WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:59:41"

NOTE recognizability:0.788

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.847751033636364

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:02.025 I'm doctor Mary. I'm lustberg.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847751033636364

 $00:00:02.025 \rightarrow 00:00:04.790$ Thank you for joining in person and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847751033636364

 $00:00:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.740$ for those of you joining online.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}09{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}14.494$ I'm pleased to introduce Doctor Louis

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:14.494 \rightarrow 00:00:19.320$ Pushti as today's ground round speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:19.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:22.470$ Doctor Pushki is professor of medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:22.470 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.770$ And Co director of the genomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:24.770 --> 00:00:26.411 genetics and Epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:26.411 \rightarrow 00:00:29.146$ Research program here at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}29.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}31.500$ He received his medical degree

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:31.500 --> 00:00:33.580 from Semmelweis University of

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}33.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37.057$ Medicine in Budapest and his Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:37.057 - > 00:00:39.302 of Philosophy degree from the

00:00:39.302 --> 00:00:41.679 University of Oxford in England.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:41.680 --> 00:00:44.105 His research group has made

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}44.105 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.045$ important contributions to establish

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:46.045 \rightarrow 00:00:48.358$ that estrogen receptor positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:48.358 \dashrightarrow 00:00:51.278$ and negative breast cancers have

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:51.278 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.220$ fundamentally different molecular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:53.220 --> 00:00:57.860 clinical and epidemiological characteristics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:57.860 --> 00:01:01.046 He's been a pioneer in evaluating

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}01{.}046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03{.}170$ gene expression profiling as

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:01:03.262 --> 00:01:05.320 a diagnostic technology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:05.320 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.580$ To predict chemotherapy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:08.580 \dashrightarrow 00:01:11.025$ endocrine the rapy sensitivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}11{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}13{.}946$ And as shown that different biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:13.950 \rightarrow 00:01:16.438$ processes are involved in determining

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:16.438 \longrightarrow 00:01:18.950$ the prognosis and treatment response

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:18.950 \rightarrow 00:01:23.090$ in different breast cancer subtype.

 $00:01:23.090 \dashrightarrow 00:01:25.976$ His group has also developed new

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:25.976 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.900$ bioinformatics tools to integrate

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:27.982 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.938$ information from across different

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}29{.}938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}32{.}872$ data platforms in order to define

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:32.947 \dashrightarrow 00:01:35.207$ the molecular pathways that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}35{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}37{.}490$ disturbed in individual cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:37.490 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.990$ and could provide the basis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:39.990 \rightarrow 00:01:42.770$ For individualized treatment strategies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}01{:}45{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}47{.}542$ Doctor Pushki is a trusted colleague

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}01{:}47.542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}50.446$ here at Yale and is a principal

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00:01:50.446 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.990$ investigator of several clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}01{:}51{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}54{.}770$ trials investigating new drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00:01:54.770 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.245$ including immunotherapies for breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

00:01:58.250 --> 00:02:01.500 He's published over 250 scientific

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

00:02:01.500 --> 00:02:05.283 manuscripts in high impact medical journals

 $00:02:05.283 \longrightarrow 00:02:09.090$ and is among the top 1% most highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}02{:}09{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}12{.}140$ cited clinical investigators in medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.9487658

 $00:02:12.150 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.350$ over the past 10 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859605108333333

00:02:14.960 --> 00:02:17.520 Today he will speak on breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859605108333333

 $00{:}02{:}17.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}21.200$ moving ever closer to cure for all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859605108333333

 $00{:}02{:}21.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}22.856$ Thank you so much Doctor Pushkar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:28.940 \dashrightarrow 00:02:31.136$ You can go ahead and start using this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:02:31.136 --> 00:02:31.994 Thank you, Mary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}02{:}31{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34{.}020$ I'm so if you're OK with you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}02{:}34.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}35.616$ I will take this mask off because

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:02:35.616 --> 00:02:37.392 having a mask, my accent and my

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:37.392 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.757$ voice would be really serious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:38.760 \dashrightarrow 00:02:41.640$ Triple hit against me from the get go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:02:41.640 --> 00:02:43.936 So I hope it's OK with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:43.940 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.554$ It's delighted to see that some

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:45.554 \rightarrow 00:02:47.334$ people are in the auditorium because

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- 00:02:47.334 --> 00:02:49.595 I actually forgot how to get here.

 $00{:}02{:}49{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}52{.}444$ So I really sympathize with those of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:52.444 \rightarrow 00:02:54.488$ you who are actually online with this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:54.490 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.480$ So I think I need to start

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:58.480 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.210$ with my disclosure slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:01.210 \rightarrow 00:03:03.289$ And then before I start my slides,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.180$ I would actually like to make a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:05.180 \rightarrow 00:03:07.207$ confession to you and admit a weakness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:07.210 --> 00:03:07.999 It's not chocolate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:07.999 --> 00:03:10.367 but I do feel like a child in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:10.367 -> 00:03:12.005 in a candy store surrounded by a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:12.005 --> 00:03:14.517 lot of really delicious and very

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}14{.}517 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}15{.}846$ interesting scientific questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}15.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18.271$ So my weakness is that I have a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:18.271 \rightarrow 00:03:20.545$ eclectic and very broad range of interests.

 $00:03:20.550 \longrightarrow 00:03:21.414$ And don't be scared,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:21.414 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.013$ I'm not going to talk about all

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:23.013 \rightarrow 00:03:23.787$ of these questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:23.790 \dashrightarrow 00:03:25.870$ but these are the type of questions that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:25.870 - 00:03:28.005 My group has been studying in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:28.005 \dashrightarrow 00:03:30.390$ past few years and I showed this here NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.427$ for you to forgive me and understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:32.427 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.710$ why I don't show up to most of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:36.710 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.638$ Administrative meetings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:37.638 \rightarrow 00:03:39.958$ so these studying things like

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:39.958 --> 00:03:40.886 cost effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}40.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}42.460$ what's the best cost effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:42.460 - 00:03:44.030 strategy in the new adjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:44.090 \rightarrow 00:03:45.690$ setting for for breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:45.690 \rightarrow 00:03:47.382$ why some preoperative chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:47.382 \rightarrow 00:03:49.497$ regimens produce high response rates

 $00:03:49.497 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.723$ but very little improvement in survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}51{.}723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}53{.}984$ and other regiments to the opposite

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:53.984 \dashrightarrow 00:03:55.788$ small improvements in response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:55.790 - 00:03:57.330 large improvements in survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.077$ Why there is some women develop breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}00{.}077 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}02{.}646$ cancer 20-30 years before the median age?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}02{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}04{.}810$ Could we develop some sort of a tool to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}04{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}06{.}958$ sum up all the genomic abnormalities?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}06{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}09{.}366$ From germline and somatic regions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}09{.}366 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}11{.}432$ would actually describe the capture

