WEBVTT NOTE duration:"00:26:30.0160000" NOTE language:en-us NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:03.283 Morgan is an assistant professor of pathology NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00{:}00{:}03.283 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}06.347$ and Epidemiology at the school of Madison. NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00{:}00{:}06{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}08{.}948$ She's a member of the combined NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 00:00:08.948 --> 00:00:10.680 program in computational biology, NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00{:}00{:}10.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}13.788$ environ fanatics, as well as the Center NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 00:00:13.788 --> 00:00:16.737 for research on Aging and her work. NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00{:}00{:}16.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}18.316$ Her multidisciplinary work has NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00:00:18.316 \rightarrow 00:00:19.892$ really been integrating new NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 00:00:19.892 --> 00:00:21.940 methods of statistical genetics, NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 00:00:21.940 --> 00:00:22.806 computational biology, NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00:00:22.806 \rightarrow 00:00:24.538$ mathematical demography to develop, NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00:00:24.540 \rightarrow 00:00:27.851$ sort of a new high dimensional mix NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 00:00:27.851 --> 00:00:31.470 approach to aging in both humans and NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512 $00:00:31.470 \rightarrow 00:00:34.100$ animal models and applying those.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512
- 00:00:34.100 --> 00:00:36.122 Efforts to a variety of major

00:00:36.122 --> 00:00:36.796 chronic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

00:00:36.800 --> 00:00:37.820 most notably cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:37.820 \rightarrow 00:00:40.200$ and so Morgan really pleased to hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:40.263 \rightarrow 00:00:42.887$ about your work and looking forward to talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:42.890 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.240$ Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68500984

 $00:00:48.540 \rightarrow 00:00:51.190$ OK, maybe we can see that yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9155807

 $00:00:55.080 \rightarrow 00:00:57.330$ And let me make it bigger on my screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8740703

00:01:01.700 --> 00:01:04.460 OK, um, so today I'm going to talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8740703

 $00{:}01{:}04{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}08{.}001$ about some of my work on in developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8740703

00:01:08.001 --> 00:01:10.354 biomarkers using DNA methylation data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8740703

 $00{:}01{:}10.354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}13.378$ to study aging and diseases like cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:16.750 --> 00:01:21.020 Why isn't it? I'm so I usually like to

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:21.020 \dashrightarrow 00:01:23.288$ kind of remind people what the biggest NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:23.288 --> 00:01:25.717 risk factor for most major cancers is,

 $00:01:25.720 \dashrightarrow 00:01:27.911$ and I like to illustrate this often

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:27.911 \dashrightarrow 00:01:29.579$ using something like lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:29.580 \dashrightarrow 00:01:32.244$ So a lot of times when asking students what NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

101E Comuchee. 0.01551215

 $00{:}01{:}32.244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}35.060$ the biggest risk factor for lung cancer is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:35.060 --> 00:01:36.986 they'll say something like cigarette smoking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}01{:}36{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}38{.}916$ which we know increases the risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}01{:}38{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}40{.}960$ The incidence and death from lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.110$ cancer by about 15 to 30 fold.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:43.110 --> 00:01:44.007 But in reality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:44.007 --> 00:01:46.100 aging itself is actually much bigger risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}01{:}46.155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}48.600$ factor for developing lung cancer, so for

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}01{:}48.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51.240$ individuals who are 25 to 29 years old.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}01{:}51{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}52{.}544$ About one in 200,000,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:52.544 --> 00:01:54.943 you have about one in 200,000 chance

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:54.943 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.320$ of Belton lung cancer, however.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:58.320 --> 00:02:00.508 Nearly 400 and 100K,

 $00{:}02{:}00{.}508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}04.867$ so it UH-80 full increase risk for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:04.867 \longrightarrow 00:02:09.160$ OR 800 fold increases for those 75 to 79.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:02:09.160 --> 00:02:11.146 And this is the case across

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:11.146 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.140$ a wide variety of cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:13.140 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.950$ We see, UM, in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}02{:}14.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}17.477$ an exponential increase with age in both

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}02{:}17.477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}19.658$ incidents in mortality risks from cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:02:19.660 --> 00:02:20.626 And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:20.626 \longrightarrow 00:02:22.558$ some people have thought that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:22.558 \rightarrow 00:02:25.088$ is just commit probability with time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:25.090 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.256$ So at the longer you live,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}02{:}27.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}29.668$ the more time and the more likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}02{:}29.668 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}31.240$ they will develop cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:02:31.240 --> 00:02:31.894 But really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}02{:}31{.}894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34{.}183$ what we think is that it's actually

- $00:02:34.183 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.220$ the molecular.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00{:}02{:}35{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}36{.}816$ Another changes that accompanied
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:36.816 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.811$ the aging process that are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:38.811 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.557$ actually playing a causal role.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00{:}02{:}40.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42.245$ In the ideology of major
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- 00:02:42.245 --> 00:02:43.256 diseases like cancer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- 00:02:43.260 --> 00:02:46.302 so I like this kind of New Yorker Cartoon,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:46.310 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.565$ which says you're deliberately putting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:48.565 \dashrightarrow 00:02:52.048$ yourself at risk avail help by being over 65.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:52.050 \dashrightarrow 00:02:54.234$ So one thing that my lab is really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:54.234 \rightarrow 00:02:56.238$ interested in is can we actually try
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00{:}02{:}56{.}238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}58{.}040$ and quantify some of these aging
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:58.040 \rightarrow 00:02:59.775$ changes that might underlie risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:02:59.775 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.166$ for things like cancer or other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- 00:03:02.166 --> 00:03:03.660 major chronic diseases?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213
- $00:03:03.660 \rightarrow 00:03:05.487$ And so this is where kind of

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}487 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}06{.}759$ biomarkers of aging come in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:06.760 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.040$ Uh, so aging is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:09.040 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.156$ Not an observable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:10.156 \rightarrow 00:03:12.016$ it's it's this latent concept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:12.020 \rightarrow 00:03:14.258$ So it's actually hard to define.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}14.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}16.702$ But biomarkers can actually serve as

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}16.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}19.066$ useful proxies that we can estimate

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}19.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}21.714$ the agent Ness of a cell or tissue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:21.720 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.958$ or on the whole Organism level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.564$ So they serve a variety of purposes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:26.570 \dashrightarrow 00:03:29.552$ They can be used as clinical trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}29{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}31{.}517$ endpoints for interventions to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}31{.}517 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}33{.}652$ and slow the rate of aging there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}33{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}36{.}845$ You can also be used for basic

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:03:36.845 - 00:03:38.830 biology to understand aging.

