WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:02:08" NOTE recognizability:0.878

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:01.881$ OK, let's begin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:01.881 \longrightarrow 00:00:03.762$ Welcome everybody to

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:03.762 --> 00:00:06.001 pathology grand rounds today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:06.001 --> 00:00:08.107 I'm excited to introduce our speaker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:08.110 --> 00:00:09.870 Christina Curtis from Stanford.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}00{:}09.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}11.630$ Christina comes has quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:11.630 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.749$ a long training history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:13.750 --> 00:00:15.514 Beginning in Heidel, Heidelberg,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:15.514 --> 00:00:18.160 Germany for a Masters degree and

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}00{:}18.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.668$ then did her doctorate at USC and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:20.670 \dashrightarrow 00:00:23.300$ computational and Molecular Biology program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:23.300 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.615$ Did a postdoc back over

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:24.615 --> 00:00:25.930 across the ocean in Cambridge,

 $00:00:25.930 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.128$ then came back to USC to begin

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:28.128 --> 00:00:29.830 as an assistant professor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:29.830 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.048$ but shortly thereafter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:31.048 --> 00:00:33.078 Joined Stanford as an assistant

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:33.078 \longrightarrow 00:00:35.548$ professor there and is now at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:35.548 --> 00:00:37.148 associate professor level at Stanford,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:37.150 \longrightarrow 00:00:39.450$ and as you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:39.450 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.593$ We in pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:40.593 --> 00:00:43.260 Most of the people are in pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:43.260 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.836$ grand rounds or some way related to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:44.840 \longrightarrow 00:00:46.835$ I've had a long appreciation for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:46.835 --> 00:00:48.330 importance of spatial information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:48.330 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.652$ but many of our genomics colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:50.652 --> 00:00:53.101 just grounded all up and I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:00:53.101 --> 00:00:55.084 that one of the reasons I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}00{:}55.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}56.220$ excited to invite Christina.

 $00:00:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.672$ She's one of those people that

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:57.672 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.720$ not only is an expert in genomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:00:59.720 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.596$ as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:00.596 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.910$ she's the director of the breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}01{:}01{:}965 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03.669$ Cancer Translational unit and the Co

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:03.669 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.400$ director of the Molecular Tumor Board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:01:05.400 --> 00:01:07.130 But she's also very conscious,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}01{:}07.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}08.806$ conscious of spatial information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:08.806 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.812$ And so the mixing of genomic information

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:11.812 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.172$ and spatial information is not an easy task,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

00:01:15.180 --> 00:01:17.696 but I think Christina Curtis is

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:17.696 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.208$ one of the world leaders on this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}01{:}19.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.360$ even though she's still fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:21.360 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.038$ junior and so rather than go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:23.038 \longrightarrow 00:01:24.242$ all the awards and fellowships

00:01:24.242 --> 00:01:25.867 and leadership positions she had,

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}01{:}25.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}27.678$ I'm going to let her speak for herself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:27.680 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.448$ And she's going to tell us about toward

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00{:}01{:}29.448 \to 00{:}01{:}30.550$ predictive markers and early stage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809758734444444

 $00:01:30.550 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.720$ Her two positive breast cancer, Christina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:33.650 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.336$ Great, thanks so much for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:35.336 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.800$ kind introduction, David and I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:36.800 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.230$ I am delighted to share this with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:01:39.230 --> 00:01:42.198 I hope next time. To be in person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:42.200 \longrightarrow 00:01:45.370$ as I'm sure we all do but but yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:45.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.410$ really delighted to share

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.740$ this sort of recent work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.036$ and I think often I have to say

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:50.036 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.947$ I've drawn a lot of inspiration

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:01:51.947 --> 00:01:54.250 from from you David in in this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:01:54.250 --> 00:01:55.295 as you were obviously a

 $00:01:55.295 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.340$ pioneer early in the field,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}01{:}56.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}58.174$ and so we've been sort of waiting

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:58.174 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.501$ for these technologies to make

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:01:59.501 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.020$ it to a place where they

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:02.020 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.550$ can be utilized by the masses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}02{:}03.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}05.485$ and so that that's what I'll speak to today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.709$ I'll just state these are my disclosures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}02{:}07.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}09.782$ The only point that is relevant to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}02{:}09.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}11.536$ the discussion today is that I am a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:11.540 --> 00:02:12.440 Scientific advisor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:12.440 --> 00:02:15.590 banana string and I will discuss the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:15.590 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.419$ mastering DSP technology and work

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}02{:}17.419 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}20.000$ that I had done Prior to joining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:20.000 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.520$ So as we all know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:21.520 --> 00:02:25.804 I'm a major objective of our current

 $00:02:25.804 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.110$ times is to affect precision oncology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:29.110 \dashrightarrow 00:02:32.540$ and there's many pieces to this puzzle

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:32.624 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.039$ that range from really improving

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:35.040 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.992$ our understanding of prognostication

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:36.992 --> 00:02:38.456 through biomarker discovery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.777$ as well as predicting response to therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:40.780 --> 00:02:42.064 improving patient stratification,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:42.064 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.920$ and ultimately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:42.920 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.727$ this goes on and actually can inform

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:45.727 --> 00:02:47.640 the drug development pipeline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}02{:}47.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}50.048$ And so there's a number of key goals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:50.050 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.392$ Here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:50.392 \longrightarrow 00:02:53.470$ mainly what I will focus on as a key

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:02:53.552 --> 00:02:56.448 area of interest from my own group is

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:56.448 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.098$ on patient stratification and really

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:02:59.098 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.386$ identifying aggressive subgroups of

 $00{:}03{:}01.386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04.328$ disease and tailoring our therapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:04.328 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.628$ approaches for these subgroups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:03:06.630 --> 00:03:08.070 Another key objective and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:08.070 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.029$ I will touch on this as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:10.030 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.914$ is really on being able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:11.914 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.170$ predict response to the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:13.170 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.123$ And of course this is not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:15.123 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.127$ our new targeted and immunotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:03:17.127 --> 00:03:18.227 therapeutic agents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}18.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}19.784$ but also chemother apeutic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:03:19.784 --> 00:03:22.892 Back bones that really remain the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:22.892 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.892$ mainstay of many treatment regimes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:24.892 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.636$ but have been hard.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}26.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}28.754$ A hard nut to crack with respect

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:28.754 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.466$ to prediction of response and

 $00:03:30.466 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.434$ ultimately a lot of the work in my

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}32.434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34.615$ own lab and I I won't dwell on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:34.620 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.475$ I'll focus more on sort of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:36.475 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.632$ applications of these approaches

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:03:37.632 --> 00:03:39.774 is has been to use systems biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}39.774 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}41.420$ techniques and and I would say

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:03:41.420 --> 00:03:43.185 that one of the potential powers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:43.185 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.250$ this type of approach is that we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}45.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}47.466$ not only interested in developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:03:47.466 --> 00:03:49.546 predictive models or classifiers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}49.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51.380$ but actually unraveling the biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:51.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.844$ so that we can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}03{:}52.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}56.130$ And develop mechanistic insights

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:56.130 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.898$ into into disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:03:57.898 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.216$ and perhaps inform the next wave of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:01.216 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.427$ therapeutic approaches and so really,

00:04:03.427 --> 00:04:05.716 what I'll talk about today is sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:05.716 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.685$ of a few pieces from my own labs work

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:04:08.685 --> 00:04:11.808 that have led from really omic technologies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:11.810 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.935$ but that are now moving

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:13.935 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.210$ towards clinical translation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:04:15.210 --> 00:04:17.667 Of course, across a very long road,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:17.670 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.680$ and so the first story that

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:19.680 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.139$ I'll talk about really is about

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}04{:}22.139 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}23.708$ leveraging spatial approaches.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:04:23.710 --> 00:04:25.400 In situ proteomic profiling to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:25.400 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.090$ predict response in this case

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:27.152 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.976$ to her two targeted agents and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

00:04:28.976 --> 00:04:30.650 her two positive breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}04{:}30.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}32.275$ and I'll describe really how

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:32.275 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.575$ we've gone about this.

00:04:33.580 --> 00:04:34.067 Actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00{:}04{:}34.067 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}36.015$ starting with dissociative and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91529736

 $00:04:36.015 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.450$ bulk technologies that that let

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:04:38.527 --> 00:04:41.192 us down some some harder paths and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:41.192 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.508$ moving forward to use new technologies

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:43.508 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.243$ that are really quite emergent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:45.250 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.189$ So that's the first story that I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:47.189 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.212$ share with you and really will be

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}04{:}49.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.910$ the bulk of my discussion today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:04:50.910 --> 00:04:53.421 Why I won't speak to some of the approaches

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:53.421 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.569$ that we've developed to for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:04:55.570 --> 00:04:57.435 product, chemotherapy benefit and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:57.435 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.782$ these are really based on epigenomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:04:59.782 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.320$ biomarkers that have emerged from large

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:02.320 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.397$ transcriptional profiling efforts

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:03.397 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.910$ but also coupled with in vitro data.

00:05:05.910 --> 00:05:07.878 But this is of course another area of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}05{:}07.878 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09.688$ interest and I think that as we think

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:09.688 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.421$ about personalizing therapy again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:05:11.421 --> 00:05:14.463 we must be cognizant about how

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:14.463 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.367$ we do this for standard of care

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:17.367 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.243$ chemotherapeutic agents and really

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:19.243 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.650$ deescalating whenever possible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:20.650 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.920$ And of course. Escalating when necessary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:23.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.336$ I will try to close and and really

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:26.336 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.091$ speak to some of our other efforts

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}05{:}29.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}31.166$ that have been leveraging genomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:31.238 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.418$ biomarkers to guide the rapy selection

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}05{:}33.418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}36.260$ and high risk of relapse breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}05{:}36.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38.900$ and I'll just touch on some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:05:38.977 --> 00:05:41.371 work that was foundational for this

00:05:41.371 --> 00:05:43.938 and our ongoing trials in this area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308 00:05:43.940 --> 00:05:44.286 Right, NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:44.286 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.054$ so I think it goes without saying that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:47.054 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.464$ really her two positive breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:49.464 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.130$ is an archetype for precision medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:05:52.130 --> 00:05:54.026 This is of course one of our first

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:54.026 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.538$ exemplars where we had a targeted

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:05:55.538 --> 00:05:56.773 therapy for this copy number,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}05{:}56.780 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}05{:}58.548$ amplified subgroup of disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:05:58.548 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.788$ and we know that trustees map has

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}01.788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}03.816$ been tremen dously effective and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:03.816 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.337$ has really changed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:05.340 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.972$ The landscape and outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:06.972 \longrightarrow 00:06:08.196$ for these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.384$ It's still the case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308 00:06:09.384 --> 00:06:09.680 however,

 $00:06:09.680 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.770$ that despite the effectiveness of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}12.770 \longrightarrow 00{:}06{:}14.556$ agent that a subset of patients recur,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:14.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.420$ and this has really led then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.102$ Down a path of developing a

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:19.102 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.647$ number of additional FDA approved

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:06:21.647 --> 00:06:24.327 agents including purchase Mab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308 00:06:24.330 --> 00:06:24.706 TDM,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:24.706 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.962$ one as well as small molecule

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}26.962 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}06{:}29.499$ inhibitors such as Neurontin and Pat

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:06:29.499 --> 00:06:31.719 nib to overcome this resistance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:31.720 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.025$ and so there's been numerous

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:33.025 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.069$ efforts in this area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}34.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}36.247$ We now have a wealth of FDA

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}36.247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}37.905$ approved drugs and of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:37.905 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.285$ in tandem to this.

 $00:06:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.486$ There have been considerable efforts to

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}41.486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}43.944$ start to understand the mechanisms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:43.944 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.978$ resistance convergence on PR3 kinase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:45.978 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.938$ Pathway involvement of P-10 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:47.938 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.716$ so forth and and two dissect the

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:50.716 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.720$ contribution of these pathways to

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}52.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}54.690$ resistance and her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:54.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.478$ breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:55.480 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.536$ But really sort of coming back to this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:06:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.998$ It's still the case that while

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}06{:}58.998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}00.557$ we need to escalate the rapy for

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:00.557 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.625$ a subset of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:01.630 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.358$ there may be a subset of patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:07:04.358 --> 00:07:06.850 actually do not require chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:06.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.686$ and who could be spared these

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:08.686 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.910$ agents and so really,

 $00:07:09.910 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.722$ this sort of highlights the very

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:11.722 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.644$ critical need at this point in

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}07{:}13.644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}15.269$ time to develop predictive mile

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:15.269 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.750$ markers to tailor therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}07{:}16.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}20.910$ And this is both for escalation but also

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:20.910 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.430$ dees calation and so just to highlight,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:23.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.296$ you know how important this is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:25.300 \dashrightarrow 00:07:28.302$ I I thought I would just demonstrate some

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:28.302 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.759$ of the pivotal trials in this space.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:07:30.760 --> 00:07:32.672 Of course, NSA, BP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

00:07:32.672 --> 00:07:33.150 B31,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:33.150 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.134$ amongst others that demonstrated

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}07{:}35.134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}37.930$ the benefit of trustees Mab with

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00{:}07{:}37.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39.480$ respect to disease free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908518037692308

 $00:07:39.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.025$ But since this time there's

00:07:41.025 --> 00:07:42.570 been numerous studies that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:07:42.625 \longrightarrow 00:07:44.460$ sought to further escalate therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:07:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.914$ These include the affinity trial of

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:07:46.914 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.232$ adjuvant trustees map in combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:07:49.232 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.968$ with pertuzumab as well as the

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:07:51.968 --> 00:07:53.476 Katherine trial which compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}07{:}53.476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.117$ T DM one versus trustees map.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:07:56.120 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.526$ And so really critical studies in

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:07:58.526 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.846$ the field have been highlighted

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:00.846 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.290$ very recently at ASCO and in tandem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}08{:}05.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07.204$ There have been efforts to dees calate

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:07.204 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.702$ therapy and and one example of this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:09.702 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.010$ the a peachy trial which examined adjutant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:08:12.010 --> 00:08:14.010 Paclitaxel plus trustees map but

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:14.010 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.610$ with omission of chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:15.610 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.220$ mainly anthracyclines.

