## WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "00:26:30.0160000"

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:03.283$  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

 $00:00:06.350 \longrightarrow 00:00:08.948$  She's a member of the combined

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:08.948 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.680$  program in computational biology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:10.680 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.788$  environ fanatics, as well as the Center

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:13.788 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.737$  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 --> 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 --> 00:00:24.538 mathematical demography to develop,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.851$  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

 $00{:}00{:}31.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}34.100$  animal models and applying those.

 $00:00:34.100 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.122$  Efforts to a variety of major

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:36.800 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.820$  most notably cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153512

 $00:00:40.263 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.887$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9155807

00:00:55.080 --> 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

 $00:01:04.460 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.001$  about some of my work on in developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8740703

 $00:01:08.001 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.354$  biomarkers using DNA methylation data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8740703

 $00:01:10.354 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.378$  to study aging and diseases like cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}01{:}16.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.020$  Why isn't it? I'm so I usually like to

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:21.020 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.288$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:29.580 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.244$  So a lot of times when asking students what

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:32.244 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.060$  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

 $00:01:36.990 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.916$  which we know increases the risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

00:01:38.920 --> 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

 $00:01:43.110 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.007$  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 --> 00:01:48.600 factor for developing lung cancer, so for

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:51.240 \longrightarrow 00:01:52.544$  About one in 200,000,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:01:52.544 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.943$  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

 $00:02:09.160 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.146$  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

 $00:02:17.477 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.658$  incidents in mortality risks from cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:19.660 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.626$  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

 $00:02:22.558 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.088$  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

 $00:02:27.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.668$  the more time and the more likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00{:}02{:}29.668 --> 00{:}02{:}31.240$  they will develop cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:31.894 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.183$  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

 $00:02:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.245$  In the ideology of major

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:42.245 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.256$  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 --> 00:02:48.565 which says you're deliberately putting

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:48.565 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.048$  yourself at risk avail help by being over 65.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:52.050 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.234$  So one thing that my lab is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:02:54.234 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.238$  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 --> 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

 $00:03:02.166 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.660$  major chronic diseases?

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:03.660 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.487$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:14.260 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.702$  But biomarkers can actually serve as

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:16.702 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.066$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:29.552 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.517$  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 --> 00:03:36.845 You can also be used for basic

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:36.845 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.830$  biology to understand aging.

 $00:03:38.830 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.655$  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

 $00:03:43.152 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.976$  these biomarkers is that you should

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:44.976 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.673$  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

 $00:03:49.742 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.106$  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 --> 00:03:56.220 but probably the harder thing is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.488$  can you actually differentiate

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:03:57.488 \longrightarrow 00:03:59.073$  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

 $00:04:00.310 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.998$  So can you identify who might be aging

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:04:02.998 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.427$  faster or slower and then in turn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61551213

 $00:04:05.430 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.980$  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 --> 00:04:13.376 So most of the biomarkers in my lab

 $00:04:13.376 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.586$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:04:25.307 --> 00:04:27.750 behave and respond is involved in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:04:27.750 --> 00:04:29.836 number of different cellular processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:29.836 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.440$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:38.780 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.940$  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

 $00:04:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.852$  So you gotta change net in the maculation

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:46.852 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.610$  landscape as a function of age.

00:04:49.610 --> 00:04:51.320 And based on this, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:51.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.544$  a number of labs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:04:56.090 --> 00:04:58.477 So because they have been very precise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:04:58.480 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.520$  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

 $00:05:06.660 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.276$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:14.060 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.039$  10s of thousands to now up to 850,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:17.039 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.680$  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

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

 $00:05:23.995 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.105$  to actually develop age predictors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}05{:}26.110 \to 00{:}05{:}28.742$  So most of the early clocks were trained

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:28.742 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.397$  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 --> 00:05:36.308 However, more recent clocks have actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:36.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.956$  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

 $00{:}05{:}40.468 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}42.353$  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

 $00:05:44.250 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.512$  but things like mortality or physiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:46.512 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.410$  processes that change with aging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:05:48.410 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.582$  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

 $00:05:54.610 \longrightarrow 00:05:57.136$  And the second generation clocks actually

00:05:57.136 --> 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

 $00:06:02.970 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.250$  Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}03.250 \longrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06.284$  but first I just want to show kind of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:06.284 \longrightarrow 00:06:08.966$  these clocks look across different tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:08.970 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.018$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:16.260 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.944$  On the X axis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}21.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.965$  Is this predicted at the genetic age?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:06:23.970 --> 00:06:26.034 These two clocks by Horvath were