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:11.432 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.826$ the totality of abnormalities in atom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:04:13.830 --> 00:04:15.888 How comes that summer stragen receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}15.888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18.289$ positive cancers recur as they are negative?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:04:18.290 --> 00:04:20.168 You know some ER positive cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:20.168 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.050$ are not fully ER positive,

- $00:04:22.050 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.656 3040\%$ positive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}04{:}22.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}25.080$ So what are the rest of those cells
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:25.142 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.450$ which are ER negative?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.385$ What's their relationship to the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:28.385 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.546$ ER positive cells?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}04{:}29{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}31{.}968$ What novel the rapeutic strategies one could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- 00:04:31.968 --> 00:04:35.308 dig out from high dimensional genomic data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:35.310 \rightarrow 00:04:37.920$ So what is the molecular phylogenetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- 00:04:37.920 --> 00:04:39.225 relationship between different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:39.225 \rightarrow 00:04:41.367$ metastatic lesions and the primary tumor?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}04{:}41{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}43{.}205$ Is these different for synchronous
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:43.205 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.306$ mats against asynchronous?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- 00:04:44.310 --> 00:04:46.515 That's you know why some Kansas are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:46.515 \dashrightarrow 00:04:48.478$ immune reaction immune poor was the NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- 00:04:48.478 --> 00:04:50.398 difference between the immune rich ER NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:50.398 \rightarrow 00:04:52.407$ positive and PR negative terms is there

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}04{:}52{.}407 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}54{.}064$ a difference in the microenvironment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}04{:}54{.}064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57{.}448$ that's race influence this so really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:04:57.448 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.679$ study all of these things and.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:00.680 \dashrightarrow 00:05:02.400$ You can look at the publications on them.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}05{:}02{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}04{.}176$ So I'm only going to focus on a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:04.176 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.170$ few which I think have a longer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:06.170 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.012$ trajectory and contributed to the to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}05{:}08.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09.477$ this remarkable events that happened
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}05{:}09{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}11{.}991$ in the past 20 years that breast
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:11.991 \rightarrow 00:05:14.226$ cancer survival and mortality decline,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:14.230 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.840$ mortality decline by about 50%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:16.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.796$ I think this is primarily driven
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00:05:18.796 \rightarrow 00:05:20.461$ by new treatment strategies based
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}05{:}20.461 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.981$ on better understanding of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054
- $00{:}05{:}21{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}23{.}197$ disease and the new
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:23.257 \rightarrow 00:05:25.159$ classes of drugs that we developed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}25{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}27{.}338$ And I think the journey is

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:27.338 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.360$ just just about to begin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}29{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32{.}310$ So how new treatment strategies

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}32{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}34{.}080$ could influence outcome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.480$ So in the early 2000s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}36{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38{.}461$ I was in the right place at

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:05:38.461 -> 00:05:40.390 the right time at MD Anderson,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}40{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}42{.}045$ we were interested to explore

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}42.045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}43.038$ period preoperative chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}43.038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}44.821$ for women who actually had operable

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:44.821 \rightarrow 00:05:46.423$ disease and we assumed that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}46.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}48.208$ would end up with a better cosmetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}48.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.288$ outcome as smaller disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:05:49.288 --> 00:05:50.600 And at that time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:50.600 \rightarrow 00:05:52.346$ it was a pretty controversial idea

 $00:05:52.346 \rightarrow 00:05:54.405$ and there was really no good way

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:54.405 \dashrightarrow 00:05:55.795$ to either define the response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:55.800 \rightarrow 00:05:57.360$ How do you measure the efficacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:57.360 \rightarrow 00:05:58.400$ of these preoperative regiments?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:05:58.400 --> 00:06:00.176 Do you measure it by response?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:00.180 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.980$ On imaging or we measured by

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}01.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}03.720$ the extent of residual disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:03.720 \dashrightarrow 00:06:05.634$ So we proposed the the definition

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}05{.}634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}07{.}292$ which eventually become the standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:07.292 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.236$ of care definition that you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:09.236 \dashrightarrow 00:06:11.069$ no residual invasive cancer in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:11.069 --> 00:06:12.938 breast or lymph nodes and that's kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}12.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}14.916$ of the best outcome that you could get.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}14.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}17.212$ So with this definition it pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:17.212 \dashrightarrow 00:06:18.740$ quickly become available become

 $00:06:18.803 \rightarrow 00:06:20.919$ obvious that individuals accomplish

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:20.919 \rightarrow 00:06:23.035$ this complete pathological response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:23.040 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.516$ It really well regardless of what

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:24.516 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.949$ type of breast cancer they had,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}25{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}27{.}665$ they are positive or negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}27.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28.694$ or too positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}28.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}30.924$ Those who had residual disease didn't do so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:30.930 \rightarrow 00:06:32.841$ And this immediately defines you what you

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:32.841 \dashrightarrow 00:06:34.887$ actually want to accomplish in the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:34.890 --> 00:06:35.180 right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}35{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}36{.}920$ You want to put more patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:36.920 \rightarrow 00:06:38.322$ into these pathologic CR category

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}38{.}322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}39{.}750$ and you want to hurt harm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:39.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.689$ Do you wanna help those who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:41.689 \rightarrow 00:06:43.410$ in the residual disease group?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:43.410 \rightarrow 00:06:45.300$ So we did that in the past 20 years.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373
- $00:06:45.300 \rightarrow 00:06:49.930$ So you see the evolution of the chemotherapy.

00:06:49.930 --> 00:06:50.222 Regiments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:50.222 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.974$ in 2008 when we published this

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:51.974 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.769$ paper on the survival curves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}53.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55.302$ the best chemotherapy was

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:55.302 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.068$ Taxol anthracyclines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:56.070 \rightarrow 00:06:58.070$ It produced about a 3035%

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:58.070 \rightarrow 00:06:59.466$ response complete response rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:59.466 \dashrightarrow 00:07:00.862$ in particular negative disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:00.862 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.648$ and now we have doubled that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:02.650 - 00:07:04.450 So now we actually accomplish

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}04.450$ --> $00{:}07{:}06.794$ about a 63% complete response rate NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:06.794 --> 00:07:08.824 by adding an immunotherapy drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:08.830 \dashrightarrow 00:07:11.224$ And you also learn that adding other NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:11.224-->00:07:12.727 chemotherapy agents like carboplatin NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:12.727 \rightarrow 00:07:14.827$ improves the pathologic CR rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:14.830 --> 00:07:16.370 We have regiments that don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:16.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.602$ include the anthracyclines that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:17.602 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.286$ some of my colleagues think that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}19.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}21.936$ Is the chemical incarnation of the devil.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}21{.}940$ --> $00{:}07{:}24{.}894$ Also there are even single agent the rapies, NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:24.900 \dashrightarrow 00:07:27.170$ targeted the rapies like PARP inhibitors