 $00:08:16.220 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.660$ So this is a huge area and there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}08{:}18.713 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}20.918$ a lot happening in this space to

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:08:20.918 --> 00:08:22.209 really personalize therapy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:22.209 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.582$ in part enabled by by the many

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:24.582 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.018$ the rapeutic options we do have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:26.020 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.142$ So I don't expect you to

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:27.142 \longrightarrow 00:08:28.140$ read this slide over here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:28.140 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.015$ but I want to say that this is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}08{:}31.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}33.325$ a place where there's been just

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:33.325 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.230$ tremendous efforts spanning multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:35.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:38.116$ neoadjuvant trials in the early stage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:38.120 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.563$ Her two positive setting looking at both

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}08{:}40.563 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}43.099$ single and or dual agent approaches,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:08:43.100 --> 00:08:45.380 and of course a key goal and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}08{:}45.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}46.842$ correlative science that has been

 $00:08:46.842 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.795$ done in tandem has really focused on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:48.800 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.540$ Can we develop predictive biomarkers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:52.540 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.812$ In the neoadjuvant setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:53.812 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.824$ and so I'll just say that there's been a

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:08:56.824 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.260$ huge amount of sequencing of these cohorts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:08:59.260 --> 00:09:01.402 Calgb for 601 Pamela includes some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:01.402 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.041$ the most in depth data where there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:09:04.041 --> 00:09:06.519 been both EXO mandor targeted sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:06.520 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.330$ There's been expression profiling some

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:09:08.330 --> 00:09:10.800 using arrays, some using RNA seek,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}09{:}10.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}12.975$ really as discovery efforts to

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:09:12.975 --> 00:09:15.380 identify these biomarkers, and then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333 00:09:15.380 --> 00:09:16.040 of course, NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:16.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.437$ a big component of embedded in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:09:18.437 --> 00:09:20.838 work has been the use and intrinsic

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:20.838 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.090$ subtyping or pan 50 based subtyping.

 $00:09:23.090 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.386$ To ask whether there is enrichment for

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:25.386 \longrightarrow 00:09:27.728$ the intrinsic subgroups and some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}09{:}27.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}29.348$ associations that have been identified,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:29.350 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.260$ there are an enrichment amongst

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:09:31.260 --> 00:09:34.266 responders in the her 2E or her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:34.266 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.342$ enriched group and then on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:36.342 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.430$ As some of these trials have

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:09:38.503 --> 00:09:40.688 included a non treatment biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:40.690 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.522$ there's been associations demonstrated

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:42.522 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.950$ between us which from her two enriched,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333 00:09:45.950 --> 00:09:46.814 for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:46.814 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.696$ to normal like and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}09{:}48.696 \to 00{:}09{:}50.747$ This is clearly an important area where

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:50.747 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.919$ there's been numerous correlative studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:52.920 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.698$ And then the other area that I

 $00:09:54.698 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.842$ that I also want to point out is

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}09{:}56.842 \to 00{:}09{:}59.596$ that of course many have turned to

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:09:59.596 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.552$ assessment of tumor infiltrating

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:01.552 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.873$ lymphocytes or thiles in attempts

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:10:03.873 --> 00:10:06.411 to predict response to her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:10:06.411 --> 00:10:08.370 targeted therapy both at baseline

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:08.370 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.208$ and in a subset of trials on therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333 00:10:11.208 --> 00:10:11.856 And so, NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:10:11.856 --> 00:10:14.789 just to speak a little bit more to that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.456$ this is one of the more recent studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00{:}10{:}17.456 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}19.628$ that actually examined both the Pamela

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:19.628 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.868$ trial as well as the validation trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

00:10:21.870 --> 00:10:24.026 And really, the goal was to ask,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94229825133333300:10:24.030 --> 00:10:24.960 could we, NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.890$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:25.890 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.215$ predict response to the rapy and

 $00:10:28.215 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.120$ so just to highlight a few pieces

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:31.120 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.260$ of data from this study?

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:33.260 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.540$ And really one of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:36.540 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.600$ If not further efforts to predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.149$ probably needs, but not at the moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.942298251333333

 $00:10:43.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.800$ Sorry I hear some noise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709592876666667

00:10:44.810 --> 00:10:46.280 Please please go on mute Susanna.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:10:48.960 --> 00:10:51.235 Right so here really what they had

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:10:51.235 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.671$ done in this study was to assess

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:10:53.671 --> 00:10:56.690 tills at baseline, and at day 15.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:10:56.690 --> 00:10:58.808 So this was our running biopsy

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:10:58.808 --> 00:10:59.867 prior to administration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}10{:}59.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}01.470$ Actually, of any chemotherapy it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:01.470 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.070$ not administered in this trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:03.070 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.897$ and what you can look at is the change

00:11:04.897 --> 00:11:06.700 in tumor infiltrating lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:06.700 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.215$ with orange showing an increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:09.215 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.730$ blew a decrease and stable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.978$ and in tandem in this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:12.980 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.904$ they also actually examined

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:11:14.904 --> 00:11:15.866 tumor cellularity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:15.870 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.767$ and you can see some exemplars here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:17.770 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.994$ And so this really led to the development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}11{:}20.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}22.513$ Of an approach called cell till which

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:22.513 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.364$ attempts to combine the estimates

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}11{:}24.364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}26.482$ based on tills with celularity you

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:26.482 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.667$ can see the area under the curve

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:11:28.667 --> 00:11:30.902 here about .7 in the panelist study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:11:30.902 --> 00:11:32.932 Actually it's higher for cellularity

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:32.932 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.985$ and so the goal was to sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}11{:}35.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}37.755$ develop a combined classifier here,

 $00:11:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.800$ and this has really been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:11:38.800 --> 00:11:39.290 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:11:41.005$ one of the great successes in trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:41.005 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.923$ to predict response to her two targeted

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:42.923 \longrightarrow 00:11:44.873$ therapy all be it with variable

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:44.873 \longrightarrow 00:11:46.505$ responses across different cohorts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:46.510 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.309$ And so I'll just show that when

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}11{:}48.309 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}50.119$ this group went on to corroborate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:50.120 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.376$ These findings in the LPT trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}11{:}52.380 \rightarrow 00{:}11{:}55.677$ You can see that the performance was

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:11:55.680 --> 00:11:57.550 substantially inferior with an AUC

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:11:57.550 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.044$ under .7 using cell till here and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:00.044 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.276$ so this shows you one of the recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:02.340 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.776$ attempts and of course this group

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:12:04.776 --> 00:12:07.310 probably needs no introduction to the

00:12:07.310 --> 00:12:09.130 opportunities and challenges around

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:09.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.950$ scoring tumor infiltrating lymphocytes

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:11.012 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.147$ and really standardizing these assays.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}13.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}14.742$ But I wanted to present this to set

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:14.742 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.297$ the stage sort of for where the fields

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:16.297 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.018$ at and to say that you know really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:12:18.020 --> 00:12:19.808 despite many many attempts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:12:19.808 --> 00:12:22.043 To develop predictive biomarkers from

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}22.043 \to 00{:}12{:}24.628$ the genomic from the transcriptomic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:24.630 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.863$ we still do not have a validated

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}26.863 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28.530$ predictive biomarker and sell tools

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}28.530 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}12{:}30.165$ have emerged in the forefront.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}30.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}32.778$ But there's more work to be done to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:32.778 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.139$ really ask how consistent this is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:35.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.655$ Also across different agents and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:36.655 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.775$ so this really sets the stage for

 $00:12:38.775 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.588$ where we began.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:12:39.590 --> 00:12:40.890 Our journey in this field,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.064$ which was a collaboration with Sarah

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:12:44.064 --> 00:12:46.916 Hurvitz and Dennis Slamon at UCLA

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:46.916 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.178$ on the trio USB 07 clinical trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:49.178 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.788$ Now this trial looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:50.788 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.660$ neoadjuvant trustees.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:12:51.660 --> 00:12:53.376 Vanderlip at mid in early stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}53.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54.940$ her two positive breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}12{:}54.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}57.320$ It was an investigator initiated

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:12:57.320 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.040$ trial and here you can see the sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:00.040 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.056$ of sample size is 130 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}13{:}02.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.982$ They were assigned either to our one

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}13{:}04.982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}07.601$ trustees Mobileone ARM 2 lapatinib or

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:07.601 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.044$ the combination and what was you know,

 $00:13:10.044 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.790$ really intriguing to me about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:11.853 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.665$ trial was that core biopsies were

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:13.665 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.509$ collected not only at baseline but

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:13:15.509 --> 00:13:17.511 actually at run in after a single

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:13:17.511 --> 00:13:19.636 cycle of targeted therapy alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:19.636 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.390$ Prior to the administration of chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:22.390 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.178$ Now you can see the pathologic

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

00:13:24.178 --> 00:13:25.072 complete response rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:25.080 \longrightarrow 00:13:27.774$ which was the primary endpoint here of 47%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}13{:}27.774 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}29.902$ The PATNAM was inferior here as it

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:29.902 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.515$ has been in other trials and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:32.515 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.450$ combination was modestly improved but

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:34.515 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.179$ not statistically significantly different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00{:}13{:}37.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}39.530$ and so really this is this trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:39.530 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.090$ is distinct in the collection of

NOTE Confidence: 0.874880092

 $00:13:41.090 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.962$ a non treatment core biopsy prior

 $00{:}13{:}42.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44.906$ to administration of chemo and at

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}13{:}44.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}46.745$ the time I felt that this would

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}13{:}46.745 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}48.540$ really afford us some unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}13{:}48.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.600$ insights into biomarkers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:13:50.600 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.660$ response after targeted therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:13:52.660 --> 00:13:54.940 Alone without having to deconvolve

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:13:54.940 \longrightarrow 00:13:57.288$ the effects of chemotherapy and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:13:57.288 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.101$ in initial work that was led by

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:13:59.101 --> 00:14:01.079 Sarah Hurvitz and Jennifer Castle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:01.080 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.879$ Gin a former fellow in my lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:14:02.880 --> 00:14:04.712 Now, faculty at Stanford,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:04.712 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.460$ we had embarked on an initiative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}14{:}07.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}10.108$ and this was actually embedded in the B

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:10.108 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.977$ 07 trial design to leverage these pre

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:12.977 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.535$ on treatment and surgical samples to

 $00:14:15.535 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.996$ conduct bulk RNA expression profiling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:14:17.996 --> 00:14:20.641 And this was done using

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:20.641 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.189$ actually dual color microarrays.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:23.190 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.110$ Which have now been largely

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:25.110 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.646$ supplanted by BDC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:26.650 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.943$ but nonetheless you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:27.943 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.130$ You can see here the sort of try the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:31.130 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.260$ design for this after a single cycle of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}14{:}34.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}36.708$ of either of these agents we collected

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:36.708 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.327$ actually fresh frozen material and

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:38.327 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.167$ this was from a total of 89 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:14:40.170 --> 00:14:42.030 The fresh frozen material was then

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:14:42.030 --> 00:14:44.011 sent for RNA profiling and so of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:44.011 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.493$ course the key question here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:14:45.493 --> 00:14:47.329 based on these expression profiles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:47.330 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.954$ could we predict pathologic

 $00:14:49.954 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.610$ complete response and?

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}14{:}51.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}53.990$ You can see that we took actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:14:53.990 --> 00:14:56.841 quite a deep dive into understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:56.841 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.461$ the baseline clinical covariates and

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:14:59.461 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.360$ tumor features for these individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.215$ What you can see are the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:04.215 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.290$ measurements that were made.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:05.290 --> 00:15:07.537 These include the her two fish ratio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:07.540 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.600$ which was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:09.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.155$ Obviously performed as part of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:11.155 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.399$ the enrollment crunch cereal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:12.400 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.836$ We then went on to calculate

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}15{:}14.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}16.054$ the immune score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}15{:}16.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}17.956$ Her two IHC was also performed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:17.960 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.198$ Tills were scored and based on

00:15:20.198 --> 00:15:21.690 the RNA expression profiling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:21.690 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.484$ we were able to infer both

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:23.484 --> 00:15:25.440 intrinsic subtype M50 as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:25.440 --> 00:15:26.844 the integrative subtypes which

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:26.844 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.900$ my group defined some years ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:28.900 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.636$ and I'll speak to that more later

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:30.640 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.146$ and and then you have hormone

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:32.146 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.540$ receptor status and of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}15{:}33.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}34.674$ Pathologic complete response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:34.674 --> 00:15:37.818 So really quite a rich data set with

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}15{:}37.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}39.402$ with numerous molecular correlate's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:39.402 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.658$ I'll cut to the chase and say that

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:41.660 --> 00:15:44.124 despite having all of these in hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:44.130 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.505$ really none of them were

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:46.505 --> 00:15:48.405 robustly predictive of PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:48.410 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.372$ And that was true both at

 $00:15:50.372 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.559$ baseline as well as on therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}15{:}52.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}54.184$ But what we did learn from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:54.184 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.970$ study is that we were able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:15:55.970 --> 00:15:57.518 really start to deconvolve some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:57.574 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.874$ the contributions and something

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:15:58.874 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.824$ and illuminate some of the real

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:00.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:03.605$ challenges that come up with

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:03.605 --> 00:16:05.825 bulk admic sequencing data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}16{:}05.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}07.926$ and so many of the patterns that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:07.926 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.980$ saw are in line with what might.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}16{:}09.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}12.360$ One might expect So what this plot

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:12.360 \longrightarrow 00:16:14.758$ shows here is actually the changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00{:}16{:}14.758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}16.923$ in gene expression during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:16.923 --> 00:16:19.279 short term on treatment biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:19.280 --> 00:16:21.653 So after just a single cycle you

 $00:16:21.653 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.812$ can see the normalized enrichment

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:23.812 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.856$ scores for a variety of gene sets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:25.860 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.578$ and amongst those that are downregulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:28.578 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.906$ we have decreases in her two signaling

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:31.906 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.818$ proliferation and so forth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:33.820 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.292$ In in contrast we see increased enrichment

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:37.292 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.409$ for stromal and immune signatures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:40.410 --> 00:16:41.535 Just started after the short

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:41.535 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.660$ term therapy and there's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:42.701 --> 00:16:43.969 variety of signatures included.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:43.970 --> 00:16:46.007 Many of them are of course correlated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:46.010 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.730$ and that's actually something that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

00:16:47.730 --> 00:16:49.801 really important to examine as we

NOTE Confidence: 0.907119852

 $00:16:49.801 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.256$ seek to parse these signatures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:16:51.260 \longrightarrow 00:16:53.980$ and so this is just showing really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:16:53.980 \longrightarrow 00:16:55.482$ Pearson correlation coefficient matrix

 $00:16:55.482 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.768$ based on the gene set enrichment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:16:57.770 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.660$ and hopefully what you can take away

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:16:59.660 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.701$ from this is that there's a huge

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

00:17:01.701 --> 00:17:03.453 degree of correlation for many of

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:17:03.516 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.043$ these pathways with one another,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:17:05.043 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.549$ and this just sort of mirrors

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:17:06.549 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.302$ what we see over here. So indeed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00{:}17{:}08.302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}10.514$ in this short time course we are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00{:}17{:}10.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}11.970$ Observing a number of patterns

NOTE Confidence: 0.912750056111111

 $00:17:11.970 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.690$ that we might expect to see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:15.740 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.600$ But there are, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}17{:}16.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}18.742$ we can also use these data to start to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}17{:}18.742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}20.200$ deconvolve what happens on the rapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:20.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.040$ and so, like many others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:22.040 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.640$ we also performed intrinsic subtyping.