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:06:27.990 --> 00:06:30.058 issues simultaneously pulled together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}32.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}34.861$  agreement across the tissues in

 $00:06:34.861 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.966$  terms of their predicted ages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}06{:}36.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}39.352$  whereas the other three clocks are

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:06:39.352 --> 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

 $00{:}06{:}44.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}46.340$  Very heists age correlations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:48.378 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.530$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:06:59.220 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.614$  if you actually took the time to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:01.614 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.050$  map these colors out is kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:06.130 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.475$  samples from brain or these tend to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:08.475 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.876$  be non bring samples and we actually

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}07{:}13.032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}14.897$  differences in Appleton at age

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00{:}07{:}14.897 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}17.113$  between tissues because we all know

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

00:07:17.113 --> 00:07:19.393 to choose don't age at the same rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

 $00:07:19.400 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.392$  So we actually shouldn't be forcing

NOTE Confidence: 0.90098894

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:26.170 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.072$  And then we can actually also

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:30.205 \longrightarrow 00:07:32.215$  differentiates normal tissue from tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:32.220 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.356$  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

 $00:07:35.780 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.167$  It tends to be the case across

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

00:07:38.167 --> 00:07:39.700 these second generation clocks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:39.700 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.996$  where we can see that in the normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

00:07:43.914 --> 00:07:46.458 epigenetic age compared to the tumor,

 $00:07:46.460 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.640$  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

 $00:07:49.950 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.479$  Um, so on our Clock and also the Clock

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00:07:52.479 \longrightarrow 00:07:55.021$  by Yang Show these differences across

NOTE Confidence: 0.91833216

 $00{:}07{:}55.021 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}57.700$  a variety of different tissue types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:08:01.695$  So one question that we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:01.695 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.390$  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

 $00:08:05.388 \longrightarrow 00:08:07.460$  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

 $00:08:11.530 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.360$  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

 $00:08:14.636 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.268$  this epigenetic aging signals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

00:08:16.270 --> 00:08:17.076 So basically,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00{:}08{:}19.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}20.670$  components and decompose the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

00:08:20.670 --> 00:08:22.494 signal to adapt to figure out

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:22.494 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.343$  what the different parts are and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:24.343 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.095$  how they map onto disease risk?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

 $00:08:26.100 \longrightarrow 00:08:28.354$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9050141

00:08:31.770 --> 00:08:33.280 part of the Clock is doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:08:35.310 \longrightarrow 00:08:38.496$  So the way that we did this is we

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}38.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}41.020$  applied something called WG CNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:08:43.300 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.615$  and we did this a cross using six

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

00:08:46.615 --> 00:08:48.765 different issue in fluid datasets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:08:48.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.626$  So we had uh samples from dermis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00{:}08{:}55.295 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}08{:}58.730$  And the goal here was to identify Co

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:08:58.730 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.300$  maculation modules that are shared

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

00:09:01.300 --> 00:09:04.799 across all these tissue or sample types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:09:04.800 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.560$  and from this we were able to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

 $00:09:07.560 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.286$  16 of these Co maculation modules

NOTE Confidence: 0.855812

00:09:10.286 --> 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

 $00:09:19.070 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.930$  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

 $00{:}09{:}24.511 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}27.119$  are impacting the overall Clock scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00{:}09{:}27.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}29.920$  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

 $00:09:32.624 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.626$  our Clock and this Clock by Hannum a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:35.626 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:42.506 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.010$  to have relatively similar proportions in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.420$  But the interesting module that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:49.420 --> 00:09:51.550 I'm actually going to talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:09:51.550 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.200$  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

 $00{:}09{:}55.378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}58.113$  of these clocks and has a pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

00:09:58.113 --> 00:10:00.118 similar proportion of about uhm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9095152

 $00:10:00.120 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.723$  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

 $00:10:06.230 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.651$  So the other thing we can do is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}08.651 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}11.139$  just look at what proportion of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:10:11.139 --> 00:10:13.450 clocks is explained by each module,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:13.450 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.090$  but whether what their capturing

 $00:10:15.090 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.730$  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

 $00{:}10{:}22.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24.639$  so basically this is the part of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:10:24.639 --> 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

 $00{:}10{:}28.860 \longrightarrow 00{:}10{:}31.803$  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

 $00:10:37.550 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.325$  However, just a contrast this

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:10:39.325 --> 00:10:40.745 on this purple module,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}40.750 \longrightarrow 00{:}10{:}43.340$  you can see that in in two of the clocks

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00:10:43.406 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.010$  what the proper module is contributing

00:10:46.010 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}10{:}52.868 \rightarrow 00{:}10{:}56.288$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:11:00.289 --> 00:11:02.349 performance by the various clocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