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.986$ that produce pretty respectable

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}28.986 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.660$ pathology company eradication of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}30.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}33.104$ the cancer before surgery in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:33.104 \dashrightarrow 00:07:34.460$ germline Brockhampton patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}34{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}36{.}868$ But we also made him really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}36.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}38.964$ improvements for in the life of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}38.964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}40.624$ those who have residual disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}40.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}42.634$ So those are three randomized clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:42.634 \longrightarrow 00:07:44.321$ trials that established the value

 $00:07:44.321 \rightarrow 00:07:45.791$ of giving capsidae in chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}45.791 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.778$ for those and the residual disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}47.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}49.298$ with triple negative cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:49.300 \dashrightarrow 00:07:51.430$ And the Olympia study showed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:51.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.026$ that whole party improves the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}53.026 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}54.571$ response within a similar population

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}54{.}571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56{.}329$ if the average germline Broca's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:56.330 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.106$ And the Catherine study did the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}58.106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}00.193$ same for the record TDM one or

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:08:00.193 \dashrightarrow 00:08:02.146$ Godzilla for her to post the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}08{:}02{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}03{.}860$ But I want to spend a few minutes on

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}08{:}03{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}06{.}158$ how do we get there, in particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}08{:}06{.}158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}10.662$ how we actually came about to establish

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}08{:}10.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}13.877$ the value of immunotherapy in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}13.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}16.036$ In breast cancer. So the roots of

 $00:08:16.036 \rightarrow 00:08:17.827$ this idea that immunotherapy might

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}17.827 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}20.215$ work in breast cancer has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:20.215 \dashrightarrow 00:08:22.560$ long rooted in preclinical studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:22.560 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.912$ But also in the early 2000s a number

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:24.912 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.775$ of of groups reported that even in

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}27.775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}29.980$ patients who only receive surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}29{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}32{.}532$ the amount of immune cells in the tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:32.532 \rightarrow 00:08:34.200$ microenvironment is hugely prognostic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}34{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}36{.}216$ So this is what the the first half of

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:36.216 \rightarrow 00:08:37.983$ this slide shows you survival curves

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}37{.}983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}39{.}897$ for patients who did not receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:39.897 \rightarrow 00:08:41.717$ any other treatment than surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.048$ they were stratified into three groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:44.050 \rightarrow 00:08:45.566$ Little high immune presence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}45.566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}47.461$ intermediate in presence or low

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:47.461 \rightarrow 00:08:49.341$ immune presence and you see that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}08{:}49{.}341 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}51{.}502$ that the the immune cells have a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}08{:}51{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}53{.}470$ massive prognostic value in all three
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}08{:}53.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}55.646$ categories of of breast cancer subtypes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:08:55.646 \rightarrow 00:08:57.920$ including the the ER positive patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}08{:}57{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59{.}656$ And what we used in this particular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:08:59.656 \rightarrow 00:09:01.452$ study was gene signature to define
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}09{:}01{.}452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}02{.}445$ the immune richness.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:09:02.450 \rightarrow 00:09:04.850$ They're in the same time German
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:09:04.850 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.450$ investigators showed that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:09:06.518 \rightarrow 00:09:08.840$ the presence of immune cells also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:09:08.840 \rightarrow 00:09:10.670$ predicts the probability of complete
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:09:10.670 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.390$ pathological response.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00:09:11.390 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.292$ But this slide shows you 32 important things.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}09{:}14.292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}16.929$ One is that in the red circles you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652
- $00{:}09{:}16{.}929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}18{.}814$ see the pathologic computer response
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:18.814 \rightarrow 00:09:22.538$ rates by tumor infiltrating into side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:22.540 --> 00:09:22.893 Presence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:22.893 - > 00:09:25.011 So they grouped the cases into

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:25.011 \rightarrow 00:09:26.430$ no lymphocytes, some lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:26.430 \longrightarrow 00:09:27.850$ lymphocyte predominant and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:27.850 \dashrightarrow 00:09:29.810$ see that the pathologic CR rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}29{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}31{.}504$ these numbers in the in the little

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:31.504 \dashrightarrow 00:09:33.251$ blood red circles increase as you

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:33.251 \rightarrow 00:09:34.706$ have more and more lymphocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:34.710 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.176$ So for example in the blue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:37.180 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.940$ so the square or highlighted

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:39.940 \dashrightarrow 00:09:42.700$ area and ER positive disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:42.700 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.660$ we know lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:43.660 \rightarrow 00:09:45.477$ it's a very small 6% PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:45.477 --> 00:09:46.996 If you have a lot of lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:47.000 - 00:09:49.922 it goes up to a respectable 23% and you see

 $00:09:49.922 \rightarrow 00:09:52.480$ this same trend across all the subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}52{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}53{.}698$ So of course these observations lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:53.698 \dashrightarrow 00:09:55.440$ to a lot of other questions then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:55.440 \rightarrow 00:09:57.484$ So why some breast cancers are immune,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}57{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}59{.}335$ originalists don't is the immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}59{.}335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}00{.}442$ microenvironment differ between

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:00.442 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.250$ the primary system and the maths,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:02.250 \rightarrow 00:10:05.373$ it's a different by ER subtype or by race?

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}05{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}07{.}240$ And ultimately the the most important

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:07.240 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.324$ question is this a causal relationship

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:09.324 \rightarrow 00:10:11.682$ or immune cell presence is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}11.682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}13.811$ responsible for the good outcome or

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}13.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}15.737$ it's just an association that reflects

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:15.740 \rightarrow 00:10:17.244$ some other underlying biology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}17{.}244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}19{.}500$ So when these papers were published,

00:10:19.500 --> 00:10:21.089 you couldn't really test this in people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:21.090 \rightarrow 00:10:22.550$ there were no chemotherapy drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}22{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24{.}414$ But now we have and we actually have

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}24.414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.118$ the answer to most of these and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:26.118 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.631$ put there some of the publications

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}27.631 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}29.635$ that that address these these issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:31.880 --> 00:10:34.283 So I want to share with you some results

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:34.283 \rightarrow 00:10:36.645$ which I think really informed a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:36.645 \rightarrow 00:10:38.887$ my thinking about the value of the NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:38.887 \rightarrow 00:10:40.996$ role of immune system in breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00{:}10{:}40.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}43.782$ So a few years ago Anton Sofronoff

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:43.782 --> 00:10:46.508 was a medical student here at. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:46.508 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.594$ At that time took on this project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00{:}10{:}48.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}51.232$ but downloaded all the CG data or an