 $00:17:24.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.236$ You can see that there's a preponderance

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:26.236 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.960$ of the her two enriched subgroup.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:27.960 \longrightarrow 00:17:30.112$ This comprises roughly 53%

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}17{:}30.112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31.726$ of patients pretreatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:17:31.730 --> 00:17:33.420 There's also a substantial normal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:33.420 \longrightarrow 00:17:36.400$ like composition here at treat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:36.400 \dashrightarrow 00:17:38.863$ You know, prior to the rapy, but on the rapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:17:38.863 --> 00:17:40.760 we do see this pretty dramatic switching,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:40.760 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.699$ where a number of the her 2E

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:17:42.699 --> 00:17:44.200 cases actually become normalized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}17{:}44.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}45.790$ There is some other switching

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:45.790 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.744$ going on amongst.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:17:46.750 --> 00:17:48.490 Luminous, but that's more modest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:48.490 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.850$ so we can assess these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:49.850 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.452$ and in these patterns are in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:17:51.452 --> 00:17:52.916 line where others have reported

 $00:17:52.916 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.616$ and Pamela and similar trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:17:54.620 \longrightarrow 00:17:57.581$ We can also use the bulk data to attempt

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:17:57.581 --> 00:18:00.597 to deconvolve the immune composition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:00.600 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.694$ but this is an exceedingly hard task,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:03.700 --> 00:18:04.284 really, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:04.284 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.620$ you know there are many algorithms for this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:06.620 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.204$ I show one example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:08.204 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.788$ the cyber sort approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:09.790 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.330$ which uses a reference matrix,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:11.330 \longrightarrow 00:18:13.175$ and what I hope you take away from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}18{:}13.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15.426$ is that you know apparent from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:15.426 \longrightarrow 00:18:16.754$ plots there's actually relatively.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}18{:}16.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}19.098$ Modest changes from pre to on treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:19.098 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.238$ or even at the time of definitive surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:22.240 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.540$ After completion of both

 $00:18:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.265$ targeted and chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:26.270 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.358$ So this is a hard nut to crack.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:29.360 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.380$ And actually the admixture

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:31.380 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.895$ in these populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:32.900 --> 00:18:34.229 Really, we believe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}18{:}34.229 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}36.444$ hindered our ability to discover

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:36.444 --> 00:18:38.280 biomarkers in this context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:38.280 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.786$ and so I'll leave off there

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}18{:}39.786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}41.409$ and say that this in tandem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:41.410 --> 00:18:41.778 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}18{:}41.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.066$ having sort of early reads into this

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:43.066 --> 00:18:44.440 and what others had been observing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:44.440 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.955$ which was similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:45.955 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.470$ Let us too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:47.470 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.955$ Then take a new approach and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:49.955 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.618$ in collaboration with ministering

00:18:51.618 --> 00:18:54.233 while they were developing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}18{:}54.233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}56.325$ digital spatial profiling platform,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:18:56.330 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.474$ we really embarked on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:57.474 --> 00:18:59.190 This study was led by Katherine

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:18:59.250 --> 00:19:00.099 McNamara and MD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:00.100 --> 00:19:02.130 PhD student,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:02.130 --> 00:19:03.677 who will match very soon and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:03.677 --> 00:19:05.520 was just a stellar lead and really

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:05.520 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.212$ taking on these new data types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}19{:}07.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}08.613$ And So what we did was to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:08.613 --> 00:19:09.940 go back to this cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:09.940 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.620$ Now we turn to the formalin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}19{:}11.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}13.552$ fixed paraffin embedded tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:13.552 --> 00:19:16.450 and we selected data from a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:16.450 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.322$ You know it was a total of 100 and.

 $00:19:18.330 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.150$ There were 122 samples that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:20.150 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.606$ derived from 57 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:21.610 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.381$ and these were the ones that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:23.381 --> 00:19:25.067 felt we had adequate material

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:25.067 --> 00:19:26.420 left for for this assay,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:26.420 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.110$ and so there were a total of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:28.110 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.390$ 20 in the discovery cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:29.390 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.990$ 29 in the validation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}19{:}30.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}32.590$ again sampled at baseline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:32.590 --> 00:19:36.188 pretreatment at run in and at surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}19{:}36.190 --> 00{:}19{:}36.579 \ \mathrm{Right},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:36.579 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.302$ so for those of you that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:39.302 \longrightarrow 00:19:41.459$ not familiar with this assay,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:41.460 --> 00:19:44.307 we were focused on the Multiplex

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:44.307 --> 00:19:45.341 proteomic piece.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:45.341 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.760$ There are indeed also technologies

 $00:19:47.760 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.860$ that allow one to profile the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}19{:}49.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}51.542$ transcriptome that we're still very

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:51.542 --> 00:19:53.264 much in development at this time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:53.270 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.058$ The basic premise of this assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:55.058 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.033$ is that we have an indexing

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:19:57.033 --> 00:19:58.813 oligo nucleotide that is attached

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:19:58.813 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.390$ to this UV linker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:20:00.390 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.070$ and So what we can essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:20:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.471$ do is to sustain our slide or FP

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}20{:}04.471 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}06.295$ slide with probes or antibodies of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:20:06.300 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.100$ Interest these oligos are UV,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

00:20:09.100 --> 00:20:09.374 photo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00:20:09.374 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.018$ cleavable and so that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.88754812

 $00{:}20{:}11.018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}11.840$ image the slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:11.840 \longrightarrow 00:20:14.432$ Go in and select regions of interest or

00:20:14.432 --> 00:20:16.960 our allies and cleave off these oligos,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:20:16.960 --> 00:20:20.026 aspirate them, and especially dispense them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:20.030 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.894$ and then they can be read off digitally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:21.900 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.364$ either using the Nanostring

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:23.364 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.194$ encounter or indeed via sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:20:25.200 --> 00:20:28.670 And this process is repeated for a number

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:20:28.670 --> 00:20:31.435 of antibodies up to approximately 40 Plex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:31.440 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.020$ and so to give you a flavor for what we did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:34.020 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.305$ These were all four Micron

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:35.305 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.890$ sections that we took from this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8257010033333333

 $00:20:36.890 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.210$ You know almost this clinical trial for which

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}20{:}39.210 \to 00{:}20{:}41.828$ we were using the sort of residual material,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:20:41.830 --> 00:20:44.518 and we actually arrayed the pre on and

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:20:44.518 --> 00:20:46.657 surgical sample onto the same slide

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:46.657 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.788$ to mitigate batch effects and went

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}20{:}48.788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}51.336$ in then and essentially use one of

 $00:20:51.336 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.332$ the the features of DSP which is to

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:54.332 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.194$ select based on phenotypic markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:20:56.194 \longrightarrow 00:20:58.868$ in this case pants ID keratin to

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:20:58.868 --> 00:21:01.822 enrich for tumor cells as well as CD

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:01.822 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.272$ 45 to illuminate immune cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:05.272 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.888$ And of course this is coupled with the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:06.890 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.594$ Does DNA marker and so we can go

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:08.594 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.550$ in and really then take the tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}21{:}10.550 --> 00{:}21{:}11.394 \ \mathrm{enrich \ mask},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:11.394 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.770$ or indeed take the inverted mask and enrich

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:14.852 --> 00:21:16.486 for the surrounding microenvironment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:16.486 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.910$ And we profiled a 43 Plex marker panel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}21{:}20.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23.062$ This was really the panel that was in

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:23.062 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.850$ development at Nanostring at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}21{:}24.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}28.030$ We were fortunate that included a

00:21:28.030 --> 00:21:31.042 number of her two pathway members,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:31.042 --> 00:21:32.860 AKT Phospho, AKT, and so forth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:32.860 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.450$ We actually had to add her to on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:34.450 --> 00:21:36.298 We could not convince them at

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:36.298 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.530$ the time to add.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:37.530 --> 00:21:39.410 IAR, which was you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:39.410 --> 00:21:40.958 disappointing in many respects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:40.958 \longrightarrow 00:21:43.695$ but I think many of the immune markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}21{:}43.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}45.270$ are really well represented here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:45.270 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.684$ and so this is the panel that we had now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:47.684 --> 00:21:49.328 just to give you a flavor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:49.330 --> 00:21:51.046 you know our eyes select selection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:51.050 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.400$ We could spend a lot of time talking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.035$ There are huge study design

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:21:54.035 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.030$ considerations for how we do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333 00:21:56.030 --> 00:21:56.834 You know,

 $00:21:56.834 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.246$ in this trial cohort we essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:21:59.246 --> 00:22:01.749 our goal was to select an average

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:01.749 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.657$ of four or ROI's part issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:03.657 --> 00:22:05.820 This shows you an example where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:05.882 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.314$ selected 6 and in a different case where.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.161$ You can see three of the four

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:10.161 --> 00:22:11.599 in this non PCR case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:11.600 --> 00:22:13.598 so you know we are essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:13.598 --> 00:22:14.597 picking similar regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:14.600 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.735$ but trying to be representative here and

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}22{:}16.735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.960$ there are many ways to go about doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:18.960 --> 00:22:20.985 this now just to convince ourselves

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}22{:}20.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}23.123$ that the technology was working because

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:23.123 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.515$ we were amongst the first to view this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:25.520 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.772$ we went in and compared the

 $00:22:28.772 \longrightarrow 00:22:31.498$ normalized DSP KY 67 levels with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:31.498 --> 00:22:33.578 immunohistochemistry CHI 67 that we had

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}22{:}33.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35.826$ for the same subset of samples and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:35.898 \longrightarrow 00:22:38.296$ can see that the correlation is .62.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:38.296 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.664$ Reasonably good here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:39.664 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.792$ We did a similar analysis for her

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:42.792 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.770$ to where we had compared with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333 00:22:44.770 --> 00:22:45.510 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}22{:}45.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}47.730$ I see based staining and again

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

00:22:47.803 --> 00:22:50.143 we're seeing trends that we would

NOTE Confidence: 0.8257010033333333

 $00:22:50.143 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.980$ expect that convinced us of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:51.980 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.236$ You know that we were at least reading

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:54.236 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.180$ out some of this appropriately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00{:}22{:}56.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}58.574$ So to give you a sense for the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333 00:22:58.580 --> 00:22:58.936 Really, NOTE Confidence: 0.825701003333333

 $00:22:58.936 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.428$ what you can see here are just

 $00:23:01.428 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.140$ two examples

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333 00:23:02.211 --> 00:23:03.125 of case 69. NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:03.125 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.100$ A pathologic complete response and case 58.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:23:06.100 --> 00:23:09.150 I'm showing you individual regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:09.150 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.206$ That we went in and profiled,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:10.210 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.721$ and you can see the her two levels are

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:12.721 \longrightarrow 00:23:15.047$ indicated for these different regions above.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:15.050 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.202$ And so this is just to show how

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:17.202 \longrightarrow 00:23:19.089$ we could visualize the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:23:19.090 --> 00:23:19.906 But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:19.906 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.810$ what we're really interested in are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:21.863 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.879$ quantifications that we derive for this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}23{:}23.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}26.505$ So coming back to the sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:23:26.505 --> 00:23:27.630 baseline characteristics that

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:27.702 \longrightarrow 00:23:29.550$ I had shared with you before,

 $00:23:29.550 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.392$ we were now very interested in looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}23{:}32.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}34.989$ two key markers starting with her two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:34.990 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.908$ Of course as well as CD 45.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:23:36.910 --> 00:23:38.744 So these are the protein markers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:38.744 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.793$ interest you can see on the bottom

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:40.793 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.303$ that we've stratified by intrinsic

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:42.303 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.296$ subtype as well as ER status obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:44.296 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.633$ critical to account for here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:23:45.633 --> 00:23:46.362 and Patsy R,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:46.362 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.186$ and so each of these dots represents

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}23{:}48.186 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}50.658$ a not at the log 2 normalized digital

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:50.658 \longrightarrow 00:23:52.408$ spatial profiling protein levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:52.410 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.300$ You can see that there is reasonably.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:23:54.300 --> 00:23:54.860 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:23:54.860 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.820$ good clustering for some of these in

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}23{:}56.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}58.638$ terms of the levels of expression

 $00:23:58.638 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.210$ within a sample, but some cases also exhibit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:24:01.210 --> 00:24:03.990 you know, pretty considerable variability,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.610$ and so this is if we want to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:06.686 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.337$ each of the regions individually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:08.337 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.672$ And that's of course something

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:09.672 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.289$ we can do with these data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:11.290 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.531$ So this gives us a sense for

