777 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.830$  drugs because it is not rare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:12.830 \longrightarrow 00:43:15.500$  it is sometimes symptomatic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:43:15.500 --> 00:43:18.170 and necessitates you know pausing

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:43:18.257 --> 00:43:22.410 infusions until it resolves. Um.

 $00:43:22.410 \longrightarrow 00:43:26.146$  So the the key statistic here that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:26.146 \longrightarrow 00:43:30.038$  can see is 12.6% frequency on LEINAD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:30.038 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.270$ 1.7 on placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:43:31.270 --> 00:43:33.550 You know why does it occur on placebo?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.502$  Well it it does occur spontaneously

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:36.502 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.510$  in related to amyloid angiopathy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

00:43:39.510 --> 00:43:42.147 You know CIA people with a lot of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:42.147 \longrightarrow 00:43:43.710$  amyloid angiopathy are disqualified

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:43.710 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.510$  from the study in the 1st place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00{:}43{:}46.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}48.463$  You know if they have more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:48.463 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.599$  four microhemorrhages at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:49.599 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.063$  start they they don't enroll in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00{:}43{:}51.063 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}52.599$  the study for safety reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7749822

 $00:43:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.328$  But there can be spontaneous cases of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:43:57.360 --> 00:44:01.418 And. Symptomatic cases are only 2.8%,

 $00:44:01.418 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.626$  you know, of, of the total.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:03.630 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.731$  When they're symptomatic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:04.731 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.566$  what are the symptoms usually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:44:06.570 --> 00:44:08.650 you know, headache, visual blurring,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:44:10.170$  confusion, things like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:44:10.170 --> 00:44:12.960 And and you know and in general

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.970$  working with a lot of these antibodies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:44:15.970 --> 00:44:17.078 I mean, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:17.078 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.250$  I view these as very manageable numbers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:19.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:21.077$  I mean I will tell you that

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:44:21.077 --> 00:44:23.511 they're 1/2 to 1/3 of the rate of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:23.511 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.096$  what other trials have reported,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:44:25.100 --> 00:44:26.680 you know, with other antibodies

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00{:}44{:}26.680 --> 00{:}44{:}27.944$  without going into detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:27.950 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.552$  not head-to-head comparisons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

00:44:29.552 --> 00:44:32.400 Or just, you know, just lower,

 $00:44:32.400 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.180$  these are substantially lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.832082954

 $00:44:34.180 \longrightarrow 00:44:36.820$  numbers than the other trials report.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721029231153846

 $00:44:41.850 \longrightarrow 00:44:44.762$  Now a little more detail on Aria H

NOTE Confidence: 0.721029231153846

 $00:44:44.762 \longrightarrow 00:44:47.589$  Again refers to hemosiderin deposition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

00:44:49.820 --> 00:44:51.086 Hemosiderin, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:44:51.086 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.430$  a blood product that shows up on the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

00:44:54.430 --> 00:44:58.100 Team sensitive sequences on MRI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:44:58.100 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.510$  So just to review again, Aria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:00.510 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.510$  Ah, you know is generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.110$  comes in three categories,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:04.110 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.154$  microhemorrhages that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:05.154 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.242$  saw on the on the image,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00{:}45{:}07.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}09.780$  they're less than a centimeter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00{:}45{:}09.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}13.224$  Superficial siderosis is a you know is

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:13.224 \longrightarrow 00:45:17.165$  a thin deposition of hemosiderin on the

 $00:45:17.165 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.650$  brain surface actually in the sub peel space.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:21.650 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.800$  And um, cerebral macro hemorrhage

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:23.800 \longrightarrow 00:45:27.509$  is you know is a micro hemorrhage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:27.510 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.030$  Well it's more than a centimeter you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:30.030 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.709$  it's it's the delineation between the two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:32.710 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.294$  So what you can see overall here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:35.294 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.490$  that the key statistic is that 17.3

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

00:45:38.490 --> 00:45:43.452 frequency for RH with Lacan Amab 9.0 placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:43.452 \longrightarrow 00:45:47.940$  Of real note though is that the increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:48.048 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.976$  in like cannab is really area and the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00{:}45{:}51.976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53.824$  Actually micro hemorrhages that