 $00{:}11{:}02.350 --> 00{:}11{:}04.240$  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

 $00:11:06.400 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.227$  which seems to be the one that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.90328705

00:11:08.227 --> 00:11:09.909 most important in terms of cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:12.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.217$  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 --> 00:11:25.114 Actually driving this kind of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

00:11:26.410 --> 00:11:28.818 So in this case I'm looking at just

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

00:11:28.818 --> 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 --> 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

 $00:11:41.188 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.900$  versus normal across these different issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89873034

 $00:11:43.900 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.652$  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

 $00:11:47.191 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.487$  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

 $00:11:53.367 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.345$  breast tissue and we do see that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

00:11:56.345 --> 00:11:58.379 module is significantly correlated with

 $00:11:58.379 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.170$  age in normal breast, suggesting that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

00:12:02.170 --> 00:12:03.574 Perhaps as women age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}12{:}03.574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}05.329$  their breasts as she develops.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:05.330 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.991$  The more of this accelerated aging phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:08.991 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.820$  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

 $00:12:13.750 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.736$  what we can observe when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

00:12:15.736 --> 00:12:18.464 look at this is all data from

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}12{:}18.464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.674$  normal breast tissue from women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:20.680 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.600$  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

 $00:12:24.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.625$  This is a collaboration with others at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:26.625 \longrightarrow 00:12:29.655$  Yale and we validated this in the original

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00{:}12{:}29.655 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}12{:}32.610$  study and then also in another study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:32.610 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.075$  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

 $00:12:38.150 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.806$  be epigenetically older when

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.150$  And women without breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

00:12:47.230 --> 00:12:50.419 adjusted and adjusted for things like BMI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159804

 $00:12:50.420 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.088$  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

 $00:12:57.903 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.389$  data set where we had, uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:00.389 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.663$  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

 $00:13:09.424 \longrightarrow 00:13:12.220$  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 --> 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

 $00:13:22.524 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.115$  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 --> 00:13:29.387 standard deviation increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:29.387 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.697$  this module it's associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:31.697 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.398$  about 2.25 fold increased risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:13:34.398 --> 00:13:36.578 mortality over this time period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:13:36.580 --> 00:13:39.639 and that's adjusting for things like age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

00:13:39.640 --> 00:13:41.384 race, ethnicity, tumor grade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8523743

 $00:13:41.384 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.564$  ER and also chemotherapy tree.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:13:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.590$  So I went looking more specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:13:48.590 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.860$  at what's in this Brown module.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:13:50.860 --> 00:13:53.116 Um, these are the individual CP

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:13:53.116 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.908$  GS in the Brown module and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:13:55.908 --> 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.

 $00{:}14{:}01.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}03.763$  So this first column is whether it

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:03.763 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.919$  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

 $00:14:17.500 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.036$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:27.749 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.662$  maculation in these 12 CP GS is

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:31.753 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.453$  associated with either cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}34.453 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}37.810$  normal tissue or or tumor versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}37.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}41.060$  normal or lower survival rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00:14:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.948$  And from the these are the jeans that

 $00:14:43.948 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.774$  these DVD's are in an there actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

 $00{:}14{:}46.774 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}49.190$  almost all in promoter regions in

NOTE Confidence: 0.91693026

00:14:49.190 --> 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

 $00:14:53.800 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.397$  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

 $00:14:59.325 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.169$  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

 $00{:}15{:}06.528 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}15{:}08.909$  find that these 12 genius seemed

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:15:08.909 --> 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

 $00{:}15{:}13.036 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}15{:}15.209$  polycomb group targets and also HT

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:15:15.209 --> 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

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

 $00:15:22.680 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.200$  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

 $00:15:27.351 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.449$  these are all the CP GS that we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:30.449 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.555$  measured in all of our samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:32.560 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.150$  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

 $00:15:43.770 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.955$  about 50% are Co locating with H2K27

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:46.955 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.908$  trying Appalachian and similarly

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:15:48.908 --> 00:15:53.078 50% with Polycom group targets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:15:53.080 --> 00:15:54.074 And Interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:54.074 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.056$  this Association is actually not news,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:15:57.060 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.084$  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

 $00:16:03.445 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.945$  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 --> 00:16:13.990 involved in repression of jeans

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:14.050 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.670$  that are required for salt.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:15.670 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.198$  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 --> 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

 $00{:}16{:}32.067 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}34.452$  PPG DNA methylations score that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:37.187 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.387$  normal tissue from cancerous tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:41.390 \longrightarrow 00:16:43.380$  And Lastly, probably to me,