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:51.232 --> 00:10:53.664 AC DNA copy number, mutation data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:53.664 \rightarrow 00:10:55.986$ germline snips and ask this question.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- $00:10:55.990 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.880$ So what drives the immune infiltration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- $00:10:57.880 \rightarrow 00:10:58.825$ and breast cancers?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- 00:10:58.830 --> 00:11:00.810 So we looked at Chrono Heterogeneity,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- 00:11:00.810 --> 00:11:02.510 mutation load, new antigen load,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- $00:11:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.016$ copy number variations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- $00:11:04.016 \rightarrow 00:11:05.020$ germline snips,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- 00:11:05.020 --> 00:11:07.068 single gene somatic mutations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- 00:11:07.068 --> 00:11:08.604 pathway level abnormalities,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- $00{:}11{:}08.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}10.740$ which of these is associated with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- 00:11:10.740 --> 00:11:11.805 high immune presence,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333
- $00:11:11.810 \longrightarrow 00:11:13.250$ whether you think the results showed?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88883495
- 00:11:15.410 --> 00:11:17.520 So. Gosh.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}11{:}22.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.755$ So the results are actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- 00:11:24.755 --> 00:11:25.669 quite counterintuitive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}11{:}25.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}27.742$ So what this shows you is a correlation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:27.742 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.446$ matrix of about 12 immune gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:29.446 \rightarrow 00:11:31.472$ signatures that we use to define the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:31.472 --> 00:11:33.474 immune presence or absence or in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:33.474 \rightarrow 00:11:35.626$ richness and about 6 genomic features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}11{:}35.626 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38.519$ So the darker brown shows a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:38.519 --> 00:11:40.784 correlation value and the darker

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:40.784 \dashrightarrow 00:11:43.570$ blue shows a negative correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:43.570 --> 00:11:45.292 And you see right away that

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:45.292 --> 00:11:46.861 the immune gene signatures are

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:46.861 - 00:11:48.309 highly correlated one another,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:48.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.375$ whereas they are not correlated

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:49.375 \rightarrow 00:11:50.728$ very closely at all. In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:50.728 \rightarrow 00:11:52.720$ they are anti correlated with many of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:52.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.404$ Economic features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}11{:}53{.}404 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}55{.}798$ So and you see this across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:55.798 \rightarrow 00:11:57.830$ board in all the three subtypes.

 $00:11:57.830 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.504$ So in in primary breast cancer greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}00{.}504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}02{.}550$ chromo heterogeneity and higher mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}02{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04{.}640$ and neoantigen loads are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}04.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}06.750$ with lower immune infiltration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}06.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}08.486$ So there was such a weird finding

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:08.486 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.090$ that we actually teamed up with

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:12:10.090 - 00:12:11.710 with the A colleague from Germany,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:11.710 \rightarrow 00:12:14.338$ Thomas Cohn to really confirm this

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}14.338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}17.250$ in an independent data set data sets

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}17{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20{.}225$ and we find the same same result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:20.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.790$ So why is this interesting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}22.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}24.995$ Because even though we found no share

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}24{.}995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26{.}679$ genomic alterations that drive the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}26.679 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28.384$ immune infiltration in breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:28.390 \rightarrow 00:12:30.406$ we really find a strong supportive

 $00:12:30.406 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.523$ evidence that there is an active

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:32.523 \rightarrow 00:12:34.647$ immune editing in early stage disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:34.650 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.962$ right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:34.962 \rightarrow 00:12:37.458$ So a lot of immune cells in actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:37.458 \rightarrow 00:12:38.995$ called remove chromo heterogeneity

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}38{.}995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41{.}704$ and that's why you have a chromoly

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}41.767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}43.975$ simple tumor and actually a lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}43.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}45.982$ your antigen load because the cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}45{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}47{.}578$ cells with the high neoantigen load

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}47.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}49.128$ are removed by the immune system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:49.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.230$ So that's really attractive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:51.230 \rightarrow 00:12:54.380$ Hypothesis and it makes testable predictions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:54.380 \rightarrow 00:12:56.980$ So one prediction is that even tumor cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}56{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59{.}720$ sort of undergo medical transformation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}59{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01{.}340$ Some of it could be eliminated

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.420$ by the immune system.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:02.420 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.460$ So if that's really true,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:03.460 \rightarrow 00:13:05.100$ then then actually immunotherapy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}13{:}05{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}06{.}740$ should work as chemoprevention.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- 00:13:06.740 --> 00:13:08.316 Of course, it's too toxic to do that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.900$ but the concept is important.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:09.900 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.867$ So we're going to test this in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:11.867 \rightarrow 00:13:13.651$ an ongoing large event trial that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}13{:}13{.}651 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}15{.}702$ uses symbolism for a year to see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}13{:}15.763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}17.171$ whether it alters contralateral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- 00:13:17.171 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:13:19.126 breast cancer events and also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:19.126 \rightarrow 00:13:21.210$ whether it alters breast density.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}13{:}21{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}23{.}862$ Which is sort of a somewhat
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- 00:13:23.862 --> 00:13:25.188 validated risk predictor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}13{:}25{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}26{.}961$ But the most important consequence is this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}13{:}26{.}961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}29{.}239$ that when we actually diagnose these cancers,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:29.240 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.508$ there may be a quasi equilibrium fight

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:31.508 \rightarrow 00:13:33.787$ between the immune system and the cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:33.790 \rightarrow 00:13:35.446$ So when there are a lot of immune cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:35.450 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.352$ it's kind of indicate that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:37.352 --> 00:13:39.367 immune system is having almost upper

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}13{:}39{.}367 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41{.}754$ hand and that's why it actually is

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:41.754 \rightarrow 00:13:43.449$ associated with better prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:43.450 \rightarrow 00:13:45.284$ But at that stage you might actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}13{:}45{.}284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47{.}127$ help tip the balance towards the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}13{:}47.127 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}49.119$ immune system by chemotherapy or by