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:53.824 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.710$  are associated with edema.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:45:55.710 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.166$  So if you take cases where there's no edema,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

00:45:59.170 --> 00:46:01.135 these actually aren't more common

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:46:01.135 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.707$  on drug than placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:46:02.710 \longrightarrow 00:46:05.302$  And again they have for a lot of

 $00{:}46{:}05.302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}06.841$  these occurred spontaneously again

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

00:46:06.841 --> 00:46:09.690 in relation to you know mild CAA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798711484545454

 $00:46:09.690 \longrightarrow 00:46:11.560$  you know in these subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:46:13.610 --> 00:46:18.348 And RH is almost always asymptomatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:18.348 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.820$  It when it's symptomatic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:46:20.820 --> 00:46:23.238 it's usually because it's with RE,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:46:23.240 --> 00:46:26.196 and it also is some, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:26.196 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.120$  a boy for genotype is a risk for RH.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:30.120 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.031$  Now I wanna spend a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:32.031 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.120$  of time on macro hemorrhages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:46:34.120 --> 00:46:37.395 which have caught a lot of press,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:37.395 \longrightarrow 00:46:39.300$  especially, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}46{:}39.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}42.923$  large low bar and fatal hemorrhages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:46:42.923 --> 00:46:45.138 And I think that they,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:45.140 \longrightarrow 00:46:46.190$  as important as they are,

 $00:46:46.190 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.130$  I think they've gotten a real inordinate

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:49.130 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.000$  and very imbalanced coverage in the press.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:52.000 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.516$  So, so just to be clear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:46:55.520 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.044$  In the double-blind study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:46:58.044 --> 00:47:01.287 there was one fatal lobar hemorrhage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}47{:}01.287 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}04.430$  and it occurred in the place bo group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:04.430 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.878$  The two that have been reported in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:06.878 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.346$  press are in the open label extension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:47:09.350 --> 00:47:09.960 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.080$  one of these was a 65 year old

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:47:13.080 --> 00:47:16.260 woman E4 homozygote who had a

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:47:16.260 --> 00:47:20.537 left MCA stroke occlusion and was

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:20.537 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.630$  administered TPA emergently in the ER.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:47:24.630 --> 00:47:27.073 And those of you familiar know that

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:27.073 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.300$  there's a there's a substantial risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.883$  of major hemorrhage with with TPA and

 $00:47:31.953 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.459$  that's what happened and she died.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:34.460 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.612$  The second case is of a A a

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:37.612 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.078$  fairly frail 87 year old man.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}47{:}40.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}41.070$  He's actually older than would

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}47{:}41.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}42.320$  have been allowed in the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:42.320 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.006$  At the start of the study E4 non

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:45.006 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.364$  carrier who was on the anticoagulant

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:47:47.364 --> 00:47:49.979 pick Saban for atrial fibrillation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:49.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.108$  he had a lobar hemorrhage and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}47{:}52.108 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}53.800$  thus the apixaban was stopped.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:53.800 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.735$  But then now with untreated

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:55.735 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.509$  atrial fibrillation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}47{:}56.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}58.946$ he had an MRI and which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:47:58.946 \longrightarrow 00:48:00.879$  probably what he died from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:00.880 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.014$  So you know,

 $00:48:02.014 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.660$  are these cases related to the kanima?

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}48{:}04.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}07.284$  You know, I would say possibly they are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:07.290 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.702$  On the other hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:08.702 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.467$  as a blinded site investigator,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:10.470 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.454$  I would have said that the case on

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:13.454 \longrightarrow 00:48:16.069$  placebo was also possibly related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:16.070 --> 00:48:18.625 So you know, we really don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:18.630 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.752$  And if you look at the overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:21.752 \longrightarrow 00:48:24.051$  frequency of these cases, it's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:24.051 --> 00:48:26.178 it's about one in 1000, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:26.178 --> 00:48:29.286 it's 0.1% for people taking placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:29.290 \longrightarrow 00:48:31.498$  It's about 0.1% for people taking

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:31.498 --> 00:48:33.496 like canama when you consider

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:33.496 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.766$  the greater exposure to lucama.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:35.770 \longrightarrow 00:48:38.040$  On the open label extension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:38.040 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.496$  So I think we need to balance