 $00{:}03{:}38{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}40{.}655$ And also for risk stratification

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}40.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}43.152$ and the goals in developing some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}43.152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}44.976$ these biomarkers is that you should NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}44{.}976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}46{.}673$ have a biomarker that differentiates

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:46.673 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.742$ between a 20 year old an 8 year old,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}49{.}742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51{.}106$ which is pretty easy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}51{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}54{.}179$ You can even use facial image to do that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:54.180 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.220$ but probably the harder thing is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:03:56.220 --> 00:03:57.488 can you actually differentiate

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}03{:}57{.}488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}59{.}073$ risks among individuals of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:59.073 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.310$ same chronological age?

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:04:00.310 --> 00:04:02.998 So can you identify who might be aging

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}04{:}02{.}998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}05{.}427$ faster or slower and then in turn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}04{:}05{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}07{.}980$ does that have implications for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:04:07.980 --> 00:04:11.400 risk of a future morbidity mortality?

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:04:11.400 \rightarrow 00:04:13.376$ So most of the biomarkers in my lab

 $00:04:13.376 \rightarrow 00:04:15.586$ works on a more epigenetic biomarkers

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}04{:}15{.}586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18{.}076$ and specifically involved in DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}04{:}18.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.600$ so I like to think of the meth alone as

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:20.666 \rightarrow 00:04:22.988$ kind of the molecular operating system

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:22.988 \rightarrow 00:04:25.307$ it instructs else how they should

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}25{.}307 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}27{.}750$ behave and respond is involved in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:27.750 \rightarrow 00:04:29.836$ number of different cellular processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:29.836 \rightarrow 00:04:32.440$ but a really interesting thing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}32{.}513 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}34{.}571$ was pointed out more than I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:34.571 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.822$ 30 years ago is that there does

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:36.822 \rightarrow 00:04:38.778$ seem to be genome wide patterns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}38.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}40.940$ Um that emerge in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:40.940 \dashrightarrow 00:04:42.860$ changes in Maculation with aging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}42.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}46.852$ So you gotta change net in the maculation

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}46.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}49.610$ landscape as a function of age.

 $00:04:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.320$ And based on this, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}51{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}52{.}544$ a number of labs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:52.544 \rightarrow 00:04:54.074$ including ours who developed what

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:54.074 \rightarrow 00:04:56.087$ we call these epigenetic clocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}04{:}56{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}58{.}477$ So because they have been very precise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:58.480 \dashrightarrow 00:05:00.520$ age changes that have been observed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}05{:}00{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}02{.}190$ We actually use machine learning

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:02.190 \dashrightarrow 00:05:04.613$ to predict the age of a sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}05{:}04.613 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}06.659$ based on the DNA methylation level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:06.660 \dashrightarrow 00:05:09.276$ So you can take a sample from whole NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:09.276 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.777$ blood from tissue in a cell culture,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:11.780 \dashrightarrow 00:05:14.060$ and we often measure metalation at

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:05:14.060 --> 00:05:17.039 10s of thousands to now up to 850,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:17.039 \dashrightarrow 00:05:19.680$ different CP G sites across the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:05:19.680 --> 00:05:22.408 And then what people have done is applied NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:22.408 \rightarrow 00:05:23.995$ supervised machine learning methods

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:23.995 \rightarrow 00:05:26.105$ to actually develop age predictors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00{:}05{:}26{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}28{.}742$ So most of the early clocks were trained
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- 00:05:28.742 --> 00:05:31.397 to predict things like chronological age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:31.400 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.039$ the first Clock being published in 2011.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:34.040 \rightarrow 00:05:36.308$ However, more recent clocks have actually,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00{:}05{:}36{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38{.}956$ which we call the second generation at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:38.960 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.468$ The generic clocks were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:40.468 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.353$ developed to predict age coral.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:42.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.250$ It's so not chronological age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:44.250 \rightarrow 00:05:46.512$ but things like mortality or physiological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:46.512 \rightarrow 00:05:48.410$ processes that change with aging.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00{:}05{:}48{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49{.}582$ So mostly that was.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00{:}05{:}49{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}51{.}865$ Our Clock is one of the second
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00{:}05{:}51.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54.607$ generation clocks inside the John Clock.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- $00:05:54.610 \rightarrow 00:05:57.136$ And the second generation clocks actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}05{:}57{.}136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}00{.}425$ tend to be much better predictors of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}00{.}425 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}02{.}965$ future disease and mortality risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:06:02.970 --> 00:06:03.250 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}03.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06{.}284$ but first I just want to show kind of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}06{.}284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}08{.}966$ these clocks look across different tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:08.970 \rightarrow 00:06:12.018$ So this is an example of five different

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:06:12.018 --> 00:06:14.365 epigenetic clocks in a variety of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:14.365 \rightarrow 00:06:16.260$ different tissue are fluid samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}16.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}17.944$ On the X axis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:17.944 \rightarrow 00:06:21.130$ I'm showing chronological age on the Y axis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:21.130 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.965$ Is this predicted at the genetic age?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:23.970 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.034$ These two clocks by Horvath were

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:26.034 \rightarrow 00:06:27.990$ actually trained using multiple different