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}13{:}49{.}119$ --> $00{:}13{:}51{.}168$ immune checkpoint inhibitors and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:51.170 - 00:13:52.874 Do not have the drugs to test this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.434$ And we actually launched 4 studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:54.434 \rightarrow 00:13:55.802$ to to address these questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:55.802 \rightarrow 00:13:57.488$ and three of them have results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:57.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.816$ and I'll show that to you.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:13:58.820 \rightarrow 00:14:01.494$ But the third prediction is also interesting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- 00:14:01.500 --> 00:14:01.850 right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- 00:14:01.850 --> 00:14:04.300 So if you really follow this logic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:14:04.300 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.940$ then the metastatic disease should
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}14{:}05{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07{.}980$ really arrive through an immune escape.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00{:}14{:}07{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}09{.}835$ So we did a series of studies
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857
- $00:14:09.835 \rightarrow 00:14:10.630$ to compare primary
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:14:10.694 \rightarrow 00:14:12.612$ exams and maths, and it's among the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}14{:}12.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}14.160$ first groups to show that actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}14{:}14{.}214 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}16{.}314$ metastatic lesions in breast cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:14:16.314 \rightarrow 00:14:17.574$ are profoundly immunocompromised.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}14{:}17.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}20.562$ And we also looked at whether there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}14{:}20.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}22.610$ is subtle variations by sight.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}14{:}22.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}24.668$ So now these are all sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:14:24.670 \rightarrow 00:14:26.306$ relatively valid accepted principles.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:14:26.306 --> 00:14:29.289 I I thought I showed this to you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}29{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}30{.}780$ especially for those of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:30.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.972$ who are younger investigators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:31.980 \rightarrow 00:14:33.932$ So there are risks of being coming up

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:33.932 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.939$ with an idea too early or too late.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:35.940 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.010$ So this particular idea came

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:37.010 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.400$ on a little bit too early.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:14:38.400 - 00:14:40.740 In 2012, about a month of Tiki came here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:14:40.740 --> 00:14:43.372 I approached Merck to do 2 large

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:43.372 \dashrightarrow 00:14:45.940$ studies in the curative setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}45{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}47{.}676$ What was the neoadjuvant trial to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:47.676 \rightarrow 00:14:49.477$ whether we could actually push the PCR?

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}49{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}51{.}216$ It's up based on the associations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}51{.}216 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}53{.}078$ I showed you to test the causality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:53.080 \rightarrow 00:14:54.354$ The other one was an adjuvant study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:54.360 \rightarrow 00:14:56.474$ We could actually improve the outcome by

- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:14:56.474 \rightarrow 00:14:58.269$ giving people liberalism out and eradicate.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:14:58.270 \rightarrow 00:15:00.230$ Micromedex and this is what they said,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:00.230 \rightarrow 00:15:02.218$ sorry you're unable to avoid the drug
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}02{.}218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04{.}365$ and the monetary support at this time
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:04.365 \rightarrow 00:15:06.225$ due to unclear regularly path forward.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}06{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}08{.}043$ But it was three years later they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}08{.}043 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}09{.}563$ actually realized that there is a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:09.563 \rightarrow 00:15:10.949$ path forward and they actually run
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}10{.}949 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}12{.}554$ both of these studies or or agree to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:12.554 \rightarrow 00:15:14.790$ do it and they to their credit they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.869$ actually invited me back to their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}16.869 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.975$ steering committee of the new adjuvant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}18.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.598$ trial and I lead the adjuvant trial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}21.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}23.959$ So what do these studies show it?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}23.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}26.270$ This is just the selection that is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:26.270 \rightarrow 00:15:28.331$ representative of the findings from

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:28.331 \rightarrow 00:15:30.339$ the neoadjuvant immunotherapy trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:30.340 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.284$ And they were lounged in triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:32.284 \rightarrow 00:15:33.994$ negative disease because of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:33.994 \rightarrow 00:15:35.754$ really strong association of immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}15{:}35{.}754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38{.}025$ cells with pathologic CR or strong

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}15{:}38.025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}39.637$ strong association with prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:39.640 \rightarrow 00:15:41.440$ And by and large triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:41.440 \rightarrow 00:15:43.638$ cancers have a higher in your presence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:43.640 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.434$ So all these studies took place

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:45.434 \rightarrow 00:15:47.380$ in that space except one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}15{:}47{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}48{.}748$ the ice spy all talk to you a

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:15:48.748 --> 00:15:49.739 little bit more about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:49.740 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.324$ So what this study shows is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:51.324 \rightarrow 00:15:52.729$ the computer response rates improved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:52.730 \rightarrow 00:15:54.606$ Didn't have as much as we thought.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:54.610 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.666$ So the largest study keynote 5 to 2,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}15{:}56.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}58.580$ the Merck study showed improvement
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:15:58.580 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.819$ about 7 percent, 56 to 63.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}16{:}00{.}819 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}02{.}271$ Really underwhelming because chemotherapy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:02.271 \rightarrow 00:16:04.829$ trials could do double digit improvements.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.170$ Yet the chemo studies actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:06.170 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.510$ didn't really improve the event
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:07.562 \rightarrow 00:16:08.950$ free survival that dramatically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00{:}16{:}08{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}10{.}055$ Often times it didn't deal with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- 00:16:10.055 00:16:11.490 it all to a significant extent.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:11.490 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.510$ But keynote 522 did.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:12.510 \rightarrow 00:16:15.230$ You see the same in an even smaller study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- 00:16:15.230 --> 00:16:15.556 paranormal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- 00:16:15.556 --> 00:16:18.480 They're also showed a 9% even PCR rate.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154
- $00:16:18.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.770$ Not even significant,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:19.770 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.227$ but the event free survival was significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:22.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.958$ The other?

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:16:22.958 --> 00:16:25.142 Important finding in this sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:25.142 \longrightarrow 00:16:27.069$ or observation from these studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}16{:}27.069 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.959$ is that in metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}16{:}28{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}30{.}900$ again parallelism have improved the

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:30.900 \rightarrow 00:16:32.840$ outcome when combined with chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:32.840 \rightarrow 00:16:34.696$ But this was only seen in the pediatric

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}16{:}34{.}696 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}35{.}980$ and positive patients whereas in

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:35.980 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.528$ the early stage setting you don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:37.528 \rightarrow 00:16:38.999$ need to have Pedialyte and one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:39.000 \rightarrow 00:16:40.596$ So that confuses a lot of people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:40.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.182$ But I think there is a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:42.182 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.860$ simple and elegant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:16:42.915 \rightarrow 00:16:44.415$ explanation and it comes from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:16:44.415 \rightarrow 00:16:46.032$ slide that I showed you previously

 $00{:}16{:}46{.}032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}47{.}730$ from the fact that the metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:16:47.730 --> 00:16:50.253 lesions are immunocompromised or really

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}16{:}50{.}253 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}52{.}857$ immunos uppressed immune attenuated so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:16:52.860 \rightarrow 00:16:54.396$ And the only stage setting I think a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:16:54.396 \rightarrow 00:16:55.676$ small amount of immune presence that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}16{:}55{.}676$ --> $00{:}16{:}57{.}474$ you could miss with the biopsy and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:16:57.474 \rightarrow 00:16:58.920$ actually miss it oftentimes with biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:16:58.920 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.704$ So this is a work that Adriana Khan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:17:00.710 --> 00:17:02.926 one of our fellows showed and we presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}17{:}02{.}926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}05{.}207$ the San Antonio Breast Cancer meeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:05.210 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.235$ So even a few period like in one positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}17{:}07{.}235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08{.}981$ cells that are intermixed with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}17{:}08{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}10{.}778$ micro environment and missed the initial