 $00:48:39.496 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.101$  you know what we hear in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:41.101 --> 00:48:42.493 press with some of these numbers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:42.500 \longrightarrow 00:48:44.999$  And I especially think we need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:44.999 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.012$  balance this issue which is that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:48.012 --> 00:48:50.640 can be catastrophic events like this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:50.640 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.670$  balance that against the untreated

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:52.670 --> 00:48:54.294 state of Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:48:54.300 --> 00:48:57.316 which is uniformly progressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:57.316 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.578$  and uniformly fatal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:48:59.580 \longrightarrow 00:49:01.788$  And in fact when we talk to patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:01.788 \longrightarrow 00:49:03.480$  and their families about these

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:03.480 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.640$  risks in relation to these drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}49{:}05.640 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!\!>}\ 00{:}49{:}06.930$  people who are interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:06.930 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.220$  these drugs to begin with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:08.220 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.068$  Which are the people I talked to?

00:49:10.070 --> 00:49:12.650 It's you really don't hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:49:12.650 --> 00:49:15.230 people being deterred by these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:49:15.230 --> 00:49:19.106 you know, this degree of risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:49:19.110 --> 00:49:23.107 Now I want to finish with biomarkers

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:49:23.110 --> 00:49:25.050 because I think the biomarker

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:25.050 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.990$  results are are probably every

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:27.057 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.821$  bit as interesting as the as

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}49{:}28.821 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}30.536$  the you know clinical effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}49{:}30.536 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}33.840$  By way of background when we talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:49:33.913 --> 00:49:36.449 biomarkers and Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00:49:36.450 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.916$  I want to introduce the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

00:49:38.916 --> 00:49:41.450 current notion of of Alzheimer's

NOTE Confidence: 0.647796774

 $00{:}49{:}41.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}43.570$  you know biologically which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:49:43.570 --> 00:49:46.846 this a TN classification, a for amyloid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:49:46.850 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.666$  T for tile and for neurodegeneration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:49:50.670 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.316$  So most people with Alzheimer's disease,

 $00:49:53.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.532$  you know, start out in the yellow

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}49{:}55.532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}57.600$  circle that is amyloid doesn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:49:57.600 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.316$  And what that means is the amyloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:00.316 \longrightarrow 00:50:02.800$  pathogenesis tends to be detected first.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:50:02.800 --> 00:50:06.100 From there, if they have Alzheimer's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:06.100 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.564$  eventually Tau pathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:07.564 \longrightarrow 00:50:09.516$  will also be detectable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:09.520 \longrightarrow 00:50:10.860$  It may be there earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:10.860 \longrightarrow 00:50:12.420$  but the ways it's detected,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:12.420 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.340$  you know, tend to to follow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:50:14.340 --> 00:50:17.034 And important thing is that Alzheimer's

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:17.034 \longrightarrow 00:50:21.162$  just defined by this intersection, A plus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}50{:}21.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}24.367$  Key is equals Alzheimer's disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}50{:}24.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}27.298$  These people also will will progress

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:27.298 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.726$  to have neurodegeneration the blue

 $00:50:29.726 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.120$  circle and then there's the green

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}50{:}32.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}34.950$  circle which is cognitive impairment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:50:34.950 --> 00:50:37.337 And important to point out that people

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:37.337 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.692$  kind of can have all of these pathologies

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:40.692 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.947$  and still remain cognitively normal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:42.950 \longrightarrow 00:50:45.421$  And it's the people are cognitively normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:45.421 \longrightarrow 00:50:47.990$  who may may represent the best target

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:50:47.990 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.740$  for treatment as well sake at the end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:50:50.740 --> 00:50:54.100 So what does lecanu mob do for amyloid?

NOTE Confidence: 0.59172584428571400:50:54.100 --> 00:50:55.156 First of all?

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}50{:}55.156 \to 00{:}50{:}58.720$  Well, we saw what it did for a myloid pet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:50:58.720 --> 00:51:00.540 What about soluble amyloid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:00.540 \longrightarrow 00:51:03.884$  such as a curse in super spinal

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:03.884 --> 00:51:05.459 fluid and plasma?