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:27.990 \rightarrow 00:06:30.058$ issues simultaneously pulled together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:30.060 \rightarrow 00:06:32.776$ so that's why you get much better

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:32.776 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.861$ agreement across the tissues in

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894
- 00:06:34.861 -> 00:06:36.966 terms of their predicted ages,

 $00{:}06{:}36{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}39{.}352$ whereas the other three clocks are

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:39.352 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.839$ actually all trained in whole blood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:41.840 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.675$ but still do predict still do show.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:44.680 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.340$ Very heists age correlations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:46.340 \rightarrow 00:06:48.378$ In other tissues, and actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:06:48.378 - > 00:06:51.530 if we were to show this within tissue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}51{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}54{.}206$ a lot of these age correlations

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:54.206 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.830$ are above .8 two point 9.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:56.830 \rightarrow 00:06:59.217$ But the interesting thing is you also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}59{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}01{.}614$ if you actually took the time to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}07{:}01.614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}04.050$ map these colors out is kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:04.050 \dashrightarrow 00:07:06.060$ these divergent issues tend to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}07{:}06.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08.475$ samples from brain or these tend to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:08.475 \rightarrow 00:07:10.876$ be non bring samples and we actually NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:10.876 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.970$ think that it's important to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:07:13.032 --> 00:07:14.897 differences in Appleton at age

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:07:14.897 --> 00:07:17.113 between tissues because we all know

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:17.113 \rightarrow 00:07:19.393$ to choose don't age at the same rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}07{:}19{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}21{.}392$ So we actually shouldn't be forcing

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:21.392 \rightarrow 00:07:23.160$ similar epigenetic gauges across tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}26.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}28.072$ And then we can actually also

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:28.072 \rightarrow 00:07:30.205$ show that epigenetic age is also

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}30.205 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32.215$ differentiates normal tissue from tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}32.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}34.356$ But that is not the case

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}34.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}35.780$ across all the clocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}35{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}38{.}167$ It tends to be the case across

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:38.167 \dashrightarrow 00:07:39.700$ these second generation clocks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}39{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}41{.}996$ where we can see that in the normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:41.996 \rightarrow 00:07:43.914$ tissue you get significantly lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:43.914 \rightarrow 00:07:46.458$ epigenetic age compared to the tumor,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216
- $00:07:46.460 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.640$ and these are all adjusted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216
- $00:07:48.640 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.948$ for chronological age.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216
- $00{:}07{:}49{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}52{.}479$ Um, so on our Clock and also the Clock
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216
- $00:07:52.479 \rightarrow 00:07:55.021$ by Yang Show these differences across
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216
- $00:07:55.021 \rightarrow 00:07:57.700$ a variety of different tissue types.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00{:}08{:}00{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}01{.}695$ So one question that we've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- 00:08:01.695 00:08:03.390 really been dealing with is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00:08:03.390 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.388$ you know all these clocks for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00{:}08{:}05{.}388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07{.}460$ developed to predict the same thing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00:08:07.460 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.840$ To capture this kind of epigenetic or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00:08:09.840 \dashrightarrow 00:08:11.529$ metalation based change with aging.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- 00:08:11.530 -> 00:08:13.360 Yet they seem to be perhaps
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- 00:08:13.360 --> 00:08:14.580 capturing different parts of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00{:}08{:}14.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}16.268$ this epigenetic aging signals.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141
- $00:08:16.270 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.076$ So basically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:17.076 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.091$ can we identify the individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

00:08:19.091 --> 00:08:20.670 components and decompose the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:20.670 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.494$ signal to adapt to figure out

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

00:08:22.494 --> 00:08:24.343 what the different parts are and NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00{:}08{:}24{.}343 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}26{.}095$ how they map onto disease risk?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00{:}08{:}26{.}100$ --> $00{:}08{:}28{.}354$ So this is kind of an illustration NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:28.354 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.270$ of taking the clocks apart.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:30.270 \dashrightarrow 00:08:31.770$ And then figuring out which each

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00{:}08{:}31{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}33{.}280$ part of the Clock is doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}35{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}38{.}496$ So the way that we did this is we

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

00:08:38.496 --> 00:08:41.020 applied something called WG CNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:08:41.020 \rightarrow 00:08:43.300$ so it's a weighted network analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}43.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}46.615$ and we did this a cross using six

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}46.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}48.765$ different issue in fluid datasets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}48.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}51.626$ So we had uh samples from dermis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:08:51.630 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.854$ epidermis, breast dorsolateral

 $00:08:52.854 \rightarrow 00:08:55.295$ prefrontal Cortex Colon, an full blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}55{.}295 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}58{.}730$ And the goal here was to identify Co

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}58{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}01{.}300$ maculation modules that are shared

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:09:01.300 \dashrightarrow 00:09:04.799$ across all these tissue or sample types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}09{:}04{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}07{.}560$ and from this we were able to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}09{:}07{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}10{.}286$ 16 of these Co
 maculation modules

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}09{:}10.286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}13.208$ using Skeggs from the clocks which

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:09:13.291 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.646$ word starting with about 1600.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}19{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}21{.}930$ I'm so the next thing we did is we actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}21.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}24.511$ looked at how these different modules

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:24.511 --> 00:09:27.119 are impacting the overall Clock scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:27.120 --> 00:09:29.920 So in this I've color coded all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}29{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}32{.}624$ 16 modules and you can see that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}32.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}35.626$ our Clock and this Clock by Hannum a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:35.626 \rightarrow 00:09:38.092$ large proportion of this is actually

00:09:38.100 --> 00:09:39.930 driven by this yellow module,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:39.930 \dashrightarrow 00:09:42.506$ whereas the two clocks by Corvette seem