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:24:14.531 --> 00:24:15.920 the heterogeneity present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:15.920 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.012$ In these markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:17.012 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.196$ and neither were predictive at baseline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:19.200 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.448$ neither of these protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}24{:}21.448 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}23.202$ markers were predictive of PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:23.202 \longrightarrow 00:24:24.940$ We can also, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:24.940 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.040$ look at her two heterogeneity

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:27.040 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.260$ with far greater granularity,

 $00:24:29.260 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.716$ and so one of the ways that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:24:31.716 --> 00:24:33.340 could envision doing this is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:33.340 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.432$ as we've represented here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:34.432 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.070$ taking the PCR cases and non

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:36.126 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.316$ PCR cases on the bottom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:24:37.320 --> 00:24:40.678 This is again for each each individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:40.678 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.792$ region or summarizing the her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:43.792 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.208$ protein levels and you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:46.210 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.658$ How they look pretreatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:48.658 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.946$ versus on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:49.946 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.622$ Whenever available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}24{:}50.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53.287$ you can see that there's quite a bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:53.287 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.742$ more variability in the on treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:54.742 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.396$ her two levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:24:55.400 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.480$ and actually we quantified this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}24{:}57.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}00.640$ You can look at the mean square error

 $00:25:00.640 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.555$ within patients versus between patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:02.555 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.260$ and see that they're far more comparable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}25{:}05.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.860$ Pretreatment versus on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333 00:25:06.860 --> 00:25:07.654 I mean, NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:07.654 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.433$ we really have a quite dramatic degree

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:25:10.433 --> 00:25:13.510 of change in her two heterogeneity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:13.510 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.508$ and so this this tells us

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:15.508 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.840$ something of course about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:16.840 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.540$ You know both that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:18.540 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.900$ likely hitting the target,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:19.900 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.040$ but what that you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}25{:}21.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23.530$ How do we interpret the functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}25{:}23.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.190$ importance of this heterogeneity

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}25{:}25.190 \to 00{:}25{:}26.954$ so you know the beauty of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:26.954 \longrightarrow 00:25:28.532$ multiplexing here is that it's not

00:25:28.532 --> 00:25:30.074 just her two that's of interest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00{:}25{:}30.080 \to 00{:}25{:}31.628$ but we can actually do these

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:31.628 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.585$ kinds of analysis for all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:33.585 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.737$ markers that we've profiled.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:34.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.260$ And so this is just stratifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:37.260 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.040$ by pretreatment on treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:39.040 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.400$ looking at all two all tumor markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:25:42.400 --> 00:25:43.348 Not surprisingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:43.348 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.666$ the greatest change in her two heterogeneity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:46.670 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.608$ Is in heterogeneous for her too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

00:25:48.610 --> 00:25:50.969 but this is followed by Phospho S6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:50.970 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.386$ If we instead look at the immune markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:53.390 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.676$ we see that the change is

NOTE Confidence: 0.846486428333333

 $00:25:55.676 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.200$ overall relatively less compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:25:57.269 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.649$ to the tumor markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:25:58.650 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.932$ but amongst the top markers we do

 $00:26:00.932 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.470$ see differences in our CD3 and CD8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}26{:}04.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06.142$ And I should emphasize right now that all

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:06.142 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.068$ of the data that I'm showing you at this

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:26:08.068 --> 00:26:09.873 point is based on the pan cytokeratin

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:09.873 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.650$ enriched regions and focusing in on those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:26:11.650 --> 00:26:14.070 So similarly we can ask, well, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.212$ how do these markers change or differ?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:16.212 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.459$ Or is there any association between patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:26:18.459 --> 00:26:20.866 that achieve a PCR versus those that don't?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:20.870 \longrightarrow 00:26:22.998$ And this is now beginning to compare

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:22.998 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.028$ these on treatment values and and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:25.028 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.135$ can see that there are indeed pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}26{:}27.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}28.959$ dramatic differences between responders

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:28.959 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.327$ and non responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.926$ So this is all very well.

 $00:26:31.930 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.210$ I want to come back to say that

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:26:33.210 --> 00:26:34.238 of course you know we were.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:26:34.240 --> 00:26:35.280 Being fairly pragmatic in

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:35.280 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.320$ our initial approach here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:36.320 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.204$ asking well can we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:37.204 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.530$ What can we learn from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:38.578 \longrightarrow 00:26:39.499$ samples at baseline?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:39.500 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.084$ It would be ideal if we had strong

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}26{:}42.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44.220$ predictors of response at baseline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:44.220 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.916$ so this is just showing you the CD

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:46.916 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.977$ 45 pretreatment levels in a vial

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:48.977 \longrightarrow 00:26:50.957$ implant for the PCR cases versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}26{:}51.027 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53.268$ non PCR as well As for CD 56 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:26:53.268 --> 00:26:55.164 what you can hopefully appreciate

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:26:55.164 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.630$ based on these violins are that

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}26{:}57.701 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}01.918$ there's really very no association

 $00:27:01.920 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.920$ in in the pretreatment markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:03.920 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.856$ but once we start to look.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:04.860 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.536$ On treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:05.536 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.226$ we're actually starting to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:07.226 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.822$ that there are significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:08.822 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.886$ differences between these markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:10.890 \longrightarrow 00:27:12.850$ in the PCR versus non PCR cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:12.850 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.830$ So that gave us some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143 00:27:13.830 --> 00:27:14.452 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:14.452 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.318$ sort of encouragement just in from

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:27:16.318 --> 00:27:18.140 a univariate analysis perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:18.140 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.500$ But what really got us excited?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}27{:}21.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23.999$ Was when we started to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:23.999 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.295$ these markers in concert and So

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:26.295 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.610$ what I'm showing you here in this.

00:27:30.610 --> 00:27:33.322 It plot is that we're looking at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:33.322 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.342$ significance or the negative log 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}27{:}35.342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}37.666$ FDR adjusted P value from the change

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:27:37.666 --> 00:27:40.386 from run into baseline again in the pan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}27{:}40.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}42.588$ CK enriched regions and so now you

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:42.588 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.324$ can look at the PCR cases and see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:45.324 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.770$ a whole host of markers are lower,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:47.770 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.350$ quite dramatically lower at running.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:50.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.498$ These include her two but also

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:27:52.498 --> 00:27:54.489 phospho 6 phospho Akt Chi 67,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:27:54.490 --> 00:27:56.710 phospho, Erk and so forth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:27:56.710 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.742$ So really the whole ham pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:00.742 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.286$ Is showing a decrease?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:28:03.290 --> 00:28:05.528 On treatment in patients that respond,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:05.530 \longrightarrow 00:28:07.195$ there is a concomitant increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:07.195 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.430$ in a number of immune markers,

00:28:09.430 --> 00:28:12.190 including CD45, CD, eight others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:28:12.190 --> 00:28:14.950 really quite dramatic opposition here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:14.950 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.982$ and in contrast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:15.982 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.046$ we did not observe these patterns

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:18.046 \longrightarrow 00:28:19.628$ in the non PCR cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:19.630 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.234$ so you can see that a handful of

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:22.234 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.124$ these markers are indeed achieved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:24.130 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.830$ Significance based on the FDR and there is a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}28{:}26.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}30.470$ you know, sort of a modest log 2 fold change,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.522$ but it is much attenuated relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:32.522 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.890$ to the PCR cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:33.890 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.940$ so this was the 1st.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00{:}28{:}34.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}37.334$ Sign that we had some signal and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:37.334 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.549$ these data and was really quite encouraging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:40.550 \longrightarrow 00:28:42.630$ Now I wanted to come back to the

 $00{:}28{:}42.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44.584$ RNA seek data RNA data that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:28:44.584 --> 00:28:46.650 showed you in the very beginning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:46.650 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.350$ and to say that we took the match samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

 $00:28:49.350 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.020$ So just subsetting the larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.912260702857143

00:28:51.020 --> 00:28:52.690 RNA fresh frozen cohort where

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}28{:}52.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.592$ we failed to observe an association

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:28:54.592 --> 00:28:56.662 and asking what if we take these

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:28:56.662 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.228$ markers and just look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}28{:}58.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}00.410$ RNA level and what you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:00.410 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.308$ Is that really we see no signal

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:03.308 --> 00:29:05.790 here now this of course could

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:05.790 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.390$ be attributed to many factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:07.390 \longrightarrow 00:29:10.780$ It could be due to admixture in the bulk RNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:29:12.844$ It could be due to the fact that

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:12.844 --> 00:29:14.618 we've actually enriched for a pan

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:14.618 --> 00:29:16.113 set of keratin tumor enriched,

00:29:16.120 --> 00:29:19.060 you know, population using DSP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:19.060 --> 00:29:20.842 And thirdly, it could be due to the fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:20.842 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.578$ that you know protein is more proximal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:22.580 --> 00:29:23.680 Readout of these signaling pathway

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:23.680 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.130$ changes that we want to observe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:25.130 --> 00:29:27.170 So multiple factors here, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.319$ the ideal comparator would be to do DSP RNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:31.320 --> 00:29:31.605 Unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:31.605 \longrightarrow 00:29:33.600$ when we did this at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:33.600 --> 00:29:36.093 the RNA probes, it was a 96 Plex panel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:36.100 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.034$ We did do it the signal to noise was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:39.040 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.515$ Incredibly poor and we really

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:40.515 --> 00:29:41.695 couldn't use those data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:29:43.401$ so it is an experiment that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:43.401 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.321$ I'm sort of curious about to get

 $00:29:45.321 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.377$ back to which of these factors is

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}29{:}47.377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}48.897$ driving our observations and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:48.897 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.932$ speak a little bit more to that more,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:51.932 --> 00:29:53.060 but but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:29:53.060 --> 00:29:55.868 I will place some bets on the fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}29{:}55.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}58.658$ that we are enriching for tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:29:58.660 \longrightarrow 00:30:01.228$ and we are reading this out of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:30:01.228 --> 00:30:03.190 protein level so encouraged by our

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:03.190 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.410$ the previous slide and showing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:30:05.410 --> 00:30:07.379 there was an association between

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}30{:}07.379 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}09.294$ multiple markers in the PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:09.300 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.980$ Cases we then went on to take the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:30:11.980 --> 00:30:14.208 logical next step which was to

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}30{:}14.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}16.434$ ask could we develop a classifier

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.812$ in our discovery cohort?

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:18.812 \dashrightarrow 00:30:22.182$ Our very small discovery cohort and

 $00{:}30{:}22.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}24.192$ ask whether we could potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}30{:}24.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}26.819$ predict response and so this is an L2

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:26.819 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.152$ regularized regression model because

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:30:28.152 --> 00:30:30.090 we were really trying to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.879$ what these data could tell us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:31.880 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.205$ What we have done is to look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:35.205 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.025$ DSP markers combined ingredients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:37.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.370$ So this is an and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:39.370 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.706 \text{ Yep}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:39.706 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.722$ pre and on treatment and we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:41.722 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.946$ comparing this with the sort of classic

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:43.946 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.470$ markers that we have in the field today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00{:}30{:}46.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48.650$ Which is estrogen receptor status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:48.650 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.684$ which we know is associated with PCR in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:50.684 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.688$ her two positive setting as well as Pam.

 $00:30:52.690 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.482$ 50 You can see that this is this

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:54.482 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.972$ purple line with amine OC of .5

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:55.972 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.629$ so not telling us a whole bunch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:30:57.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.376$ We also try to combine these and

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:00.376 \longrightarrow 00:31:02.224$ ask whether this would improve our

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:02.224 --> 00:31:04.386 prediction and answer is no but but

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:04.386 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.526$ we were reasonably encouraged by

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:06.526 --> 00:31:10.074 this AUC of .733. Obviously this is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:10.074 --> 00:31:13.615 In, you know, in the discovery cohort alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:13.620 --> 00:31:17.295 using cross validation and so you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:17.300 --> 00:31:18.917 encouraged by this the next question was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:19.604 \longrightarrow 00:31:21.656$ what markers are actually informative here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:21.660 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.306$ and so looking at the marker coefficients

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:24.306 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.419$ with this within this L2 model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:26.420 --> 00:31:28.989 what we noticed was that really CD

 $00:31:28.989 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.384$ 45 and adjacent to this the next

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:31.384 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.166$ one up was Vista were amongst the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

00:31:34.166 --> 00:31:36.254 the largest marker coefficient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:36.260 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.905$ so that gave us some clues and

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:37.905 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.619$ this was in the on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667 00:31:39.620 --> 00:31:40.096 Right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:40.096 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.952$ shown here in pink in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905109314666667

 $00:31:42.952 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.380$ on treatment biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:31:44.380 \longrightarrow 00:31:46.414$ So with this in hand we then you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:31:46.420 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.300$ got a bit bolder and said, well, OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

00:31:48.300 --> 00:31:51.632 What if we just look at CD 45 DSP alone?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:31:51.632 --> 00:31:53.390 I mean, this would obviously be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}31{:}53.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}55.040$ simpler way to approach this problem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:31:55.040 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.745$ and the answer was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:31:56.745 --> 00:31:58.032 in our discovery cohort,

 $00:31:58.032 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.838$ so this is using cross validation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}31{:}59.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}02.598$ We got a very very high AUC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:02.600 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.453$ almost too good to be true of .9 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:05.453 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.784$ so then we actually took this into our,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:08.790 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.106$ you know, withheld validation set where

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:11.106 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.700$ we assess this in the AC was .75.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:13.700 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.900$ So not too bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:32:14.900 --> 00:32:16.220 Still encouraging enough and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:32:16.220 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.078$ LED us to then kind of come back to

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:32:18.078 --> 00:32:19.480 what I mentioned at the beginning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:19.480 \dashrightarrow 00:32:21.736$ which was what we had on treatment pills.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:21.740 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.220$ We had scored these for the entire cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}32{:}24.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}26.110$ We hadn't seen an association at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:32:26.110 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.393$ large with that and we had reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:28.393 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.983$ that along with the trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:32:29.990 --> 00:32:31.673 But you know what are these trends look like?