 $00:16:43.380 \longrightarrow 00:16:45.365$  the most interesting thing is

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:45.365 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.350$  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

 $00:16:49.576 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.568$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:16:55.862 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.143$  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

 $00:16:58.860 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.236$  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 --> 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

 $00{:}17{:}06.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.547$  naturally occuring with aging and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:08.547 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.767$  that that might be predisposing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

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

 $00:17:13.970 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.142$  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

 $00:17:18.448 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.818$  kind of a primary or secondary

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:17:20.818 --> 00:17:21.608 prevention approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

00:17:21.610 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

 $00:17:29.250 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.380$  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

 $00{:}17{:}35.360 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}17{:}37.270$  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

 $00:17:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.219$  aging faster in blood also aging?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88783175

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:17:48.550 --> 00:17:50.810 And then last, um, basically,

 $00:17:50.810 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.274$  we also looked at this using a cultured

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:17:54.274 --> 00:17:56.668 fiberglass and basically we have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:17:56.670 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.920$  uhm, the early passage controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:17:58.920 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.925$  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

 $00:18:06.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.297$  and we also looked in cellular senescence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}09.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}12.000$  So on pigeon induced, in essence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:12.000 --> 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 --> 00:18:23.216 associated beta gal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}23.216 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}25.890$  And basically what you can see is

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:25.963 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.435$  compared to the early passes cells.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:30.800 --> 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 --> 00:18:35.510 there are different kinds of DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:35.566 \longrightarrow 00:18:37.588$  methylation changes in aging that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}37.588 \rightarrow 00{:}18{:}39.311$  captured in the different epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:39.311 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.916$  clocks and by deconstructing then

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:40.916 --> 00:18:42.948 we can start to understand the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:42.948 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.818$  functionality of the signals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:44.818 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.760$  are captured in these clocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:47.720 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.120$  the Brown module seems particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:18:50.120 --> 00:18:52.279 interesting in terms of cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:52.280 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.234$  Is one of the biggest shared signals

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:18:55.234 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.124$  across all the epigenetic clocks and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00{:}18{:}58.124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}00.689$ a distinguishes tumor versus normal

 $00:19:00.689 \longrightarrow 00:19:04.118$  in a variety of different issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:10.710 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.182$  and the signal from these from the model

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:14.182 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.270$  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 --> 00:19:24.704 the signal in this Brown module

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

00:19:24.704 --> 00:19:27.278 there mainly capturing promoters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:27.280 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.360$  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 --> 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,

 $00:19:36.850 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.892$  fiberless, appan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:37.892 \dashrightarrow 00:19:38.934 \ \mathrm{immortalization} \ \mathrm{transformation}$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:38.934 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.060$  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

 $00:19:43.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.922$  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

 $00:19:49.592 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.787$  a bunch of different issues which

NOTE Confidence: 0.84702134

 $00:19:51.787 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.375$  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 --> 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.

 $00:20:10.510 \longrightarrow 00:20:12.337$  And elsewhere, as well as my funding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:14.860 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.054$  Working, thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:17.642 \longrightarrow 00:20:19.600$  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

 $00:20:22.680 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.127$  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 --> 00:20:30.681 through a few Dan Demayo ask you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00:20:30.681 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.046$  make see that people have recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.9009531

 $00{:}20{:}33.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35.800$  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 --> 00:20:41.328 the context of what you've been describing?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

 $00{:}20{:}42.690 --> 00{:}20{:}44.846$  So we haven't looked at that here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

00:20:44.850 --> 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

 $00:20:49.952 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.926$  looking at that in terms of aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

 $00:20:51.930 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.981$  but it for now what I'm discussing

NOTE Confidence: 0.86948186

00:20:53.981 --> 00:20:56.240 here is just CG metalation in DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:20:57.920 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.068$  Um, one another question sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:00.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:02.366$  Have you looked at this in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:02.366 --> 00:21:04.010 context of progeria patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:04.010 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.425$  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

 $00:21:15.179 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.381$  looked at the overall Clock scores

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:17.381 --> 00:21:20.118 in progeria and not all of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:20.120 \longrightarrow 00:21:22.268$  but some of them do show

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

00:21:22.268 --> 00:21:23.700 acceleration in fridge area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

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

 $00:21:26.444 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.160$  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

 $00:21:33.424 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.168$  thing and progeria something we

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:35.168 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.184$  we have plans to look at all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:37.184 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.896$  different modules to see if there

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00:21:38.896 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.852$  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

 $00{:}21{:}42.508 \longrightarrow 00{:}21{:}44.725$  clocks seem to pick up the progeria