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:42.506 \dashrightarrow 00:09:45.010$ to have relatively similar proportions in NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:45.010 \dashrightarrow 00:09:47.674$ contributing to the overall Clock score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}47.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}49.420$ But the interesting module that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:49.420 \dashrightarrow 00:09:51.550$ I'm actually going to talk about NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:51.550 --> 00:09:53.200 today is this Brown module,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:53.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.378$ which actually is shown in most

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:55.378 --> 00:09:58.113 of these clocks and has a pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}58{.}113 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}00{.}118$ similar proportion of about uhm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:10:00.120 --> 00:10:01.723 10 to 15% in each of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:10:01.723 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.380$ clocks to the overall signal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}06{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}08{.}651$ So the other thing we can do is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:08.651 \rightarrow 00:10:11.139$ just look at what proportion of the NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}11{.}139 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}13{.}450$ clocks is explained by each module,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}13.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}15.090$ but whether what their capturing

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00:10:15.090 \rightarrow 00:10:16.730$ is actually the same signal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00:10:16.730 \longrightarrow 00:10:18.686$ So this is all the modules,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00:10:18.690 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.568$ but I'm going to really focus
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- 00:10:20.568 --> 00:10:22.630 just on 2 for right now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00:10:22.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.639$ so basically this is the part of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00{:}10{:}24.639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.297$ each Clock that that's represented
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- 00:10:26.297 --> 00:10:28.859 by Stevie jobs in this Brown module.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00{:}10{:}28.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}31.803$ And what you can see is that for these,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00{:}10{:}31{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}33{.}635$ epigenetic clocks have really similar
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- 00:10:33.635 --> 00:10:35.861 or high agreements in terms of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00{:}10{:}35{.}861 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}37{.}546$ their epigenetic age signal here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- 00:10:37.550 -> 00:10:39.325 However, just a contrast this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00:10:39.325 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.745$ on this purple module,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- 00:10:40.750 --> 00:10:43.340 you can see that in in two of the clocks
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
- $00:10:43.406 \rightarrow 00:10:46.010$ what the proper module is contributing NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705
 - 18

 $00:10:46.010 \rightarrow 00:10:48.200$ to is considered accelerated aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:48.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.975$ whereas in the other two

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:49.975 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.395$ clocks or three clocks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:51.400 \rightarrow 00:10:52.868$ it's considered decelerated aging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}52.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}56.288$ So this is an example of a module is

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:10:56.288 --> 00:10:58.213 differentially waited and might be

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:58.213 \rightarrow 00:11:00.289$ contributing to differences in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:11:00.289 \rightarrow 00:11:02.349$ performance by the various clocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}11{:}02{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}04{.}240$ But for the rest of the talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:11:04.240 --> 00:11:06.400 I'm going to focus on this Brown module,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}11{:}06{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08{.}227$ which seems to be the one that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:11:08.227 \rightarrow 00:11:09.909$ most important in terms of cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}12{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}15{.}217$ So now what we can do is we can look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}15{.}217 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}18{.}305$ instead of looking at the entire Clock score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:18.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.930$ look at the individual modules.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:19.930 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.170$ So is there a part of the clocks for this?

 $00:11:23.170 \rightarrow 00:11:25.114$ Actually driving this kind of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:25.114 \rightarrow 00:11:26.410$ associations that we're seeing?

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:26.410 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.818$ So in this case I'm looking at just

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}28{.}818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}31{.}031$ the part of our Clock that's captured

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

00:11:31.031 --> 00:11:33.530 by CP GS in this Brown module.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

00:11:33.530 --> 00:11:36.446 So this is just 21 CP GS over all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}36{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38{.}700$ and what we can see is we can kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:38.770 \longrightarrow 00:11:41.188$ recapitulate the finding with the tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}41{.}188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}43{.}900$ versus normal across these different issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

00:11:43.900 --> 00:11:45.652 However, in this case it's actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}45.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47.191$ more significant when we're just

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00{:}11{:}47{.}191 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}48{.}487$ considering this Brown module.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}11{:}50{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}53{.}367$ We can also look up this is in normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}11{:}53{.}367 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}56{.}345$ breast tissue and we do see that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:11:56.345 \rightarrow 00:11:58.379$ module is significantly correlated with NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

- $00:11:58.379 \rightarrow 00:12:02.170$ age in normal breast, suggesting that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}02{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}03{.}574$ Perhaps as women age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00:12:03.574 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.329$ their breasts as she develops.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}05{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}08{.}991$ The more of this accelerated aging phenotype
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}08{.}991 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}11{.}820$ which could predispose them to cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00:12:11.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.750$ And this is actually, uhm,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}13.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15.736$ what we can observe when we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}15{.}736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}18{.}464$ look at this is all data from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- 00:12:18.464 --> 00:12:20.674 normal breast tissue from women,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}20.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}22.600$ either with or without breast
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00:12:22.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.136$ cancer prior to treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}24{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26{.}625$ This is a collaboration with others at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}26.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}29.655$ Yale and we validated this in the original
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00{:}12{:}29.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}32.610$ study and then also in another study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00:12:32.610 \rightarrow 00:12:36.075$ Or you can see that women with breast cancer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00:12:36.080 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.150$ their normal tissues seems to

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804
- $00:12:38.150 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.806$ be epigenetically older when

 $00:12:39.806 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.058$ we look at this Brown module.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}12{:}42.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}44.150$ And women without breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:44.150 \rightarrow 00:12:47.230$ And this is all age matched our age

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:47.230 \rightarrow 00:12:50.419$ adjusted and adjusted for things like BMI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}12{:}50{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}52{.}088$ smoking another potential confounders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:12:54.830 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.903$ Uh, we also had a really small

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:12:57.903 --> 00:13:00.389 data set where we had, uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}00{.}389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}02{.}663$ this Brown module measured in tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:13:02.663 --> 00:13:05.630 and we had information on survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:05.630 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.424$ so this is a data set with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:09.424 \rightarrow 00:13:12.220$ only 51 samples an over.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:13:12.220 --> 00:13:15.046 I totale I are over 3471