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:10.778 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.476$ biopsy could be enough to actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}17{:}12.476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}14.794$ ignite an immune response and the same

00:17:14.794 --> 00:17:16.990 way chemotherapy ignites sort of like

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:17.061 \rightarrow 00:17:19.609$ one expression in the more massive scale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:19.610 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.479$ but you don't see the same thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:21.479 \rightarrow 00:17:23.850$ in in the metastatic setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:23.850 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.510$ So the other question was this really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}17{:}26{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}29{.}042$ This thing observation that why small

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:17:29.042 --> 00:17:31.584 improvements in Pathologic CR really lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:31.584 \rightarrow 00:17:33.930$ to large improvements in survival whereas

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:33.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:36.419$ in other setting it doesn't happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:36.420 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.275$ So that brings me to another sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:38.275 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.280$ of debate that used to rage and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:40.280 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.002$ the the breast cancer community and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:42.065 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.665$ we spent a lot of time on it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:43.670 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.548$ It's really prompted by the 1st

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:17:45.548 \rightarrow 00:17:47.444$ initial new adjuvant trials and shovel

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:17:47.444 --> 00:17:49.196 power to show improvement in PCR,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:17:49.200 \rightarrow 00:17:50.970$ but was woefully underpowered and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- 00:17:50.970 00:17:53.224 included all subtypes to to really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}17{:}53.224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}54.896$ show improvement in survival.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}17{:}54{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}56{.}937$ So this matter analysis by the FDA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}17{:}56{.}937 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}58{.}939$ and showed very little in fact
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}17{:}58{.}939 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00{.}714$ no relationships at all between
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- 00:18:00.714 --> 00:18:02.479 improvement in PCR and survival.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:18:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.118$ They confused a lot of people,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:18:04.120 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.751$ but it would have to fly against
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:18:05.751 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.770$ the totally common sense.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- 00:18:06.770 --> 00:18:09.042 Observations, Taxol improved pathologic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}09{.}042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}11{.}314$ sciarid improved survival receptive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:18:11.314 \rightarrow 00:18:12.690$ improved Pathologic CR,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- 00:18:12.690 --> 00:18:13.740 it improves survival.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}13.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15.140$ Platinum improved Pathologic CR
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:15.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.355$ it's and now we know that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:18:17.355 --> 00:18:18.467 improves survival as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}18{:}18{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20{.}624$ And of course the immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:20.624 \rightarrow 00:18:21.701$ inhibitors improved pathologic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:18:21.701 --> 00:18:22.929 security improve survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:18:22.930 --> 00:18:24.740 But nevertheless it's really true

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}18{:}24.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}26.991$ that at the individual trial level

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:26.991 \rightarrow 00:18:28.886$ the relationship between the PCR

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:28.886 \rightarrow 00:18:30.839$ change improvement and the improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:30.839 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.689$ in PFS is hugely variable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:32.690 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.028$ So that's the next question to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}18{:}34{.}028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}35{.}823$ study why and I actually have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:35.823 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.959$ good explanation for you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}18{:}36{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}39{.}024$ And I think it's very elegant and simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}18{:}39{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}41{.}598$ But to understand that you need

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:18:41.598 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.754$ to familiarize yourself with this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}43.754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}46.351$ concept of a continuous metric of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}46{.}351 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}48{.}948$ of outcome or pathological response.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:18:48.950 \rightarrow 00:18:51.939$ So again in 2007 we developed this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}51{.}939 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}54{.}250$ metric called residual cancer burden
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}54{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}56{.}615$ to capture the pathological residual
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}56.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}59.609$ disease as a continuous variable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}18{:}59{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}01{.}370$ We did that because continuous
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:19:01.370 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.130$ variables are more powerful to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:19:03.188 \rightarrow 00:19:05.360$ identify genes that would be associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:19:05.360 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.070$ with outcome or not but.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- 00:19:07.070 --> 00:19:08.876 So eventually it took sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:19:08.876 \dashrightarrow 00:19:10.990$ traction in the form of categories,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}19{:}10{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}13.678$ so you can use this continuous score to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00{:}19{:}13.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}17.258$ create bins of 0 being complete response.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667
- $00:19:17.260 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.898$ Another bin.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:19:17.898 \rightarrow 00:19:19.493$ That's the minimal residual disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

00:19:19.493 --> 00:19:21.578 or RCB 1 moderate amount or CB2

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:19:21.578 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.360$ and a large amount of RCB 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:19:23.360 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.720$ But the truth is that this is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}19{:}25{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}27{.}161$ a continuous scroll and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00{:}19{:}27{.}161 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}28{.}476$ why we did it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:19:28.480 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.168$ Be teamed up the deal I spoke

NOTE Confidence: 0.8667539386666667

 $00:19:31.168 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.320$ to investigators because

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}19{:}32{.}395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}34{.}530$ this continuous sort of score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:34.530 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.175$ I thought actually could reveal

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:36.175 \rightarrow 00:19:37.491$ some really interesting things

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}19{:}37{.}491 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}39{.}078$ about how different drugs work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:39.080 \rightarrow 00:19:41.969$ So what you see here is actually a pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:41.969 \rightarrow 00:19:45.299$ cool picture of the continuous RCB scores in

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:45.299 \rightarrow 00:19:48.097$ seven different arms of the eye spy study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:48.100 \rightarrow 00:19:49.745$ So the eye spy is randomized trials,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- 00:19:49.750 --> 00:19:51.955 the control arm is always staxel ACC,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}19{:}51{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}55{.}434$ and but you see here is the RCB values
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}19{:}55{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}57{.}664$ from zero to 50 is complete response.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:19:57.664 \rightarrow 00:19:58.507$ Five is expensive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- 00:19:58.510 --> 00:19:59.050 Single disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}19{:}59{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}01{.}210$ This kind of shows you the the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:20:01.272 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.120$ prevalence of the density or the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:20:03.120 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.012$ frequency with which you encounter a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}20{:}05{.}012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07{.}112$ particular RCB value in the trial arm.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}20{:}07{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.552$ So the black is the control and the dotted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}20{:}10.552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}11.992$ lines are various experimental drugs.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:20:12.000 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.168$ I just want to look at you the two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}20{:}15.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.370$ panels which are labeled so I don't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}20{:}18.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}20{.}819$ think I can use a A.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- 00:20:20.820 --> 00:20:21.676 Sort of a pointer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:21.676 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.746$ but you probably see there

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}22{.}746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}23{.}739$ that the bottom panel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:23.740 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.068$ which is regimen 7,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:25.068 \rightarrow 00:20:27.780$ you have a large improvement in PCR rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:27.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.440$ right, because the the initial

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:29.440 \longrightarrow 00:20:31.100$ zero values are much higher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}31.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}32.820$ That's where the curves start.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}32.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35.060$ But you also see a massive shift towards

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}35.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}36.979$ the smaller values across the board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:36.980 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.338$ If you look at the Regiment 3 on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}39{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}41{.}579$ top instead of right hand corner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:41.580 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.260$ then you see that that regimen

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:20:43.260 --> 00:20:44.380 also improves PCR rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:20:44.380 --> 00:20:47.035 But it does it by moving the RCB 1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}47.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49.460$ the little residual disease group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:49.460 \dashrightarrow 00:20:51.720$ into the PCR company response.