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.500$  And that's what's shown here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714 00:51:08.500 --> 00:51:09.814 On the left,

00:51:09.814 --> 00:51:12.880 we're looking at lacanada effects on CSF,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:12.880 \longrightarrow 00:51:15.008$  Abeta 40 and 42.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:15.008 --> 00:51:17.190 Remember, 42 is the more important one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:17.190 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.183$  the malignant one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:18.183 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.507$  In the upper right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:19.510 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.561$  we're looking at the ratio of 42 to 40

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:22.561 --> 00:51:26.329 and in the lower right we're looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}51{:}26.329 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}29.138$  the corresponding ratio in blood plasma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:29.140 \longrightarrow 00:51:31.006$  Overall, one thing to note is

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:31.006 --> 00:51:32.790 that in in Alzheimer's disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}51{:}32.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}35.730$  actually these all go down,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:35.730 --> 00:51:36.999 not up because,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00{:}51{:}36.999 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}39.960$  and that's thought to occur because they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:40.034 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.184$  being aggregated and deposited in the brain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:43.190 \longrightarrow 00:51:44.950$  you know, as plaques.

00:51:44.950 --> 00:51:47.262 So up is good, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:47.262 \longrightarrow 00:51:48.090$  in these cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:48.090 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.322$  And what you can see is that although

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:50.322 --> 00:51:52.810 there's no effective lukianov on EBITDA 40,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:52.810 --> 00:51:56.202 the more important a beta 42, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

00:51:56.202 --> 00:51:59.460 there's a definite normalizing of the A beta.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:51:59.460 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.264$  Aggregation process and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:52:01.264 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.376$  also shown in the ratio of abeta

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:52:04.376 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.644$  42 to 40 and it's even shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.591725844285714

 $00:52:06.644 \longrightarrow 00:52:09.037$  in the same ratio in plasma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:11.320 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.870$  What about Tau?

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:13.870 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.958$  Well, with Tau there are two main.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

00:52:17.960 --> 00:52:19.630 Things that are being measured,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:19.630 \longrightarrow 00:52:21.478$  there's the phosphorylation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:21.478 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.739$  soluble Tau which is thought to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:24.739 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.229$  an early marker of Tau pathogenesis,

 $00:52:27.230 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.410$  and that's what's shown here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:29.410 \longrightarrow 00:52:32.380$  What we can see is that for phospho

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

00:52:32.380 --> 00:52:35.800 Tau 181 steady increases in people

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:35.800 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.794$  on placebo and decreases relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00.52:38.794 \longrightarrow 00.52:42.334$  to that and people taking liking

NOTE Confidence: 0.752258933333333

 $00:52:42.334 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.619$  amab in both CSF and plasma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:52:48.480 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.647$  Tao pet on the other hand is measuring the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:52:52.650 \longrightarrow 00:52:55.200$  The is looking at the aggregation

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

00:52:55.200 --> 00:52:59.750 you know of Tau into.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:52:59.750 \longrightarrow 00:53:02.066$  Uh deposited as neurofibrillary

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00{:}53{:}02.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04.961$  tangles or dystrophic neurites in

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00{:}53{:}04.961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}08.066$  brain can be measured on a PET scan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00{:}53{:}08.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}10.653$  In this case we're looking at pet

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:10.653 \longrightarrow 00:53:12.829$  data from multiple brain regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:12.830 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.720$  Although I should point out that the

 $00:53:14.720 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.579$  ones of pre specified interest were

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00{:}53{:}16.579 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}18.896$  in the temporal lobe you know which

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:18.961 \longrightarrow 00:53:20.926$  are represent earlier Brock stages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:20.930 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.763$  And what we can see here is that for

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:25.770 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.850$  three different temporal lobe regions

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:27.850 \longrightarrow 00:53:29.930$  and medial temporal lobe so-called.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:29.930 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.678$  Meta temporal and a whole temporal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:32.680 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.438$  In all cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00{:}53{:}34.438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}37.368$  there was a statistically significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:37.368 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.400$  blunting bilican amab compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:39.400 \longrightarrow 00:53:41.080$  to the place bo group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

00:53:41.080 --> 00:53:42.480 You know, with increasing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

 $00:53:42.480 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.180$  you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81702165