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}15{.}046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}17{.}790$ person Montes or 20 deaths.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:17.790 \longrightarrow 00:13:19.980$ And what you can see,

 $00:13:19.980 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.524$ we need to validate this given

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:22.524 \rightarrow 00:13:25.115$ those small sample where we do

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}25{.}115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}27{.}563$ see that this Brown module 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}27.563 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}29.387$ standard deviation increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}29{.}387 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}31{.}697$ this module it's associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:13:31.697 --> 00:13:34.398 about 2.25 fold increased risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:34.398 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.578$ mortality over this time period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:36.580 \rightarrow 00:13:39.639$ and that's adjusting for things like age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}39{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41{.}384$ race, ethnicity, tumor grade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00{:}13{:}41{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}43{.}564$ ER and also chemotherapy tree.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:13:46.550 --> 00:13:48.590 So I went looking more specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:13:48.590 --> 00:13:50.860 at what's in this Brown module.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}13{:}50{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}53{.}116$ Um, these are the individual CP

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}13{:}53{.}116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}55{.}908$ GS in the Brown module and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}13{:}55{.}908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}58{.}308$ can actually relate each CVG to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}13{:}58{.}308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}01{.}036$ some of the outcomes I discussed.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026
- $00{:}14{:}01{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}03{.}763$ So this first column is whether it

 $00:14:03.763 \rightarrow 00:14:05.919$ differentiates in normal breast tissue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}05{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08{.}356$ women with breast cancer versus controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:08.360 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.078$ The second column is whether it

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:14:11.078 --> 00:14:12.890 can differentiate breast tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:12.966 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.871$ from normal breast tissue and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:14.871 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.500$ the third column is the survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:17.500 \rightarrow 00:14:22.036$ I'm finding and basically what we can see is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}22.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}25.586$ There's about a group of 12 CP GS for

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:25.586 \rightarrow 00:14:27.749$ which hypermethylation so increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}27.749 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}31.662$ maculation in these 12 CP GS is

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}31{.}753 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34{.}453$ associated with either cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:14:34.453 --> 00:14:37.810 normal tissue or or tumor versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}37{.}810$ --> $00{:}14{:}41{.}060$ normal or lower survival rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}41.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}43.948$ And from the these are the jeans that

00:14:43.948 --> 00:14:46.774 these DVD's are in an there actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:14:46.774 --> 00:14:49.190 almost all in promoter regions in

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}49{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}51{.}662$ these jeans and we can use just ease NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:51.662 \longrightarrow 00:14:53.800$ 12 to estimate an overall score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}53{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}56{.}397$ So we use PCA across these three

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}56{.}397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}59{.}325$ samples and we can take PC one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}59{.}325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02{.}169$ those 12 jeans and follow up with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:04.320 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.528$ So the other thing is that we also

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}15{:}06{.}528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}08{.}909$ find that these 12 genius seemed

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}15{:}08{.}909 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10{.}669$ to have specific characteristics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}15{:}10.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}13.036$ so they seem to be associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:15:13.036 --> 00:15:15.209 polycomb group targets and also HT

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}15{:}15{.}209 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}17{.}029$ K27 trimethylation occupancy and see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:17.030 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.148$ and they tend to be ensues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:19.150 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.209$ 12 pound jeans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:20.209 \rightarrow 00:15:22.680$ So this is these 12 selected jeans.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:15:22.680 \rightarrow 00:15:25.200$ These were all the jeans that were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00{:}15{:}25{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}27{.}351$ in the original ground module and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- 00:15:27.351 --> 00:15:30.449 these are all the CP GS that we have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:15:30.449 \rightarrow 00:15:32.555$ measured in all of our samples.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00{:}15{:}32{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}35{.}150$ So about 20,000 CP GS over also.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:15:35.150 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.190$ This is kind of the background.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:15:37.190 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.950$ So about um 65 to 70% of them
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- 00:15:40.950 --> 00:15:43.770 are orange juice 12 pound jeans,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00{:}15{:}43.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}46.955$ about 50% are Co locating with H2K27
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- 00:15:46.955 --> 00:15:48.908 trying Appalachian and similarly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:15:48.908 \rightarrow 00:15:53.078 50\%$ with Polycom group targets.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00{:}15{:}53.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}54.074$ And Interestingly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:15:54.074 \rightarrow 00:15:57.056$ this Association is actually not news,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00{:}15{:}57{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}00{.}084$ so there's some dating back about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:16:00.084 \longrightarrow 00:16:03.445$ 13 years of evidence that these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:03.445 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.945$ polycomb mediated methylations does

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}16{:}05{.}945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}09{.}848$ seem to be important in cancer and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:09.850 --> 00:16:10.264 Basically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:10.264 --> 00:16:11.920 Polycom group proteins are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:11.920 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.990$ involved in repression of jeans

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}16{:}14.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}15.670$ that are required for salt.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}16{:}15.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}19.198$ A stem cell differentiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:19.200 --> 00:16:19.659 Um,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}16{:}19.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}22.413$ so finally we also looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:22.413 \dashrightarrow 00:16:26.038$ these in non breast cancers again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:26.040 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.740$ so this is in colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.067$ and again we find using this 12

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:32.067 --> 00:16:34.452 PPG DNA methylations score that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:34.452 \rightarrow 00:16:37.187$ we can significantly differentiate

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}16{:}37{.}187 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}41{.}387$ normal tissue from cancerous tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:41.390 --> 00:16:43.380 And Lastly, probably to me,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175
- $00:16:43.380 \longrightarrow 00:16:45.365$ the most interesting thing is

 $00:16:45.365 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.350$ we can look at this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:47.350 --> 00:16:49.576 A trustee PG score in completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:49.576 --> 00:16:51.568 normal tissue across a bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:51.568 --> 00:16:53.296 of different tissue types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:53.300 \rightarrow 00:16:55.862$ And basically we see really strong

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:55.862 \rightarrow 00:16:57.143$ correlations with chronological

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:57.143 \longrightarrow 00:16:58.858$ age across all of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:16:58.860 --> 00:17:01.236 So in brain whole glide colon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:01.240 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.621$ dermis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}01.621 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}03.907$ an epidermis which to me suggests

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}03{.}907 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}06{.}642$ that these might be changes that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:06.642 \rightarrow 00:17:08.547$ naturally occuring with aging and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}08.547 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}10.767$ that that might be predisposing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:10.770 \rightarrow 00:17:13.969$ Some of these tissues to tumor Genesis.