 $00:32:31.680 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.102$ So so here you can see the on

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}32{:}35.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}37.362$ treatment tell score broken down

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:37.362 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.512$ by non PCR versus PCR and you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:40.512 \longrightarrow 00:32:42.794$ we really see a far more striking

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:42.794 \dashrightarrow 00:32:44.908$ separation of PCR versus non PCR cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:32:44.910 --> 00:32:47.297 Saying CD 45 DSP they are correlated

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:47.297 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.068$ but not as well as one would like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.030$ And that begs a number of questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:52.030 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.601$ and and of course it would be really

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:54.601 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.640$ interesting to ask you know why is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:32:56.640 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.709$ the case in in this PO7 clinical trial?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:32:58.710 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.190$ And why have others seen more of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}33{:}01.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}02.488$ association? For example in Pamela?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:02.488 \longrightarrow 00:33:03.970$ But as I showed you before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:03.970 --> 00:33:05.130 not this doesn't always validate,

 $00:33:05.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:06.849$ and I think you know it raises the question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:06.850 \dashrightarrow 00:33:09.910$ There's of course a lot of inter and intra

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:09.910 --> 00:33:12.403 observer variability in scoring chills,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:12.403 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.560$ and so perhaps that's a contributing factor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:15.560 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.311$ But so with this information in hand

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:18.311 --> 00:33:21.028 and encouraged by the fact that CD

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:21.028 --> 00:33:23.212 45 DSP protein alone on treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:23.220 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.776$ seem to be predictive of a PCR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:33:26.780 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.660$ we then went on to really try to reduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:29.660 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.897$ this approach to a more simplistic strategy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:32.900 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.460$ And So what we did was to then

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:33:37.270$ come back and perform CD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:37.270 --> 00:33:39.820 45 I mean a histochemistry on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:33:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.978$ the cohort we had in hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:41.980 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.080$ and we gathered as many additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}33{:}44.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}46.192$ cases from this clinical trial which

 $00{:}33{:}46.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}48.148$ was near expended at this point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:48.150 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.068$ To use that as a validation set,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:33:51.645$ and so importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:51.645 --> 00:33:56.050 we built into this an effort to enrich

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:33:56.050 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.800$ with expert pathology guidance for

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:33:57.800 --> 00:34:00.090 tumor for tumor and rich regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:00.090 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.211$ and this was really trying to mimic

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}34{:}02.211 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}04.897$ what we had done with the pants

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:34:04.897 --> 00:34:06.605 cytokeratin enrichment using DSP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:06.610 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.675$ We then use Q path to really

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

00:34:08.675 --> 00:34:10.426 automate this process and develop

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:34:10.426 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.038$ a digital pathology workflow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9311552611111111

 $00:34:12.040 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.270$ So how does this look?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:34:13.270 --> 00:34:16.070 Well, so now this is taking, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:16.070 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.770$ a comparison of the match cases where we had.

00:34:18.770 --> 00:34:21.135 And then CD 45 immunohistochemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00{:}34{:}21.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}23.500$ shown in orange versus those

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:23.578 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.654$ cases where we had CD 45 DSP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:25.654 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.894$ You can see that they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:26.894 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.990$ largely in agreement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

00:34:27.990 --> 00:34:30.610 The IHC does slightly better,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931155261111111

 $00:34:30.610 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.770$ but really these are very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:33.770 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.204$ you know, reasonable AUC's to observe

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:35.204 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.928$ and just to put this in context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.652$ then what we're what we really want

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:38.652 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.467$ to be able to do is ask, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:40.467 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.369$ what is the positive predictive value?

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}34{:}42.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}44.926$ The chance that a tumor will

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:34:44.926 --> 00:34:46.630 have a pathologic complete

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:34:46.708 --> 00:34:48.568 response to TCLTCH or TCHL?

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:34:48.568 --> 00:34:51.284 So the three different arms in the study

 $00:34:51.284 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.554$ and we were able to then, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}34{:}53.554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}56.253$ use this to sort of set a cut point and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:56.253 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.750$ the positive predictive value for a CD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:34:59.750 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.558$ 45% positivity greater than 20% is .82 here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:02.558 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.050$ and this is in this combined cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:05.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.479$ If we do this only in the validation set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:08.480 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.600$ Where we have fewer cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:09.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.740$ it drops to about .71.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:35:11.740 --> 00:35:12.764 But Needless to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:12.764 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.044$ this was really encouraging and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:14.044 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.218$ begs the question, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:35:15.218 --> 00:35:16.370 sort of just to come back to this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}35{:}16.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}18.490$ but we could go from a Multiplex assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}35{:}18.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}20.323$ and reduce this down to a single

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:20.323 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.218$ marker that could be run in any lab.

 $00:35:22.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.397$ We know that CD 45 is incredibly

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:24.397 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.000$ robust and raises the possibility that

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}35{:}27.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}29.779$ perhaps this kind of approach could

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:29.779 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.670$ be used to guide therapy D escalation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:32.670 \longrightarrow 00:35:34.086$ Now I'll come back to this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.240$ This will require further validation

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:36.240 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.506$ in additional trial cohorts, namely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:38.506 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.782$ Ideally those that did not administer

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:41.782 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.328$ chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.776$ Afterwards,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:35:42.776 --> 00:35:45.452 and we are actively now validating

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:45.452 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.262$ us in a in a retrospectively in

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:48.262 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.102$ one of those trial cohorts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}35{:}50.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}52.630$ and if that pans out then of course then

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:52.630 \longrightarrow 00:35:55.215$ next steps would be a prospective effort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:35:55.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.550$ So moving you know back,

 $00:35:57.550 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.836$ I just want to spend a few more minutes

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}35{:}59.836 \longrightarrow 00{:}36{:}01.848$ saying that we of course had much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:01.848 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.068$ data in this cohort that we could mine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:04.070 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.723$ We are very keen to really leverage

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}06.723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09.547$ what started out as a discovery effort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:09.550 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.209$ but LED us to this new biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:11.210 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.812 \text{ I mean}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:11.812 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.220$ this really was a piloting of the technology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}14.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}15.372$ That uncovered some pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:15.372 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.236$ interesting biology here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}16.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}18.504$ but sort of coming back to the data

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:18.504 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.936$ I showed you before that the non

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}20.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}23.414$ PCR cases really didn't show very

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:23.414 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.514$ dramatic changes at the pretreatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:25.514 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.514$ versus run in time point.

 $00:36:27.520 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.852$ However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}27.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}30.176$ if we take those same patients and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}30.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}32.684$ now look at them at at the surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:36:32.684 --> 00:36:34.196 versus pretreatment time points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.999$ so after they've completed the full course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:36.000 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.947$ what we see is actually that by

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:38.947 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.752$ then they do indeed exhibit a

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:41.752 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.147$ a reduction in her two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:44.150 \longrightarrow 00:36:45.966$ We'll see that there is a reduction in

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:45.966 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.048$ CHI 67 these other downstream markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}36{:}48.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}50.270$ however, are less downregulated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:50.270 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.490$ and this potentially suggests

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:52.490 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.870$ compensatory signaling in the non PCR

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:54.870 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.459$ cases that's active at the time of surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:57.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.323$ I will point out as well that we do

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:36:59.323 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.296$ see shifts by the time of surgery

00:37:01.296 --> 00:37:03.464 in immune markers, including CD 56.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00{:}37{:}03.464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}06.530$ And of course you know this raises

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:06.622 \longrightarrow 00:37:07.740$ the question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:07.740 \longrightarrow 00:37:09.910$ Why that might be the most enriches

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:09.910 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.672$ this because we're seeing an

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:37:11.672 --> 00:37:13.212 effective natural killer cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:13.212 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.270$ in identifying and killing these

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:15.270 \dashrightarrow 00:37:17.106$ chemotherapy stressed tumor cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.980$ You know that's that's possible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:19.980 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.220$ And so really a lot to unpack here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

 $00:37:22.220 \longrightarrow 00:37:23.295$ but I think it's quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.85091825

00:37:23.295 --> 00:37:24.370 interesting that now we do

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}37{:}24.418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25.780$ start to see these changes now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:25.780 \longrightarrow 00:37:27.747$ On top of this, I haven't really

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:27.747 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.732$ talked at all beyond what we can

 $00:37:29.732 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.900$ do with the tumor in rich regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:37:31.900 --> 00:37:33.356 But as I mentioned in the beginning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}37{:}33.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35.502$ you know a benefit of the DSP

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:35.502 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.011$ approach and the phenotypic

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:37.011 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.616$ selection strategy that we deployed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:39.620 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.154$ There are many others that one could

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:42.154 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.565$ envision is that we can now select the

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:45.565 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.280$ surrounding tumor microenvironment area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}37{:}47.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}49.989$ and so we wanted to explore that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:49.990 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.850$ You know a bit here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}37{:}51.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}53.796$ and So what I'm showing you is

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}37{:}53.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}55.827$ now looking at the enrichment of

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:37:55.827 --> 00:37:58.089 just immune genes in either the

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:58.089 \dashrightarrow 00:37:59.349$ surrounding microenvironment that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:37:59.349 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.803$ shown over here on the right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:01.810 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.785$ So that's an enrichment towards the TME.

 $00:38:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.823$ The TME area versus in the tumor over here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:07.830 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.318$ and so this is in the first instance

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:38:10.318 --> 00:38:11.990 looking at the pretreatment time point

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:11.990 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.134$ where you can see is that there's really

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:14.134 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.078$ a number of immune suppressive marks

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:16.078 \longrightarrow 00:38:18.290$ evident in the tumor in rich region.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:18.290 \longrightarrow 00:38:20.390$ We see evidence for T cell exclusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:20.390 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.070$ Based on you know, CD3 CD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:22.070 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.018$ four other markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:38:23.018 --> 00:38:25.230 I do want to be cautious here

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:25.302 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.034$ and why we sort of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}38{:}27.034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}28.294$ interpret this a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:38:28.294 --> 00:38:29.509 carefully is that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:29.510 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.028$ I think there's a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:31.028 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.787$ open questions around,

 $00:38:31.790 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.855$ just the relative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:32.855 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.340$ So we say stickiness affinity of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:35.409 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.589$ antibodies in tumor versus immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:37.589 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.150$ populations that we don't understand well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:40.150 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.846$ and that will need to be parsed further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:42.850 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.750$ And I say that in part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:38:43.750 --> 00:38:46.298 just noting that we see very, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:38:46.298 --> 00:38:48.290 high enrichment of B7H4 over here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:48.290 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.788$ So we could take that with a grain of salt,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:50.790 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.462$ but of course what we can do is

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}38{:}52.462 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}54.368$ assume that those are going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:54.368 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.064$ equivalent overtime and now ask well

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:38:56.064 \longrightarrow 00:38:58.214$ what happens in terms of these marks

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}38{:}58.214 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}00.209$ from pretreatment to on treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:00.210 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.873$ and you can see that you know really

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:02.873 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.528$ in the tumor enriched region,

 $00:39:04.530 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.316$ things stay large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:05.316 \dashrightarrow 00:39:07.490$ largely the same at this first time point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:07.490 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.434$ by the time we get to the post

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:09.434 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.300$ treatment time point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:10.300 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.594$ we actually do see that you know many

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:13.594 \longrightarrow 00:39:15.382$ of these markers have now shifted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:15.390 --> 00:39:17.404 We see far less evidence of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:17.404 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.766$ sort of this T cell exclusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:18.770 --> 00:39:19.308 Now they've.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:19.308 \dashrightarrow 00:39:20.922$ Appeared to infiltrate and and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:20.922 \dashrightarrow 00:39:22.909$ point out that this Last Post treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:22.910 --> 00:39:24.585 timepoint were of course only

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}39{:}24.585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26.720$ looking at the non PCR cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:26.720 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.261$ We're not looking at the responders who

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:29.261 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.688$ presumably had no tumor cells present.

00:39:31.690 --> 00:39:31.974 Right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}39{:}31.974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}34.246$ so this this gives us some clues as

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:34.246 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.592$ to also potentially the timing of

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:36.592 --> 00:39:38.582 changes of these immune markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:38.590 \longrightarrow 00:39:40.840$ and you know raises the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:40.840 \longrightarrow 00:39:43.125$ as to whether further efforts to

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:43.125 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.050$ profile at multiple time points

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:45.050 --> 00:39:46.962 on the rapy might actually inform

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}39{:}46.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}49.110$ you know the timing of these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:49.110 --> 00:39:51.618 I mean infiltrates and maybe have

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:51.618 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.528$ relevance for contemplating the timing

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:53.528 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.308$ of immunotherapy in these populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:55.310 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.155$ And of course that will

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:39:57.155 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.000$ require further study as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

00:39:59.000 --> 00:40:00.393 So I guess you know just to

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:40:00.393 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.519$ really wrap up this part.