 $00:20:51.720 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.424$ And that is very unlikely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:53.424 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.060$ affect survival like it doesn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:55.060 \rightarrow 00:20:56.465$ But this particular regimen didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:56.465 \rightarrow 00:20:58.680$ affect at all the higher residual cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}58{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}01{.}116$ So we thought that actually measuring NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:01.116 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.689$ the the distribution of the differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}03.689 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06.323$ in residual cancer burden scores could

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:06.323 \rightarrow 00:21:08.738$ capture the efficacy of a regimen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:08.740 --> 00:21:10.406 And we developed a new statistical tool

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}10{.}406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}12{.}196$ that you can find in this paper and

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:12.196 --> 00:21:14.056 you can even play with it if you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}14.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}15.601$ a breast cancer on this open website,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}15.601 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}17.406$ we call it treatment efficacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:17.406 --> 00:21:19.305 score and it basically compares

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}19{.}305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}21{.}275$ the distribution of RCB scores.

 $00:21:21.280 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.440$ Cross through trial arms in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:23.440 --> 00:21:24.880 particular metric actually really

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}24{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}26{.}575$ correlates quite well with event

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:26.575 \rightarrow 00:21:28.709$ free survival which is what you see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}28{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29{.}650$ There's a significant difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:29.650 \rightarrow 00:21:31.530$ There is an event free survival improvement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:31.530 \rightarrow 00:21:33.220$ Is that all significant improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:33.220 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.763$ in this test score then you don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}35.763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.948$ have significant improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:36.948 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.528$ in event free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}38{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}40{.}468$ So we're going to validate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:40.468 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.250$ within with the other groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}42.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}44.050$ So we're not move to this other question

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:44.050 \rightarrow 00:21:45.781$ that these studies show up, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}21{:}45{.}781 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}48{.}967$ So pembrolizum ab is expensive and 15%

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:48.970 \rightarrow 00:21:51.028$ of the patients have severe toxicity,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}21{:}51{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}51{.}442$ so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:21:51.442 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.326$ He entered into this race to find
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:21:54.326 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.527$ predictive markers that define the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:21:56.527 \rightarrow 00:21:58.697$ patients who need pembrolizumab and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}21{:}58.697 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}01.579$ this is a slide from from us from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- 00:22:01.579 --> 00:22:03.392 a group in Germany civil libel.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- 00:22:03.392 --> 00:22:05.740 And one of my former lab members Thomas Kuhn,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}22{:}05{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}08{.}080$ who leads their translational research arm.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}22{:}08{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}11{.}083$ And what they show in this randomized
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- 00:22:11.083 --> 00:22:12.746 immunotherapy versus chemotherapy alone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:22:12.746 \rightarrow 00:22:14.944$ ARM study that there are a number
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}22{:}14{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16{.}632$ of molecular variables that predict
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00:22:16.632 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.375$ response to any if you have them like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764
- $00{:}22{:}19{.}375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}21{.}865$ high commutation burden or a high.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}22{:}21.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}24.294$ Energy and expression or high P like in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:24.294 \rightarrow 00:22:26.303$ one expression or high till comes you

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:26.303 \rightarrow 00:22:28.440$ have higher PCR rate with chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.232$ chemotherapy but also with

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:30.232 \rightarrow 00:22:31.576$ chemotherapy plus immunotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:31.580 \rightarrow 00:22:33.965$ But the improvement by immunotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:22:33.965 --> 00:22:35.873 happens in both groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:35.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.580$ the remediation low and high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:22:37.580 --> 00:22:39.876 the PD low and high or the field

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:39.876 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.619$ count low and high groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}22{:}41.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}44.042$ So these are these one of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:22:44.042 --> 00:22:45.936 metrics are selective to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:22:45.936 --> 00:22:47.896 who actually needed the panel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:47.900 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.734$ but we have an idea who actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:49.734 \rightarrow 00:22:50.880$ might benefit from Pedro.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:50.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.218$ So we teamed up with the investigators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:22:53.220 \rightarrow 00:22:55.170$ On the build who previously suggested

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}22{:}55{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}57{.}653$ that MH subclass 2 expression in tumor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:22:57.653 \rightarrow 00:22:59.897$ cells might actually identify a group,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:22:59.900 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.340$ the group of patients who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.492$ really need it Pembroke.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}23{:}02{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}04{.}966$ So I need to see class to is is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:04.966 \rightarrow 00:23:08.000$ mostly expressed in immune cells and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:23:08.000 --> 00:23:10.148 participates in antigen presentation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:10.150 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.294$ but it can be induced to be expressed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:12.294 \rightarrow 00:23:14.426$ in cancer cells and epithelial cells
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:14.426 \rightarrow 00:23:17.089$ by interferon gamma, for example, so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:23:17.089 --> 00:23:20.107 Have you run this immunity chemistry,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}23{:}20{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21{.}990$ a simple immunity chemistry for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:21.990 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.494$ emission classical expression on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:23.494 \rightarrow 00:23:25.565$ cancer as opposed to the immune cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:23:25.570 \rightarrow 00:23:29.254$ And we actually confirmed that what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:23:29.254 --> 00:23:31.710 Justin Balko originally reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}23{:}31{.}807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}33{.}994$ that the cancers which were positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:23:33.994 --> 00:23:36.190 for MHC Class 2 expression actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:36.252 \rightarrow 00:23:38.485$ had a higher pathologic CR rate when

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:38.485 \rightarrow 00:23:40.729$ Pembroke was added in the ice spy study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:40.730 \longrightarrow 00:23:41.962$ But the pathologic CR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:41.962 \rightarrow 00:23:44.124$ it was the same whether they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:23:44.124 --> 00:23:46.108 MHC Class 2 high or low if they

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}23{:}46.108 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}47.870$ only got chemotherapy and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:47.870 \rightarrow 00:23:49.646$ They really strong interaction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}23{:}49.646$ --> $00{:}23{:}50.978$ marker treatment interaction