00:53:43.180 --> 00:53:45.210 Tau deposition on PET scan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:53:49.000 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.946$  One measure of end of neurodegeneration

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:53:51.946 \longrightarrow 00:53:54.424$  would be volumetric MRI and

 $00:53:54.424 \longrightarrow 00:53:56.168$  that's shown shown here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:53:56.170 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.025$  First of all in the top row

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:53:58.025 \longrightarrow 00:53:59.848$  we're looking at the effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:53:59.848 --> 00:54:01.774 lecan amab on whole brain volume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:01.780 \longrightarrow 00:54:03.448$  cortical thickness and

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:03.448 --> 00:54:05.116 lateral ventricular volume.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:05.120 --> 00:54:07.740 And maybe paradoxically Kanab is

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:07.740 --> 00:54:09.836 associated with greater atrophy

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:09.836 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.139$  and all of these measures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:12.140 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.645$  Now this is something that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:13.645 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.548$  been seen many times before now

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:15.548 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.243$  with anti amyloid therapies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}54{:}17.243 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}18.599$  and one simple explanation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:18.600 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.864$  Maybe simply that it represents plaque

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:21.864 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.690$  clearance which which reduces volume.

00:54:24.690 --> 00:54:26.860 The bottom row shows hippocampal

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}54{:}26.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}29.872$  volumes and in this case that effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:29.872 --> 00:54:33.240 is not seen and in fact like Kanab

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:33.336 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.684$  is associated with less atrophy in

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:36.684 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.840$  hippocampal volumes at end of study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00.54:39.840 \longrightarrow 00.54:43.648$  So where do we go next from here?

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:43.650 --> 00:54:46.251 You know we can't amab may be ready for

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:46.251 --> 00:54:48.256 the clinic you know remains remains

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:48.256 \longrightarrow 00:54:51.387$  to be seen by you know FDA and CMS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:54:51.390 --> 00:54:54.462 It did receive the accelerated approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:54.462 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.540$  based on plaque clearance January 6th.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.970$  Umm, and it was submitted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:54:58.970 \longrightarrow 00:55:01.538$  They submitted for traditional approval on

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:01.538 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.080$  January 6th with a decision likely to occur,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667 00:55:05.080 --> 00:55:05.712 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:05.712 \longrightarrow 00:55:06.660$  probably late spring.

 $00:55:06.660 \longrightarrow 00:55:07.680$  And then the question will be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:07.680 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.760$  will CMS revisit coverage decision?

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00.55:10.760 --> 00.55:13.304 I just want to highlight here in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:13.304 \longrightarrow 00:55:15.637$  middle though that this whole issue

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}55{:}15.637 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}17.672$  of accelerated approval based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:17.672 \longrightarrow 00:55:19.678$  biomarker is really controversial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:19.680 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.240$  And for anyone interested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}55{:}21.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}23.580$  we're going to have a webinar

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:23.655 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.119$  debate next Thursday.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:55:25.120 --> 00:55:26.480 Dennis Selkoe's going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:26.480 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.500$  take the affirmative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:27.500 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.970$  That this is a ready,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:28.970 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.994$  we're ready for this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:29.994 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.090$  so I'm going to take the negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:32.090 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.876$  Here's the link.

 $00:55:32.876 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.087$  We can put it in the chat and

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}55{:}35.087 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}36.923$  if anyone has any trouble you

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:55:36.923 --> 00:55:39.187 can just e-mail me and I'll make

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:39.187 \longrightarrow 00:55:40.782$  sure that you get registered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:40.790 \longrightarrow 00:55:43.135$  The other where to next is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:43.135 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.450$  where we go scientifically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:45.450 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.106$  And I think these results really beg the

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:48.106 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.109$  question about earlier intervention,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:55:50.110 --> 00:55:52.384 you know then clarity AD which

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:52.384 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.530$  was in early symptomatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}55{:}54.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}56.986$  I think we need to go to pre

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:55:56.986 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.595$  symptomatic disease which is what

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:55:58.595 --> 00:56:00.702 the ahead study does and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:56:00.702 --> 00:56:02.857 study was started already about

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:02.857 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.520$  almost three years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:04.520 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.920$  And we fortunately chose the cannabis