00:40:01.520 --> 00:40:04.556 I'll say that Multiplex proteomic profiling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00{:}40{:}04.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}06.430$ coupled with pan Cytokeratin and

NOTE Confidence: 0.961272315

 $00:40:06.430 \longrightarrow 00:40:08.300$ Richemond can reveal dynamic changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:08.357 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.849$ in the tumor microenvironment

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:09.849 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.714$ during her two targeted therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:11.720 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.016$ These data are data really under score the

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:40:14.016 --> 00:40:16.340 value of having a non treatment biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:16.340 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.804$ That's obviously can be difficult to achieve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:18.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.594$ but this was instrumental.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:20.594 \longrightarrow 00:40:24.679$ And really where we saw the most predictive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:40:24.680 --> 00:40:29.048 A potential of any of these biomarkers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:29.050 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.130$ We see that CD 45,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}40{:}31.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}34.175$ either expression or cell counts as measured

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}40{:}34.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}37.184$ by HC predicted PCR in an independent

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:37.184 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.620$ set and this really did outperform

 $00:40:39.699 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.051$ other candidate biomarkers such as ER

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:42.051 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.690$ or her to enrich status and so we do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:45.690 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.622$ We think that these findings have

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:47.622 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.910$ implications for tailoring therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:48.910 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.828$ Of course, far more work is needed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:50.830 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.245$ but really the dream would be to

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:53.245 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.207$ be able to scare to spare patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:56.210 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.730$ who safely can omit chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:40:59.730 \longrightarrow 00:41:01.570$ And to make that determination

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:01.570 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.410$ early during their treatment course

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}41{:}03.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}05.522$ and so this will require further

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:05.522 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.599$ validation which is ongoing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:06.599 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.300$ But I'll just say that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.082$ I think there's many other open

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:10.082 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.575$ questions that this work informs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737 00:41:11.575 --> 00:41:12.185 Of course,

00:41:12.185 --> 00:41:14.660 you know it will be interesting to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}41{:}14.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}16.916$ how predictive CD 45 is in other cohorts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:16.920 \longrightarrow 00:41:19.020$ as well As for other anti

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:19.020 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.420$ her two targeted agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}41{:}20.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}22.364$ I'm still very interested to better

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:22.364 \longrightarrow 00:41:23.660$ understand the comparison with

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:23.718 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.524$ cell till that hasn't really been

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:41:25.524 --> 00:41:26.692 head-to-head in larger cohorts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}41{:}26.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}28.378$ I think this raises the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:28.378 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.039$ about what is the optimal timing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.259$ We had this essentially one cycle of

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:32.259 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.423$ targeted therapy two week window because

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}41{:}34.423 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}36.338$ that's when patients were biopsied,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:36.340 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.825$ and it's convenient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:41:37.825 --> 00:41:40.300 There may be better windows,

 $00:41:40.300 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.000$ but of course understanding this

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}41{:}42.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}44.520$ timing is going to be critical for

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:44.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.408$ really optimizing our interventions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:46.408 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.768$ And then there's many other

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:48.768 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.580$ questions about whether CD 45,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:50.580 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.408$ you know will correlate with long term

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:53.408 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.524$ outcomes and whether its prognostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:55.524 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.026$ and or predictive in other subgroups

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:41:58.026 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.649$ of breast cancer and other cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:00.650 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.082$ So I'll say that you know there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}42{:}03.082 \rightarrow 00{:}42{:}05.322$ many other efforts to contemplate

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:05.322 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.879$ D escalation strategies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.216$ One of these is the ADAPT trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:11.216 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.046$ which is looking at neoadjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:42:13.046 --> 00:42:14.144 pertuzumab plus trustees.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:14.150 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.190$ Mab with or without paclitaxel.

00:42:16.190 --> 00:42:19.110 Another trial is for gain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:19.110 \longrightarrow 00:42:22.732$ which is looking at and FDG PET based

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:22.732 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.788$ biomarker of Pathologic complete

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}42{:}24.788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}27.750$ response and of course these are

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:27.750 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.216$ you know ongoing and reporting out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:42:30.220 --> 00:42:31.820 And really, just highlight,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:31.820 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.698$ I think the the real efforts of

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:34.698 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.098$ the Community to try to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}42{:}37.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}39.506$ these biomarkers and two to optimize

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:39.506 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.880$ for our patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:40.880 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.707$ Now I will say that of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:42.707 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.500$ I've I've mentioned this in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:44.500 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.457$ context of deescalation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:45.460 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.970$ Really the flip side of that coin is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:48.970 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.757$ ultimately we're very likely to need risk.

00:42:51.760 --> 00:42:54.706 Adapted novel trial designs to tailor

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}42{:}54.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}57.559$ therapy and deliver new drugs to

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:42:57.559 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.373$ high risk patients as needed and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:00.380 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.634$ We've been contemplating that a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:01.634 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.344$ bit more in the ER positive her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:43:03.344 --> 00:43:04.830 negative setting and I'll just say that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737 00:43:04.830 --> 00:43:05.382 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

00:43:05.382 --> 00:43:07.314 sort of building on from this work

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:07.314 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.334$ we've now embarked on a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:09.334 \longrightarrow 00:43:11.680$ other efforts to really chart not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}43{:}11.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}13.224$ the tumor immune microenvironment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:13.230 \longrightarrow 00:43:15.034$ but to characterize tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00{:}43{:}15.034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.387$ evolution through the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:16.390 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.064$ And that's been on a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.838715517894737

 $00:43:18.064 \longrightarrow 00:43:19.180$ long standing interest in

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:19.240 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.642$ my lab. We are using a

 $00:43:20.642 \longrightarrow 00:43:22.190$ variety of tools to do this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:22.190 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.450$ not only spatial proteomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:43:24.450 --> 00:43:26.145 but also transcriptomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:26.150 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.562$ which you know affords us maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:28.562 \longrightarrow 00:43:30.448$ a less biased approach, and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:30.448 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.394$ Enables discovery efforts and and for many

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:43:32.394 --> 00:43:34.497 of these cohorts that we're working on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}43{:}34.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}36.885$ we've previously performed end up

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:43:36.885 --> 00:43:40.110 sequencing mainly at the bulk DNA level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:43:40.110 --> 00:43:42.120 but in some cases when possible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:43:42.120 --> 00:43:44.028 We're also doing this, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.030$ at the single cell level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}43{:}45.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}47.410$ to try to tease apart this biology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:47.410 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.909$ and so one of the areas that

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:43:49.909 --> 00:43:51.230 we're particularly interested in,

00:43:51.230 --> 00:43:53.450 and that I'll just summarize

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:53.450 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.670$ briefly is in understanding the

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:55.745 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.035$ determinants of breast cancer relapse

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:43:58.035 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.000$ and so to highlight this problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333 00:44:01.000 --> 00:44:01.470 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:01.470 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.880$ I think we all appreciate that

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:02.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.395$ prognosis has improved dramatically for

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:04.395 --> 00:44:06.055 early stage breast cancer patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.316$ in part due to new therapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:08.316 --> 00:44:09.820 strategies and screening and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9405470383333333

 $00{:}44{:}09.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}11.143$ and we certainly know this is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:11.143 --> 00:44:12.619 case for her two positive disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:12.620 --> 00:44:14.738 but but for many other subgroups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:14.740 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.756$ And yet at the same time more

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:16.756 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.204$ than 20% of patients will recur

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:19.204 --> 00:44:21.534 with Mets at distant sites,

 $00{:}44{:}21.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}23.960$ and this remains largely incurable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:44:26.720$ There was a very powerful meta

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:26.720 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.560$ analysis performed by panel

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:28.639 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.859$ published several years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}44{:}30.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}32.440$ Which demonstrated that there's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:32.440 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.550$ subset of women with early stage ER,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:34.550 --> 00:44:36.344 positive breast cancer who have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}44{:}36.344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}38.422$ persistent risk of recurrence and death

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:38.422 --> 00:44:41.068 2 decades after their initial diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:41.070 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.230$ and these include women

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:43.230 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.072$ with node negative disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:45.072 \longrightarrow 00:44:47.676$ As you can see over here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}44{:}47.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}49.555$ and so really illuminating what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:49.555 \longrightarrow 00:44:51.430$ been observed in clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333 00:44:51.430 --> 00:44:51.770 Now,

 $00:44:51.770 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.150$ a key challenge of this has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}44{:}54.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}56.810$ that it's evident that our classic

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:44:56.810 --> 00:44:58.666 characteristics of nodal status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:44:58.670 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.698$ size, grade are insufficient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:45:00.698 --> 00:45:02.219 To predict recurrence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:02.220 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.376$ and really that the progress in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:04.376 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.703$ space has been impeded by the lack

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:06.703 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.701$ of cohorts with long term clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}45{:}08.768 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}45{:}10.560$ follow-up and molecular data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:10.560 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.576$ And so this is really a segue to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9405470383333333

 $00{:}45{:}14.580 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}45{:}16.778$ just a brief summary of of other

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:45:16.778 --> 00:45:18.873 work that we've been pursuing where

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:18.873 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.393$ several years ago now a decade ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333 00:45:21.400 --> 00:45:21.971 Actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:45:21.971 --> 00:45:25.397 we sought to unpack the genomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:25.397 \longrightarrow 00:45:27.860$ landscape of breast cancer,

00:45:27.860 --> 00:45:30.335 really focusing on combining whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:30.335 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.810$ genome copy number based profiling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:45:32.810 --> 00:45:34.750 Quick transcriptomics and using

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:34.750 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.690$ unsupervised approaches we discovered

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:36.690 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.090$ that there are at least 10 molecularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:39.090 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.930$ distinct groups of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:40.930 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.950$ You can see these over here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:41.950 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.596$ This is the chromosome copy number

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:44.596 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.360$ in red shows amplifications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:45:46.360 --> 00:45:47.850 deletions in blue looking along

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:47.850 \longrightarrow 00:45:48.446$ the chromosome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}45{:}48.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}50.388$ and you'll recognize the Pam 50

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}45{:}50.388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}52.107$ intrinsic subgroups and then our

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:52.107 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.947$ integrative subgroups on the outside.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:53.950 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.308$ You can see that we really

 $00:45:56.310 \longrightarrow 00:45:57.990$ discover a number of groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:45:57.990 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.886$ Not only do we recover, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:45:59.886 --> 00:46:01.590 the her two positive Group A great control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:01.590 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.078$ but we see other groups such

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:03.078 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.822$ as integrative cluster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:46:03.830 --> 00:46:05.348 One which has amplification of ARP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333 00:46:05.350 --> 00:46:06.172 6 KB,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:46:06.172 --> 00:46:09.104 one on chromosome 17 Q integrative cluster,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:09.104 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.978$ 6 amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:46:09.978 --> 00:46:11.289 Overexpression of FGFR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:11.290 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.615$ one on chromosome 8P12 and then this

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

00:46:14.615 --> 00:46:16.516 highly complex integrated cluster

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}46{:}16.516 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}19.354$ two with amplification of a cassette

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:19.354 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.700$ of chromatin regulators on 11 Q.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:21.700 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.610$ So additional subgroups that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00{:}46{:}23.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}25.520$ very much copy number defined

 $00:46:25.589 \longrightarrow 00:46:27.962$ and we were able to further show

NOTE Confidence: 0.940547038333333

 $00:46:27.962 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.979$ that these integrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:29.045 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.557$ subgroups really have

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:30.557 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.069$ distinct clinical outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:32.070 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.114$ This is this cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:46:33.114 --> 00:46:34.680 obviously by virtue of the long

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:34.737 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.699$ follow-up predated the use of trustees,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:36.700 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.380$ and Ave can see the integrative Cluster

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:38.380 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.357$ 5 or her two positive group here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:40.360 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.628$ but numerous other groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:46:41.628 --> 00:46:42.896 have very steep trajectories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:42.900 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.198$ So just to recap what what

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:46:45.198 --> 00:46:47.915 this really told us is that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}46{:}47.915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}49.954$ addition to the her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:49.954 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.584$ subgroup or integrated Cluster 5.

 $00:46:51.590 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.022$ Many other subgroups are

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:53.022 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.454$ copying overdriven and might

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:54.454 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.090$ share similar characteristics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:56.090 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.323$ and so in recent years we've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:46:58.323 \longrightarrow 00:47:01.166$ able to go back and obtain the 20

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:01.166 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.513$ year clinical follow up for this

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:47:03.513 --> 00:47:06.249 metabolic cohort of over 2000 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:47:06.250 --> 00:47:08.154 and So what I'm showing you here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:08.154 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.446$ just a summary broken down by ear

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:10.446 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.201$ positive and ear negative patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}47{:}12.210 \longrightarrow 00{:}47{:}13.510$ Each patient along the vertical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:13.510 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.708$ You can see the site of metastasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:15.708 \longrightarrow 00:47:16.650$ for these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:16.650 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.958$ You can see that they're vast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:17.960 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.936$ so there's a huge degree of organic tropism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231 00:47:21.940 --> 00:47:22.550 But really,

 $00:47:22.550 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.075$ what's critical about these data

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:24.075 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.386$ with long term follow up is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:47:26.386 --> 00:47:28.066 now having this complete recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:28.066 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.487$ information allows us to study

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:29.487 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.035$ the rates and routes of distant

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:31.040 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.228$ relapse and their lethality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:32.228 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.699$ and so I won't dwell on these data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:47:34.700 --> 00:47:37.200 They're all publicly available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:47:39.520$ but what this led us to is to then really

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:39.578 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.298$ revisit these integrative subgroups

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:47:41.298 --> 00:47:43.878 and their association with relapse risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:43.880 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.632$ and So what I'm showing you here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}47{:}46.632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}48.635$ the probability of relapse ordered

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}47{:}48.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}51.460$ by increasing risk for individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:51.460 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.560$ And I'll walk through starting

 $00:47:52.560 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.440$ with her two positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231 00:47:53.440 --> 00:47:53.717 Again, NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:47:53.717 --> 00:47:56.002 before the use of trustees met Ian Black,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:56.002 \longrightarrow 00:47:58.179$ you can see after surgery there risks

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:47:58.179 \longrightarrow 00:48:00.416$ over this 20 year interval in red

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:00.416 --> 00:48:02.320 after being disease free five years

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:02.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.420$ and in green disease free 10 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}48{:}04.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}05.820$ And of course these trajectories

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:05.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.940$ are are very steep.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:06.940 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.756$ We know her too is a bad actor

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:08.756 --> 00:48:10.199 prior to trustees moving.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:10.200 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.580$ This has changed the game,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:11.580 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.716$ but we were intrigued to see that just

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:13.716 --> 00:48:15.669 adjacent to the her two positive group

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:15.669 --> 00:48:17.733 where these four what we term high

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:17.733 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.980$ risk ER positive her two negative subgroups,

 $00:48:19.980 \longrightarrow 00:48:22.278$ integrative clusters 169 and two which

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:22.278 \longrightarrow 00:48:24.439$ happened to be defined by those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:24.440 --> 00:48:25.466 Hallmark copying appropriations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:25.466 --> 00:48:26.834 I just showed you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:26.840 \longrightarrow 00:48:27.791$ and so really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}48{:}27.791 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}29.693$ Hopefully you can appreciate that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:29.693 --> 00:48:31.598 risks of relapse are in excess of,

 $\begin{aligned} & \text{NOTE Confidence: } 0.895192625769231 \\ & 00:48:31.600 --> 00:48:32.136 \text{ you know,} \end{aligned}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:32.136 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.308$ in some cases 55% and this persists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:35.308 --> 00:48:37.348 Five 1020 years after diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:37.348 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.981$ so we believe that this subset of

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:39.981 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.339$ patients may correspond to the late

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}48{:}42.339 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}44.239$ relapsing groups defined by PAN

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:44.239 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.189$ at all for which biomarkers have

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:46.189 --> 00:48:47.844 been lacking now adjacent to this.