 $00:17:13.970 \rightarrow 00:17:16.142$ I'm so something that we're really

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:16.142 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.448$ interested now is in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:17:18.448 --> 00:17:20.818 kind of a primary or secondary

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:20.818 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.608$ prevention approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:21.610 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.052$ Can you identify people who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}24.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}26.804$ scoring higher for their age then we NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:26.804 \rightarrow 00:17:29.247$ would expect an are those boots are?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:17:29.250 --> 00:17:31.380 Are those people more at risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}31{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33{.}290$ of developing cancer in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:33.290 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.360$ specific tissues down the road?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}35{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37{.}270$ The other thing we're interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:37.270 \longrightarrow 00:17:39.180$ in is comparing across tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:39.180 \longrightarrow 00:17:41.700$ So are people who seems to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00{:}17{:}41.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}44.219$ aging faster in blood also aging?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:44.220 \rightarrow 00:17:46.439$ Faster and something like breast or colon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:17:48.550 \rightarrow 00:17:50.810$ And then last, um, basically,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}17{:}50{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}54{.}274$ we also looked at this using a cultured
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:17:54.274 \rightarrow 00:17:56.668$ fiberglass and basically we have,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:17:56.670 00:17:58.920 uhm, the early passage controls.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:17:58.920 \rightarrow 00:18:00.925$ We haven't immortalized transform fiberglass
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}00{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}04{.}041$ where you can see an acceleration of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}04{.}041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}06{.}137$ this epigenetic score immortalized,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}06{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}09{.}297$ and we also looked in cellular senescence.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:18:09.300 --> 00:18:12.000 So on pigeon induced, in essence,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:18:12.000 \longrightarrow 00:18:13.311$ an replicative senescence,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}13{.}311 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}16{.}370$ and these are near near senescence that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}16{.}439 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}18{.}889$ were passage together so prohibitive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:18:18.890 --> 00:18:22.066 But they, uh, show high snacks and story,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}22{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}23{.}216$ associated beta gal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:18:23.216 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:18:25.890 And basically what you can see is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}18{:}25{.}963 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}28{.}435$ compared to the early passes cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.800$ We can recapitulate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:30.800 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.570$ Indies cultured fiberglass.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:32.570 --> 00:18:33.746 So In conclusion, uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}33{.}746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}35{.}510$ there are different kinds of DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}35{.}566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}37{.}588$ methylation changes in aging that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:37.588 --> 00:18:39.311 captured in the different epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}39{.}311 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}40{.}916$ clocks and by deconstructing then

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}40{.}916 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}42{.}948$ we can start to understand the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:42.948 --> 00:18:44.818 functionality of the signals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}44{.}818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}46{.}760$ are captured in these clocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:46.760 --> 00:18:47.720 And specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:47.720 --> 00:18:50.120 the Brown module seems particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}50{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}52{.}279$ interesting in terms of cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}52{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}55{.}234$ Is one of the biggest shared signals

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:55.234 --> 00:18:58.124 across all the epigenetic clocks and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:58.124 \rightarrow 00:19:00.689$ a distinguishes tumor versus normal

- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:19:00.689 \longrightarrow 00:19:04.118$ in a variety of different issues.

00:19:04.120 --> 00:19:04.543 Uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}19{:}04{.}543 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}06{.}235$ differences to normal breasts

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:06.235 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.878$ are also observed for women with

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:08.878 \rightarrow 00:19:10.706$ cancer versus those without,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}19{:}10.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}14.182$ and the signal from these from the model

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}19{:}14.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}17.270$ and tumors associated with survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:17.270 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.727$ We can that also narrow it down

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:19.727 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.142$ to \$12.00 that are really driving

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:22.142 \longrightarrow 00:19:24.704$ the signal in this Brown module

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:24.704 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.278$ there mainly capturing promoters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:19:27.280 --> 00:19:29.360 TPG island hypermethylation that tend

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}19{:}29{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}31{.}965$ to be marked by Polycom extricate

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}19{:}31{.}965 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}34{.}235$ 27 trimethylation and sues 12.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:34.240 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.850$ We can observe acceleration in culture,

- 00:19:36.850 --> 00:19:37.892 fiberless, appan,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}37{.}892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}38{.}934$ immortalization transformation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}38{.}934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}42{.}060$ and also so there's no sense.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:19:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.780$ But to me out again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}43.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}45.922$ really interesting thing is that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}45{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}47{.}960$ actually see linear changes in this NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}47.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}49.592$ signal across the adult range in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}49{.}592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}51{.}787$ a bunch of different issues which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}51{.}787 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53{.}375$ actually might be informative.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:19:53.380 --> 00:19:54.160 So overall,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:19:54.160 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.890$ I think this may represent an opinion
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:19:56.890 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.245$ about genetic aging change that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00{:}19{:}59{.}245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}01{.}610$ explains the increase cancer risk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:20:01.610 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.365$ With that I want to acknowledge people
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:20:05.365 --> 00:20:08.170 in my lab and also my collaborators,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- $00:20:08.170 \longrightarrow 00:20:10.510$ both at Yale.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134
- 00:20:10.510 --> 00:20:12.337 And elsewhere, as well as my funding.