NOTE Confidence: 0.88106155

 $00{:}21{:}44.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}46.017$  acceleration whereas others don't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00:21:47.090 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.810$  Thank you Marcus has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00:21:48.810 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.890$  question which as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00:21:50.890 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.280$  he said for the for the 12 CP GS that

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00:21:53.353 \longrightarrow 00:21:55.037$  you've identified their individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.907711

 $00:21:55.037 \longrightarrow 00:21:57.563$  basis as opposed to islands in

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:00.550 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.632$  Uhm, I actually haven't looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8786886

 $00:22:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.090$  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 --> 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 --> 00:22:23.597 adjacent snips that would be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

00:22:29.286 --> 00:22:31.878 Looking at your data and realizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:22:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.100$  environmental exposures for lack of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:22:39.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.840$  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

 $00:22:48.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.876$  uh, the behavior of of these individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:22:51.876 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.241$  overtime that would drive the signature

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

00:22:54.241 --> 00:22:57.518 in a way that you know they are sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:22:57.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.979$  They have a greater component of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:23:01.980 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.745$  At Methylations signature that not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

00:23:03.745 --> 00:23:05.900 only is reflective of promoted aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8813521

 $00:23:05.900 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.790$  but increase risk of cancer. Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00{:}23{:}08.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}11.274$  so we can see we have UM shown in

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:11.274 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.825$  the overall Clock scores that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:13.825 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.473$  do get accelerated at genetic age

00:23:16.473 --> 00:23:18.711 in Association with things that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:18.711 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.874$  think of as normal risk factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

00:23:27.920 --> 00:23:29.760 We haven't looked again specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.974$  at this module, although I will

NOTE Confidence: 0.898412700000001

 $00:23:31.974 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.550$  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

 $00:23:45.083 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.130$  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

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

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

 $00:23:54.830 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.580$  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

 $00:24:04.956 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.308$  and with regarding the breast in memory

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

00:24:07.308 --> 00:24:09.330 you can obviously the questions you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

 $00:24:09.330 \longrightarrow 00:24:13.150$  can see is that breast tissue is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

 $00:24:13.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.100$  A combination of various cell types

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

 $00:24:15.100 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.099$  and have you narrowed down sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

 $00:24:17.099 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.456$  of the epithelial, fibroblast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

 $00{:}24{:}18.456 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}20.436$  other cell types with regard

NOTE Confidence: 0.8408731

 $00:24:20.436 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.380$  to what you're finding. Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:22.380 \longrightarrow 00:24:24.844$  so unfortunately we just have bulk samples

 $00:24:24.844 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.671$  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

 $00:24:30.250 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.278$  but I think because breast is

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:32.278 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.050$  so heterogeneous we actually the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:24:35.855$  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

 $00:24:37.770 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.989$  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

 $00:24:45.067 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.011$  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

 $00{:}24{:}49.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}51.478$  capturing something about cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:51.478 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.330$  composition changes with aging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:54.330 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.670$  And the other interesting thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:55.670 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.653$  is that at least the Brown module

 $00:24:57.653 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.417$  seems to be pretty conserved across

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:24:59.417 \longrightarrow 00:25:00.729$  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

 $00:25:02.906 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.807$  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

 $00:25:06.910 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.138$  at epithelial versus fiberglass

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:25:08.138 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.274$  and see if one of those is driving

NOTE Confidence: 0.91106963

 $00:25:10.274 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.079$  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

 $00{:}25{:}15.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}16.976$  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

 $00:25:19.433 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.593$  expression of of the individual jeans

NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023

 $00:25:21.593 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.505$  a particularly as they relate to

NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023

 $00:25:24.505 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.489$  potentially classic tumor suppressor

NOTE Confidence: 0.92196023

 $00:25:26.489 \longrightarrow 00:25:28.590$  genes or other typical mechanisms.

 $00:25:29.640 \longrightarrow 00:25:31.880$  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

 $00:25:33.440 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.760$  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 --> 00:25:39.856 The second part is in progress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:39.860 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.488$  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

 $00:25:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.226$  Do see some associations in terms of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

 $00:25:51.230 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.631$  Answer and expression in the jeans in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8860609

00:25:53.631 --> 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

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

 $00{:}26{:}08.189 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.239$  talks that it really elucidated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917106799999999

00:26:10.240 --> 00:26:11.560 Gray science being conducted

 $00:26:11.560 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.880$  at our Cancer Center.

 $00{:}26{:}12.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}15.456$  Thank you all for joining us again for

 $00:26:15.456 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.481$  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.