 $00:48:47.844 \longrightarrow 00:48:49.099$ There are two subgroups of

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:49.099 --> 00:48:50.180 triple negative disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:50.180 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.393$ so I see 10 is a classic baselight group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:53.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.793$ You can see the risk of relapse

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:54.793 \longrightarrow 00:48:55.670$ plateaus after five years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:55.670 --> 00:48:56.978 Integrative cluster for this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:48:56.978 \longrightarrow 00:48:58.613$ ER negative group actually has

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:48:58.613 --> 00:49:00.369 a increased risk of relapse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:49:00.370 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.278$ which better mirrors the ER positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:49:02.278 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.172$ groups and they have dramatically

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}49{:}04.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}06.310$ different immune landscapes and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00:49:06.310 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.150$ over here we have our more typical risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

 $00{:}49{:}08.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}10.496$ The majority of ER positive her

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:49:10.496 --> 00:49:12.444 two negative patients who really

NOTE Confidence: 0.895192625769231

00:49:12.444 --> 00:49:14.748 show show much more modest risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:14.750 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.640$ so. Taking this information and comparing

00:49:16.640 --> 00:49:19.359 it to a sort of a typical risk group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:19.360 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.110$ we built the most powerful

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:21.110 \longrightarrow 00:49:22.510$ clinical models we could,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:22.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.610$ incorporating all of the known covariates

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:49:24.666 --> 00:49:26.640 and what I'm comparing here is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:49:26.640 --> 00:49:28.169 clinical model plus immunohistochemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:28.169 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.677$ versus integrative subtype information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:30.680 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.525$ and what I hope you can appreciate is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:49:32.525 --> 00:49:34.315 if we just look at immunohistochemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:34.315 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.845$ data to separate these groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:35.850 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.446$ we see that the risk is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:37.446 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.747$ homogenized the green line triangles

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}49{:}38.747 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}40.457$ are very similar across these groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:40.460 \longrightarrow 00:49:41.564$ whereas when we incorporate

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:41.564 \longrightarrow 00:49:42.116$ intricate subtype,

00:49:42.120 --> 00:49:43.896 we see pretty dramatic separation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}49{:}43.896 \longrightarrow 00{:}49{:}46.117$ in this varies over time and it varies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:46.120 \longrightarrow 00:49:47.113$ In a subgroup,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:47.113 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.099$ so we believe that this information

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:49.099 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.260$ informs the prediction of relapse risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:49:51.260 --> 00:49:52.580 But critically, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:52.580 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.560$ really these groups have distinct drivers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:54.560 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.392$ and so I've already talked to you about

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}49{:}56.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}58.098$ what the integrative subtypes are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:49:58.100 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.822$ This is just showing you the

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:49:59.822 --> 00:50:00.970 landscape or amplification frequency

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:01.021 \longrightarrow 00:50:02.257$ for these different drivers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:02.260 --> 00:50:02.922 \ {\rm And \ really},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}50{:}02.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}04.577$ there's many genes in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:04.577 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.100$ large copy number regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:06.100 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.120$ so pinpointing the precise

00:50:07.120 --> 00:50:08.395 driver is a challenging task,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}50{:}08.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}10.320$ but there's a number of candidates

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:10.320 \longrightarrow 00:50:12.935$ that emerge for each one and just to

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:12.935 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.760$ say that while individually these

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:14.760 \longrightarrow 00:50:16.650$ groups account for eight or five.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:16.650 \longrightarrow 00:50:19.384$ Or you know, another 8% of the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:19.384 \longrightarrow 00:50:21.854$ Together they account for 25% of all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}50{:}21.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}23.962$ ER positive, her two negative cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}50{:}23.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}26.810$ and the vast majority of distant relapses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:26.810 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.412$ And so we've been really intrigued

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:28.412 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.079$ to contemplate the fact that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:30.079 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.459$ may nominate new therapeutic targets

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}50{:}31.459 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}33.119$ in these high risk populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:33.120 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.698$ thinking about honing in on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:34.698 \longrightarrow 00:50:38.008$ downstream targets, either the FGFR.

 $00:50:38.010 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.446$ Receptor itself, or indeed the ligands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:40.450 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.075$ And of course many downstream

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:50:42.075 --> 00:50:44.260 targets in the AKT mtor pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:50:44.260 --> 00:50:46.584 And so this actually motivated us to

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:46.584 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.923$ develop a window of opportunity trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:48.923 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.053$ to evaluate new therapeutic strategies

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:50:51.053 --> 00:50:53.348 in these high risk populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:53.350 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.723$ and this is funded by the Department

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:55.723 \longrightarrow 00:50:58.230$ of Defense and and really this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:50:58.230 --> 00:50:59.904 a multicenter trial terpsichore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:50:59.904 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.796$ which we will biomarker stratify patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:02.796 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.609$ according to their integrative subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:05.610 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.256$ Assign them into these individual groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:51:08.260 --> 00:51:10.500 And conduct a window study where patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:51:10.500 --> 00:51:12.598 receive two weeks of targeted therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:12.600 \longrightarrow 00:51:15.996$ The readout of interest is a

00:51:15.996 --> 00:51:18.854 reduction in CHI 67 after therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:18.854 \longrightarrow 00:51:20.636$ and of course we're comparing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:20.636 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.462$ targeted agent alone or in combination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667 00:51:22.462 --> 00:51:22.776 Sorry, NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:22.776 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.660$ the targeted agent in combination with

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:24.715 \longrightarrow 00:51:26.779$ ending therapy or endocrine therapy alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:26.780 \longrightarrow 00:51:27.876$ and they are randomized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}51{:}27.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}29.520$ and so we're really excited about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:29.520 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.960$ This is a very ambitious trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667 00:51:30.960 --> 00:51:31.512 of course, NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:31.512 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.720$ to biomarker stratify in a very short window,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:33.720 \longrightarrow 00:51:35.232$ and to do this in the early stage setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:35.240 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.960$ but we believe that additionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.944$ by collecting on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:38.944 \longrightarrow 00:51:40.904$ And core biopsy surgical samples

 $00:51:40.904 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.100$ will actually be able to conduct

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}51{:}43.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}45.212$ similar studies to what I described

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:51:45.212 --> 00:51:47.180 before looking at the change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:47.180 \longrightarrow 00:51:49.664$ in these in these tissue samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:49.664 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.419$ in response to short term therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:52.420 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.600$ And so to enable this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:53.600 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.791$ we've really also set up a whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:55.791 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.339$ pipeline to do prospective biobanking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

00:51:58.340 --> 00:51:59.988 Both plasma tissue collection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:51:59.988 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.460$ but also the generation of organoids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00{:}52{:}02.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}04.086$ And I'll say that that's been

NOTE Confidence: 0.866668124666667

 $00:52:04.086 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.170$ really ongoing work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:05.226 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.921$ my group to establish organized

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:06.921 \longrightarrow 00:52:08.616$ models that are representative of

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:52:08.669 --> 00:52:10.595 these high risk of relapse subgroups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.276$ because in fact they are vastly

 $00:52:13.276 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.540$ underrepresented by existing cell lines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:15.540 \longrightarrow 00:52:18.020$ and this is afforded us a real opportunity

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:52:18.020 --> 00:52:20.101 to have very high quality viable

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:52:20.101 --> 00:52:22.500 material for a number of assays and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:22.500 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.201$ And I hope to share with you

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:24.201 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.939$ some of that at another time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:25.940 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.900$ but also just to say that this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}52{:}27.900 \longrightarrow 00{:}52{:}29.818$ also really fueled a new center that

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:29.818 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.840$ we have for breast cancer metastasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:31.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.694$ It's very much focused on delineating

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:33.694 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.342$ the evolutionary dynamics as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:35.342 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.778$ as micro environmental determinants

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}52{:}36.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}38.214$ of metastatic breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}52{:}38.220 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}52{:}40.355$ and it's really oriented around

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:40.355 \longrightarrow 00:52:42.063$ these integrative subgroups which

 $00:52:42.063 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.019$ we've defined seeking to define

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}52{:}44.019 \longrightarrow 00{:}52{:}45.854$ their definitive drivers as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:45.854 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.053$ as to leverage real-world data

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:48.053 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.825$ to evaluate these associations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:49.830 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.126$ but also to do a deep dive

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:52.126 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.010$ into the cellular topography.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:52:54.010 --> 00:52:56.458 Of both the primary tumor and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:52:56.458 --> 00:52:57.682 metastasis through therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:52:57.690 --> 00:52:58.899 And, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:52:58.899 \longrightarrow 00:53:00.914$ these are inexorably LinkedIn breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}53{:}00.914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}03.100$ cancer and then a final piece of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:03.100 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.908$ and sort of give you the overwhelming

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:04.908 \longrightarrow 00:53:06.996$ schematic is actually now with these

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:06.996 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.909$ organoid models that we've established.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:08.910 --> 00:53:10.760 We're actually conducting our very

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:10.760 --> 00:53:12.910 first crisper screens in 3D models

00:53:12.910 --> 00:53:14.690 to really pinpoint the definitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:14.756 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.308$ drivers of these subgroups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:16.310 \longrightarrow 00:53:17.462$ and and of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:17.462 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.902$ we hope that this information

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:18.910 --> 00:53:21.300 will ultimately inform the next

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:21.300 \longrightarrow 00:53:23.212$ wave of clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:23.220 --> 00:53:25.572 It's all closed by thanking the many

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:25.572 --> 00:53:28.167 people in my lab who led this work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077 00:53:28.170 --> 00:53:28.491 Fabulously. NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}53{:}28.491 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}30.417$ Talented scientists that it's really a

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:30.417 --> 00:53:32.528 privilege for me to work with every day.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:32.530 \longrightarrow 00:53:33.934$ And you saw some of their

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

00:53:33.934 --> 00:53:34.870 pictures along the way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:34.870 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.166$ I just want to thank our collaborators at

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:37.170 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.370$ Sarah Hurvitz densely man and Mike Press.

 $00:53:39.370 \longrightarrow 00:53:41.442$ And of course the initial work was also

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00{:}53{:}41.442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}43.669$ done in collaboration with Nanostring,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920233951923077

 $00:53:43.670 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.505$ and I'd be very happy to take any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00:53:51.090 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.058$ Great thank you Christina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00:53:53.058 \longrightarrow 00:53:54.534$ That was terrific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00{:}53{:}54.540 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}53{:}55.996$ Vic lecture and we would all be

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00:53:55.996 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.140$ clapping except that you can hear us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00:53:58.140 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.508$ You can see is the logos these days,

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00{:}54{:}00.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}04.406$ but I'm sure there must be questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00:54:04.410 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.965$ Anyone can either raise their

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00{:}54{:}05.965 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}07.973$ hand or if they have questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.775183734285714

 $00:54:07.973 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.630$ just unmute and go ahead.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61104

00:54:13.560 --> 00:54:15.960 Hi hi Christina, very nice work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61104

 $00.54:15.960 \longrightarrow 00.54:16.990$ This is iron crop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:19.320 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.664$ In the it's a very nice study when

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:21.664 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.794$ you have these the the neoadjuvant

 $00:54:23.794 \longrightarrow 00:54:26.714$ trial with the window of the her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00{:}54{:}26.714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}28.954$ therapy alone and you saw that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:28.954 \longrightarrow 00:54:31.122$ know this decrease in in her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:31.122 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.024$ signaling and increase in in immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00.54:33.024 \longrightarrow 00.54:35.173$ markers in the responders or the people

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:35.173 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.855$ who eventually would be responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00.54:36.855 \longrightarrow 00.54:40.020$ Did you see any difference in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00{:}54{:}40.020 \longrightarrow 00{:}54{:}41.742$ association when you looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:41.742 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.952$ type of her two therapy that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:43.952 \longrightarrow 00:54:45.950$ had given the potential for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

00:54:45.950 --> 00:54:47.811 putative differences met different

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

00:54:47.811 --> 00:54:49.275 mechanism action between.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795845276666667

 $00:54:49.280 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.880$ Antibodies and T keys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00{:}54{:}51.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}53.722$ Yes we did and it was something near

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:54:53.722 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.768$ and dear to my heart to explore,

00:54:55.770 --> 00:54:58.702 but I have to say we were pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

00:54:58.702 --> 00:55:00.186 underpowered because, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:00.186 \longrightarrow 00:55:02.085$ the whole trial whole trial was

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:02.085 \longrightarrow 00:55:04.010$ 130 patients and then just for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

00:55:04.071 --> 00:55:06.143 subsets that we did DSP on that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:06.143 \longrightarrow 00:55:07.929$ that there was adequate material.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:07.930 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.324$ The numbers in each of the arms were low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:10.330 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.580$ We kind of course grouped the

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:12.580 \longrightarrow 00:55:14.770$ trustees amebo only and the trustees

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

00:55:14.770 --> 00:55:17.232 met platinum are we see some hints

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:17.232 \longrightarrow 00:55:19.020$ of signal that would suggest that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

00:55:19.020 --> 00:55:21.990 You know, ABC mechanisms are are distinct,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

00:55:21.990 --> 00:55:23.834 but we're really underpowered

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:23.834 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.139$ to fully tease that apart,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

00:55:26.140 --> 00:55:27.862 and I think that it's ultimately just

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00{:}55{:}27.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}29.647$ going to require a greater sample size,

 $00:55:29.650 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.710$ but it's a wonderful question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00{:}55{:}30.710 \longrightarrow 00{:}55{:}34.710$ one that I ruminated on long and hard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:34.710 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.829$ and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:35.829 \longrightarrow 00:55:38.067$ I think I suspect that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:38.067 \longrightarrow 00:55:40.627$ that that it will be different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:40.630 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.010$ We just didn't have the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816529504

 $00:55:42.010 \longrightarrow 00:55:43.560$ Yeah, thanks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:55:48.540 --> 00:55:51.174 Right, this is my year. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00{:}55{:}51.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}53.809$ That was sharing the exciting

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00{:}55{:}53.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}56.570$ part that was really nice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:55:56.570 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.678$ Difference in the pattern?