00:20:14.860 --> 00:20:16.054 Working, thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:16.054 \rightarrow 00:20:17.642$ That's a terrific presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:17.642 \rightarrow 00:20:19.600$ in a really interesting work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:19.600 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.680$ And we actually have a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00{:}20{:}22{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}25{.}127$ questions that have been put forth

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:25.127 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.021$ on the chat or let me just run

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00{:}20{:}28{.}021 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}30{.}681$ through a few Dan Demayo ask you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00{:}20{:}30.681 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}33.046$ make see that people have recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00{:}20{:}33.046$ --> $00{:}20{:}35.800$ described meth elation of RNA M RNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00{:}20{:}35{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}38{.}348$ Specifically, does that change as well in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:38.348 \rightarrow 00:20:41.328$ the context of what you've been describing?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

 $00:20:42.690 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.846$ So we haven't looked at that here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

 $00{:}20{:}44.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47.328$ I know people are looking at that, um,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

 $00{:}20{:}47{.}328$ --> $00{:}20{:}49{.}952$ there's a group at Harvard who is actually

 $00{:}20{:}49{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}51{.}926$ looking at that in terms of aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

00:20:51.930 --> 00:20:53.981 but it for now what I'm discussing

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

 $00{:}20{:}53{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}56{.}240$ here is just CG metalation in DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}20{:}57{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}00{.}068$ Um, one another question sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:00.070 --> 00:21:02.366 Have you looked at this in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:02.366 \longrightarrow 00:21:04.010$ context of progeria patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}04.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06.425$ which is sort of a really interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:06.425 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.659$ question as it relates to aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}08.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11.131$ is curious if if you are folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:11.131 --> 00:21:12.959 she worked with it worked

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}12{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}15{.}179$ in that space and so we we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}15{.}179 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}17{.}381$ looked at the overall Clock scores

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:17.381 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.118$ in progeria and not all of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}20{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}22{.}268$ but some of them do show

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}22{.}268 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23{.}700$ acceleration in fridge area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}23.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}26.444$ We haven't looked at this specific modules

 $00:21:26.444 \rightarrow 00:21:29.160$ for the Brown module or the 12 PPG.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}29{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}31{.}267$ Part of the Brown module in progeria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:31.270 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.424$ but that is actually an interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}33{.}424 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}35{.}168$ thing and progeria something we

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:35.168 --> 00:21:37.184 we have plans to look at all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}37{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}38{.}896$ different modules to see if there

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}38.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}40.852$ are certain parts that are that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:40.852 --> 00:21:42.508 picking that up because again some

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}42{.}508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}44{.}725$ clocks seem to pick up the progeria NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

NOTE connuclice. 0.00100155

00:21:44.725 --> 00:21:46.017 acceleration whereas others don't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

00:21:47.090 --> 00:21:48.810 Thank you Marcus has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00{:}21{:}48.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}50.890$ question which as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00{:}21{:}50{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}53{.}280$ he said for the for the 12 CP GS that

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00{:}21{:}53{.}353 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}55{.}037$ you've identified their individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00{:}21{:}55{.}037 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}57{.}563$ basis as opposed to islands in

 $00:21:57.630 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.510$ any variation of those sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00{:}22{:}00{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}02{.}632$ Uhm, I actually haven't looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:02.632 \rightarrow 00:22:05.019$ whether there snips um at those sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

00:22:05.020 --> 00:22:07.090 so they are individual CP GS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:07.090 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.466$ so 12 individuals seeking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

00:22:08.466 --> 00:22:10.162 Geez, what we're interested now

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:10.162 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.190$ is actually looking at the whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:12.250 \longrightarrow 00:22:14.314$ region and looking at it like

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00{:}22{:}14.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}15.690$ variation across the regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:15.690 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.748$ but we haven't done that yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00{:}22{:}17.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}19.815$ But yeah, I should go back and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:19.815 \longrightarrow 00:22:21.577$ actually look at whether they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00{:}22{:}21{.}577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}23{.}597$ adjacent snips that would be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}25.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}29.286$ One question I have is, uhm, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}29{.}286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}31{.}878$ Looking at your data and realizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:22:31.878 \rightarrow 00:22:34.237$ that beyond aging there are,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521
- 00:22:34.240 --> 00:22:36.928 you know many sort of behaviors,

 $00{:}22{:}36{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39{.}100$ environmental exposures for lack of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

00:22:39.100 - 00:22:41.840 a better phrase that drive cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}41.840$ --> $00{:}22{:}45.895$ Breast colon, certainly. And should have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}45{.}895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}48{.}880$ Is there an opportunity to study sort of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

00:22:48.880 --> 00:22:51.876 uh, the behavior of of these individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}51{.}876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}54{.}241$ over time that would drive the signature

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}54{.}241 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}57{.}518$ in a way that you know they are sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}22{:}57{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}01{.}979$ They have a greater component of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00{:}23{:}01{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}03{.}745$ At Methylations signature that not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:23:03.745 \rightarrow 00:23:05.900$ only is reflective of promoted aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

00:23:05.900 --> 00:23:08.790 but increase risk of cancer. Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

00:23:08.790 --> 00:23:11.274 so we can see we have UM shown in

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00{:}23{:}11{.}274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}13{.}825$ the overall Clock scores that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00{:}23{:}13.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.473$ do get accelerated at genetic age

 $00:23:16.473 \rightarrow 00:23:18.711$ in Association with things that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

00:23:18.711 --> 00:23:20.874 think of as normal risk factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:20.874 \rightarrow 00:23:23.310$ so cigarette smoking obesity I need in

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:23.373 \rightarrow 00:23:25.635$ some socioeconomic factors seem to map

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:25.635 \rightarrow 00:23:27.919$ onto differences in these aging rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:27.920 \longrightarrow 00:23:29.760$ We haven't looked again specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