 $00:56:06.920 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.959$  the drug before we knew these results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.606$  But there are two parts of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:12.610 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.830$  The head study people in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:14.830 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.475$  so-called a 4-5 arm have elevated

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:17.475 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.175$  and clearly elevated brain amyloid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:20.180 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.270$  In the A3 portion they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:24.815$  sub threshold elevation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:56:24.820 --> 00:56:26.794 you don't it's it looks visually normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:26.794 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.144$  but we know these folks are destined

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:29.144 \longrightarrow 00:56:30.954$  for further you know accumulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:30.960 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.876$  So maybe even a better point

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:33.876 \longrightarrow 00:56:35.334$  of of intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}56{:}35.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}38.088$  Your head study design is shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:38.088 \longrightarrow 00:56:41.578$  here to four year long trial 5050

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:56:41.578 --> 00:56:44.543 randomization people in the A45

00:56:44.543 --> 00:56:46.808 arm with clearly elevated amyloid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:56:46.810 --> 00:56:49.127 Start out every two week infusions for

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:49.127 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.968$  two years and then go to every four weeks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:51.970 \longrightarrow 00:56:53.282$  Those with the intermediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:53.282 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.666$  levels can just be on every four

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}56{:}55.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}57.406$  weeks for the entire duration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:56:57.410 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.450$  Maybe a three study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:57:00.450 \longrightarrow 00:57:04.050$  So in summary of what I've shown you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}57{:}04.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}06.708$  the cannab treatment met all primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

00:57:06.708 --> 00:57:08.480 and secondary endpoints versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00{:}57{:}08.548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}11.242$  place bo at 18 months with highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.737305082666667

 $00:57:11.242 \longrightarrow 00:57:13.038$  significant differences starting at

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:57:13.112 --> 00:57:15.270 six months. And I think one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:57:15.270 --> 00:57:17.087 the most compelling things is how

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00{:}57{:}17.087 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}19.019$  consistent the results are across a

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:19.019 \longrightarrow 00:57:21.479$  broad range of endpoints and subgroups.

00:57:21.480 --> 00:57:24.581 The safety profile of LA Canada I

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00{:}57{:}24.581 \to 00{:}57{:}26.637$  would consider acceptable with lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00{:}57{:}26.637 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}57{:}29.395$  rates of Aria E compared to other

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:29.395 \longrightarrow 00:57:31.820$  published studies with other antibodies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:31.820 \longrightarrow 00:57:34.268$  Biomarker studies revealed that we cannot

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:34.268 \longrightarrow 00:57:37.024$  have improved both of the essential

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:57:37.024 --> 00:57:39.140 biological features of Alzheimer's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:57:39.140 --> 00:57:42.380 both amyloid and Tau and they did it by Pat,

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:57:45.248$  CSF and blood plasma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:45.248 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.116$  And this indicates biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:57:48.116 --> 00:57:49.550 disease modification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:49.550 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.370$  The brain MRI volumetric analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00{:}57{:}51.370 --> 00{:}57{:}53.747$  indicated that like Canada was associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:57:53.747 --> 00:57:55.747 with reduced hippocampal atrophy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:57:55.750 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.122$  but greater global and cortical atrophy

 $00:57:59.122 \longrightarrow 00:58:02.523$  possibly related to amyloid removal like

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00{:}58{:}02.523 \to 00{:}58{:}04.888$  Kanab has received accelerated approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:04.888 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.817$  with the decision on full approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:58:07.817 --> 00:58:10.709 pending and it's uncertain whether CMS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364 00:58:10.710 --> 00:58:11.818 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

00:58:11.818 --> 00:58:14.034 Medicare will revise coverage

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:14.034 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.823$  decision and last you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:15.823 \longrightarrow 00:58:18.700$  Had to study is investigating were earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:18.700 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.020$  Whether early or pre,

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:21.020 \longrightarrow 00:58:23.340$  symptomatic intervention may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:23.340 \dashrightarrow 00:58:26.349$  associated with greater effect sizes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:26.350 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.078$  So I I thank you for your attention

NOTE Confidence: 0.833930258636364

 $00:58:29.078 \longrightarrow 00:58:30.999$  and I'll take questions.