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00{:}55{:}58.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}01.313$ You know signature or markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:01.313 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.576$ between the ACB 2 and three?

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:03.580 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.210$ If y'all look at those or with

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:56:06.210 --> 00:56:08.485 ACB 3 just you know worst thing

00:56:08.485 --> 00:56:11.077 you know the same type of markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00{:}56{:}11.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}13.768$ persisting but much worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:56:13.768 --> 00:56:15.596 Yeah, I mean we did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:15.596 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.041$ We did group them again

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:17.041 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.410$ because of power issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:56:18.410 --> 00:56:19.676 You know just in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:19.676 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.520$ stratifying further on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:56:20.520 --> 00:56:21.936 I agree it would be interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:21.936 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.880$ we could go back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:56:22.880 --> 00:56:24.945 I think we're just we're really limited

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:24.945 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.878$ by the numbers here and you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:26.880 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.319$ This was intended to be sort of a pilot

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

00:56:29.319 --> 00:56:31.359 effort to understand the technology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:31.360 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.280$ and we went back once we saw these

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:33.280 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.919$ results and gathered as many samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:34.919 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.184$ from this cohort as we could to go

00:56:37.184 --> 00:56:38.828 back and really bolster the numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:38.830 \dashrightarrow 00:56:41.053$ but I think we're still just just fall short,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:56:42.180$ and so you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:42.180 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.580$ I think would be very

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:43.580 \longrightarrow 00:56:44.700$ interesting to to do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:44.700 \longrightarrow 00:56:46.056$ Not not that there's so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:46.056 \longrightarrow 00:56:46.960$ of these additional cohorts

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:47.001 \longrightarrow 00:56:47.929$ that have on treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:56:50.380$ but there are others that are larger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:50.380 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.266$ so yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4488485674

 $00:56:51.266 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.709$ unfortunate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.967590635

00:56:54.240 --> 00:56:59.248 Thank you. Both very nice talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.967590635

 $00{:}56{:}59.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}01.340$ So for the first part of Orlando strain

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

 $00:57:02.050 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.181$ studies when where you showed pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

 $00:57:05.181 \longrightarrow 00:57:08.367$ good prediction power with on treatment

 $00:57:08.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:10.374$ parameter but not pre treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

00:57:10.374 --> 00:57:12.150 But I wonder whether you actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

00:57:12.208 --> 00:57:14.600 look like the the difference or ratio

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

00:57:14.600 --> 00:57:16.266 between some of the parameters and

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

 $00:57:16.266 \longrightarrow 00:57:17.646$ see whether there's a correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.458792016

00:57:17.650 --> 00:57:19.240 It might be better prediction power,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:19.760 \longrightarrow 00:57:22.731$ that's right so we did so initially many

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:22.731 \longrightarrow 00:57:24.537$ of our models were actually combining

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}57{:}24.537 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}26.609$ sort of trying to get at this delta.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:57:26.610 --> 00:57:29.350 The delta which I I thought was going to be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:29.350 \longrightarrow 00:57:32.500$ you know where it's at?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}57{:}32.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}34.336$ Additional information that you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:34.336 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.172$ leveraging from having these

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:36.172 \longrightarrow 00:57:38.478$ pairs and it really turned out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:38.480 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.520$ That it seems that it's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:40.520 \longrightarrow 00:57:42.581$ that the on treatment value in

00:57:42.581 --> 00:57:44.453 and of itself held its own.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:57:45.909$ It really held its own and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:45.909 \longrightarrow 00:57:47.720$ didn't get a huge benefit from that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:47.720 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.141$ Now there there may be many reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:57:49.141 --> 00:57:51.680 why I mean, I'll say that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}57{:}51.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}53.535$ we were struck by the reduction in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:53.535 \longrightarrow 00:57:55.379$ celularity in this cohort on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:55.380 \longrightarrow 00:57:56.076$ Many of these patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}57{:}56.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}57.470$ and of course we know that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:57.470 \longrightarrow 00:57:58.844$ there's cellularity estimates

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:57:58.844 \longrightarrow 00:58:00.676$ are not always concordant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:00.680 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.200$ We estimated this both molecularly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}58{:}03.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}04.790$ but obviously with expert pathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:58:06.761$ review and the sections were not

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:06.761 \longrightarrow 00:58:08.376$ identical for the different assays,

 $00:58:08.380 \longrightarrow 00:58:09.068$ of course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:09.068 \dashrightarrow 00:58:11.820$ So there were a number of cases that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:11.894 \longrightarrow 00:58:14.396$ you know had essentially 0 celularity

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:14.396 --> 00:58:17.006 upon path review on treatment more

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:17.006 \longrightarrow 00:58:18.448$ so than I would have expected we

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:18.448 \longrightarrow 00:58:20.278$ see in association with cellularity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:20.280 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.792$ But of course then what's interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:21.792 --> 00:58:24.334 is you go in with DSP and you you start

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:24.334 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.216$ to illuminate this and we can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:26.216 --> 00:58:28.700 evident tumor markers there, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}58{:}28.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}30.545$ So I mean just coming back to sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:30.545 \longrightarrow 00:58:32.419$ some of the questions about the delta,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429 00:58:32.420 --> 00:58:34.500 I think. NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:34.500 --> 00:58:34.872 Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:34.872 \longrightarrow 00:58:37.104$ You know some some questions emerge

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:37.104 --> 00:58:39.161 about like what's the heterogeneity

 $00:58:39.161 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.336$ in the pretreatment sample versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:41.336 \longrightarrow 00:58:42.641$ the on treatment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:42.650 \longrightarrow 00:58:43.928$ We're limited by the core biopsies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:43.930 --> 00:58:45.900 I think we see quite a bit of it and

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}58{:}45.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}47.806$ I I would say that we do detail some

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:47.806 \longrightarrow 00:58:49.510$ of this in the supplement and methods.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:49.510 \longrightarrow 00:58:51.092$ There's a lot of comparisons one can

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:51.092 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.248$ do if you reduce the number of regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:53.250 \longrightarrow 00:58:54.650$ which is one way to kind of come

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:58:54.650 --> 00:58:56.308 back to this question of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:56.308 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.862$ are we measuring enough in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:58:57.862 \longrightarrow 00:58:58.750$ of the delta?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}58{:}58.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}00.661$ Because we had some cases for up

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:00.661 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.596$ to four ROI's and it looked to us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:59:02.600 --> 00:59:03.317 just, you know,

 $00:59:03.317 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.990$ sort of from a study design consideration

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00{:}59{:}05.032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}06.286$ that a minimum of two regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:06.290 \longrightarrow 00:59:08.690$ Would be really helpful here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:08.690 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.300$ whether for improved that a ton is a you

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:11.300 \longrightarrow 00:59:15.360$ know another matter, not always feasible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

00:59:15.360 --> 00:59:16.050 But I think it's a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:16.050 \longrightarrow 00:59:17.290$ It's a great question that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:17.290 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.530$ was our intuition as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:18.530 \longrightarrow 00:59:19.965$ but for these various reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:19.965 \dashrightarrow 00:59:21.792$ we didn't really see a dramatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.859905728571429

 $00:59:21.792 \longrightarrow 00:59:23.116$ benefit of the delta.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:26.570 \longrightarrow 00:59:27.956$ Maybe I'll take a chance to

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:27.956 \longrightarrow 00:59:29.330$ ask a question here as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

00:59:29.330 --> 00:59:30.506 We're kind of running out of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:30.510 \longrightarrow 00:59:32.670$ but maybe we have a couple more minutes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:32.670 \longrightarrow 00:59:34.065$ In particular one of those

 $00:59:34.065 \longrightarrow 00:59:35.773$ things we struggle with is how

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

00:59:35.773 --> 00:59:37.309 many fields of you are enough,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

00:59:37.310 --> 00:59:39.214 and in your DSP study it's it

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:39.214 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.689$ looked like that there was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00.59:40.690 \longrightarrow 00:59:42.650$ You were struggling with that same thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

00:59:42.650 --> 00:59:44.967 Did you look at in in DSP?

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:59:47.168$ One of the blessings and curses of

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00{:}59{:}47.168 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}59{:}49.087$ that technology is it's way more

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00{:}59{:}49.087 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}50.905$ data than you can analyze years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:50.910 \dashrightarrow 00:59:52.611$ and there's lots of other questions I

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

00:59:52.611 --> 00:59:54.526 have for you that I'll discuss later

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00:59:54.526 \longrightarrow 00:59:56.520$ about other ways of analyzing that data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00{:}59{:}56.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}59.112$ Did you look at averaging your

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $00{:}59{:}59.112 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}01.466$ fields of view versus looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $01:00:01.466 \longrightarrow 01:00:03.226$ them individually and with that

 $01:00:03.226 \longrightarrow 01:00:05.390$ with the average or individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

01:00:05.390 --> 01:00:06.785 fields more informative?

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $01:00:06.790 \longrightarrow 01:00:09.463$ And did you look also at like how many

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $01:00:09.470 \longrightarrow 01:00:11.437$ you know comparing 2 versus 6 that

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

 $01:00:11.437 \longrightarrow 01:00:13.580$ looked like you had different numbers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.889476086666667

01:00:13.580 --> 01:00:14.168 Can you comment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:14.180 \longrightarrow 01:00:14.914$ That's right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:14.914 --> 01:00:17.116 Yeah, it's a hugely important question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:17.120 \longrightarrow 01:00:19.354$ I would say we were very.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:19.354 \longrightarrow 01:00:21.730$ We spent a lot of time trying to parse

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:21.795 \longrightarrow 01:00:24.252$ this with this with the data that we had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:24.260 --> 01:00:27.404 I think that some of the analysis I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:27.404 \longrightarrow 01:00:30.430$ presented we did indeed take the average.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:30.430 \longrightarrow 01:00:32.320$ There are ways to also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:32.320 --> 01:00:33.900 you know, wait that information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:33.900 \longrightarrow 01:00:36.444$ but in the sort of logistic regression

01:00:36.444 --> 01:00:37.954 models we were actually predicting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:37.960 \longrightarrow 01:00:41.138$ we did take an average across them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:41.140 --> 01:00:42.500 We subsequently, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:42.500 \longrightarrow 01:00:44.200$ we also investigated sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:44.200 --> 01:00:45.110 What if you had only?

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:45.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.369$ One versus 2 versus 4 and some had up

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:47.369 --> 01:00:49.826 to six and and as I sort of hinted at

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:49.826 \longrightarrow 01:00:52.362$ and actually analogous to what we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:52.362 \longrightarrow 01:00:54.384$ seen with genomic heterogeneity at

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:54.384 \longrightarrow 01:00:56.256$ minimum of two regions gets you a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:00:56.256 --> 01:00:58.269 this ability to say anything about

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:58.269 \longrightarrow 01:00:59.989$ how heterogeneous these markers are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:00:59.990 \longrightarrow 01:01:03.080$ even between sort of two regions

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:03.080 \longrightarrow 01:01:04.625$ is hugely important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:04.630 --> 01:01:04.902 informative,

 $01:01:04.902 \longrightarrow 01:01:07.078$ and then there starts to be what appears

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:07.078 --> 01:01:09.328 to be a trail off in terms of the added

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:09.328 --> 01:01:11.047 benefit when you get up higher to six,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:11.050 --> 01:01:11.458 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:11.458 --> 01:01:13.090 I think I wouldn't stake my life on

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:13.142 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.794$ whether choose the absolute Max we we

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:14.794 \longrightarrow 01:01:16.537$ try to collect more whenever possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:16.537 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.505$ because we're interested in the discovery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:18.510 --> 01:01:18.924 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:18.924 \longrightarrow 01:01:20.166$ and sort of questions around this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01{:}01{:}20.170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}22.519$ And I, I think also questions arise as to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:22.520 --> 01:01:24.167 you know how variable is this going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:24.167 --> 01:01:27.330 for different subgroups of disease, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

01:01:27.330 --> 01:01:28.996 So I don't think we've mastered that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:29.000 \longrightarrow 01:01:31.718$ but I felt at least encouraged that with two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:31.720 \longrightarrow 01:01:34.584$ We seem to be gaining information that that

 $01{:}01{:}34.584 \to 01{:}01{:}36.720$ the heterogeneity itself was informative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875 01:01:36.720 --> 01:01:36.990 Yeah, NOTE Confidence: 0.85785495875

 $01:01:37.570 \longrightarrow 01:01:39.680$ great thanks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920342458

 $01:01:39.680 \longrightarrow 01:01:40.660$ Are there any other questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.920342458

01:01:40.660 --> 01:01:42.440 Were already 5 minutes past,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920342458

01:01:42.440 --> 01:01:44.180 but if there's one more question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920342458

 $01:01:44.180 \longrightarrow 01:01:45.566$ maybe we could take that if not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.913292115714286

 $01:01:47.750 \longrightarrow 01:01:49.787$ I don't see anyone raising their hands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.913292115714286

 $01:01:49.790 \longrightarrow 01:01:52.748$ so I'll assume that we're all

NOTE Confidence: 0.913292115714286

 $01:01:52.750 \longrightarrow 01:01:54.520$ happy with where we are and

NOTE Confidence: 0.913292115714286

 $01:01:54.520 \longrightarrow 01:01:56.838$ thank you very much for a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.913292115714286

 $01:01:56.838 \longrightarrow 01:01:58.530$ interesting lecture and well, thank.

NOTE Confidence: 0.913292115714286

 $01:01:58.530 \longrightarrow 01:02:00.080$ Thank you all for joining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328743

 $01:02:01.280 \longrightarrow 01:02:01.750$ Thank you.