00:23:29.760 --> 00:23:31.974 at this module, although I will

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:31.974 \rightarrow 00:23:34.550$ say from some of our other work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00{:}23{:}34{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}37{.}175$ it seems like the Brown module is

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

00:23:37.175 --> 00:23:39.080 not particularly picking up smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:39.080 \longrightarrow 00:23:41.180$ But that might just be when

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:41.180 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.230$ measured in blood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:42.230 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.083$ whether it is in long or or some other

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:45.083 \rightarrow 00:23:47.130$ samples that might be different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:47.130 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.517$ whereas it seems more like that purple

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:49.517 \rightarrow 00:23:52.028$ module that it didn't really go into.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001
- 00:23:52.030 --> 00:23:53.430 It's actually picking up
- NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001
- $00:23:53.430 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.830$ more of those smoking,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001
- $00{:}23{:}54.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}56.580$ and the influence was smoking
- NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001
- $00:23:56.580 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.330$ in when measured in blood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00:24:00.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.214$ Another question is that the methyl
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00:24:02.214 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.956$ lation that of the 12 jeans in breast
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00:24:04.956 \rightarrow 00:24:07.308$ and with regarding the breast in memory
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00:24:07.308 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.330$ you can obviously the questions you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00{:}24{:}09{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}13{.}150$ can see is that breast tissue is.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- 00:24:13.150 --> 00:24:15.100 A combination of various cell types
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- 00:24:15.100 > 00:24:17.099 and have you narrowed down sort
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- 00:24:17.099 --> 00:24:18.456 of the epithelial, fibroblast,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00:24:18.456 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.436$ other cell types with regard
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731
- $00{:}24{:}20{.}436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22{.}380$ to what you're finding. Yeah,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:24:22.380 \rightarrow 00:24:24.844$ so unfortunately we just have bulk samples
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}24{.}844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}27.671$ so we can actually narrow it down to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}27.671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}30.250$ which cell type this is coming from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}30{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}32{.}278$ but I think because breast is

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}32{.}278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}34{.}050$ so heterogeneous we actually the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

00:24:34.050 --> 00:24:35.855 age correlation with our measures

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}35.855 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}37.770$ actually much weaker and breast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}37{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}39{.}989$ I think because it's a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:39.989 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.069$ confounded by the cell composition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

00:24:42.070 --> 00:24:42.949 However, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:42.949 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.000$ part of the reason we did to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

00:24:45.067 --> 00:24:47.011 follow up in the culture fiberglass

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

00:24:47.011 --> 00:24:49.706 was to make sure we weren't just NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

IVOIL Commence: 0.51100505

00:24:49.706 --> 00:24:51.478 capturing something about cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}51{.}478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54{.}330$ composition changes with aging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}54{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}55{.}670$ And the other interesting thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00{:}24{:}55{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57{.}653$ is that at least the Brown module

- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:24:57.653 \rightarrow 00:24:59.417$ seems to be pretty conserved across
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:24:59.417 \rightarrow 00:25:00.729$ cell and tissue types,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00{:}25{:}00{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}02{.}906$ so I don't think it is picking up
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:25:02.906 \rightarrow 00:25:04.807$ something from a specific tissue type.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:25:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.910$ It it would be interesting to look
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00{:}25{:}06{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}08{.}138$ at epithelial versus fiberglass
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:25:08.138 \rightarrow 00:25:10.274$ and see if one of those is driving
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00:25:10.274 \rightarrow 00:25:12.079$ the signal more than the other,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963
- $00{:}25{:}12.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}14.408$ but right now we don't have that data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023
- $00:25:15.020 \rightarrow 00:25:16.976$ And then the last question before
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023
- $00:25:16.976 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.433$ we break is if you looked at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023
- 00:25:19.433 --> 00:25:21.593 expression of the individual jeans
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023
- $00{:}25{:}21{.}593 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}24{.}505$ a particularly as they relate to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023
- $00{:}25{:}24.505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}26.489$ potentially classic tumor suppressor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023
- $00:25:26.489 \rightarrow 00:25:28.590$ genes or other typical mechanisms.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:29.640 \longrightarrow 00:25:31.880$ I'm so that is the follow up that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

00:25:31.880 --> 00:25:33.438 we're actually doing right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00{:}25{:}33{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35{.}760$ so everything I showed today is either on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00{:}25{:}35{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38{.}105$ the first part of the talk is impressed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:38.110 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.856$ The second part is in progress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:39.860 \rightarrow 00:25:42.488$ so it's kind of early days still on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:42.490 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.242$ But yeah, our goal is then

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:44.242 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.410$ to move to expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00{:}25{:}45{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}47{.}738$ We have looked at human protein at listen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00{:}25{:}47.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}51.226$ Do see some associations in terms of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00{:}25{:}51{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53{.}631$ Answer and expression in the jeans in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:53.631 \rightarrow 00:25:57.071$ our 12 CG set so we are optimistic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00{:}25{:}57{.}071 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59{.}406$ that we'll see differential expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999

 $00:26:00.670 \longrightarrow 00:26:02.966$ Well thank you were or just now at

NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999

 $00:26:02.966 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.618$ the top of the hour and I want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999

 $00:26:05.618 \rightarrow 00:26:08.189$ thank Morgan and Marcus for two superb

- NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999
- $00:26:08.189 \rightarrow 00:26:10.239$ talks that it really elucidated.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999
- 00:26:10.240 --> 00:26:11.560 Gray science being conducted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999
- $00{:}26{:}11.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}12.880$ at our Cancer Center.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999
- $00{:}26{:}12.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}15.456$ Thank you all for joining us again for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999
- $00{:}26{:}15{.}456 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17{.}481$ virtual grand rounds and look forward
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999
- $00{:}26{:}17{.}481 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}20{.}139$ again to seeing you all again next week.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79265245
- 00:26:21.180 --> 00:26:23.580 Great. Thanks, thank you.