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:50.978 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.750$ in that study and parallel with

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:23:53.750 -> 00:23:55.130 this completely independent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:23:55.130 \rightarrow 00:23:57.298$ Another set of former lab member of mine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:23:57.300 - 00:23:58.716 Jean-paul Bianchini showed the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:23:58.716 --> 00:24:00.840 same thing in their new adjuvant

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:00.901 00:24:02.417 trial without the salesman.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:02.420 --> 00:24:03.036 You know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:03.036 --> 00:24:04.576 I highlighted for you the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:04.576 00:24:05.500 interaction between Italy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:24:05.500 \rightarrow 00:24:08.500$ the expression on epithelial cells that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:08.500 --> 00:24:11.578 actually predicted higher odds ratio for PCR.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:11.580 --> 00:24:13.561 Vidot is always the map but didn't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- 00:24:13.561 --> 00:24:15.758 have any sort of significant other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}24{:}15.758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}17.474$ ratio with chemotherapy alone,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:24:17.480 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.419$ but the same.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:24:18.419 \rightarrow 00:24:20.610$ Study our immune cells didn't carry this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}24{:}20.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22.633$ So it's a really cool project there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}24{:}22.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}24.954$ and we just got funding from the NCI
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00{:}24{:}24{.}954 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}27{.}328$ to kind of test this and validate this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667
- $00:24:27.328 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.710$ in a larger trial them S 1418 that I,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:24:30.710 --> 00:24:33.010 I mentioned to you earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:24:33.010 --> 00:24:33.506 But again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:33.506 \rightarrow 00:24:35.242$ so this study is the fascinating thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:35.242 \rightarrow 00:24:36.962$ about science is that every advance

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}24{:}36{.}962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38{.}382$ actually throws up new questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}24{:}38{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}40{.}574$ even more interesting questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:40.574 \rightarrow 00:24:44.160$ So one question is why some cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:44.160 \rightarrow 00:24:45.659$ are important in reach, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}24{:}45{.}659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}47{.}213$ A lot of people are struggling

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:47.213 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.990$ to find answers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}24{:}47{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}50{.}710$ how you make a cold against the heart.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}24{:}50{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}52{.}243$ But we thought we ask something a

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:52.243 \rightarrow 00:24:53.712$ little bit more original and maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}24{:}53.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}55.810$ something that that could be easier to crack.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:55.810 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.250$ And that's the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:24:57.250 \rightarrow 00:24:59.050$ why doesn't all immune high

 $00:24:59.050 \rightarrow 00:25:01.030$ cancers actually accomplished PCR?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:01.030 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.696$ Why is the PCR only 63%?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:02.696 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.628$ And 100 or 90 that's a project

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:04.628 \rightarrow 00:25:06.651$ that Kim actually came women led

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

00:25:06.651 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:25:08.757 and we compared the immune reach

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:08.827 \rightarrow 00:25:10.647$ triple negative disease that had

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00{:}25{:}10.647 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}13.220$ the PCR versus those that did not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:13.220 \rightarrow 00:25:15.470$ And we find really pretty interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:15.470 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.496$ stuff that I think could lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.6263295966666667

 $00:25:17.496 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.308$ us to some leads about what

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:19.382 \rightarrow 00:25:20.830$ combination therapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:20.830 \longrightarrow 00:25:22.898$ immunotherapies could really be

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}22{.}898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25{.}483$ make embolism and more effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}25{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}27{.}128$ So just to summarize this let's we

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}27.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}28.842$ found that the teacher have better if

 $00:25:28.842 \rightarrow 00:25:30.894$ one teacher beat is high in the immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:30.894 \rightarrow 00:25:32.868$ microenvironment even if you are in reach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}32{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}34{.}772$ You don't accomplish PCI and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:25:34.772 --> 00:25:36.463 lot of innate immunity markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}36{.}463 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38{.}258$ are also associated with it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:38.260 \rightarrow 00:25:40.740$ The innate immunity markers actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}40.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}43.130$ are macrophage and K markers and when

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:43.130 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.597$ you look at the cytokine milieu then

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:25:45.597 --> 00:25:47.871 you really see this very strikingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}47.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}50.319$ so cancers it raises your disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}50{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}52{.}295$ The dominant cytokines are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}52{.}295 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53{.}875$ cytokines which are involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}53{.}875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}56{.}249$ in chemotaxis and activation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:56.249 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.689$ neutrophils and macrophages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}57.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59.210$ So we hypothesized they're blocking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:59.210 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.190$ Some of those would actually improve

 $00:26:01.190 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.120$ the outcome or the efficacy. Of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}05{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06{.}784$ You actually went pembrolizumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:26:06.784 --> 00:26:09.280 So interestingly I just put that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:09.347 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.135$ asterisk for you to to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:11.140 \rightarrow 00:26:13.078$ It's so beautiful because it congruent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}13.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}15.393$ So we find that a lot of these very

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:15.393 \rightarrow 00:26:17.491$ same cytokines that we see highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:17.491 \rightarrow 00:26:19.726$ present in immune rich non responding

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}19.726 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}22.120$ TNBC at the very same chemokines

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}22.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}24.704$ and silicones that we find in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}24.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}25.742$ microenvironment metastatic disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}25{.}742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}28{.}334$ right in that paper that showed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}28{.}334 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29{.}453$ the metastatic microenvironment

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}29{.}453 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}31{.}230$ is more immuno attenuated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}33{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}36{.}142$ Just instead of finish these sort of

 $00:26:36.142 \rightarrow 00:26:38.390$ series of questions and immunotherapy off.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:26:38.390 --> 00:26:40.154 So if immuno
therapy works

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:40.154 \rightarrow 00:26:41.477$ beautifully entrepreneur disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:41.480 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.950$ could it actually work in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}42.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44.390$ subset of ER positive cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}44{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47{.}142$ And we think that it will work because

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:47.142 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.760$ we noticed in the eye spy trial data

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}49{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52{.}073$ that in three arms that included

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:52.073 \rightarrow 00:26:55.079$ immunotherapy including the door volume up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:26:55.080 --> 00:26:56.520 Olaparib arm, the Iliad,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}56{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}59{.}238$ the Penrose Metaxa arm and the pembrolizumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:59.238 \rightarrow 00:27:02.160$ and it's all like receptor antagonist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:02.160 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.610$ Arm in all of these three arms

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:04.610 \rightarrow 00:27:06.707$ independently we saw that among the

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}06{.}707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}08{.}968$ ER positive here we call them HR

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:09.041 \rightarrow 00:27:11.377$ hormone receptor positive cancers.

 $00:27:11.380 \rightarrow 00:27:15.076$ There is a group that is characterized by

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:15.076 --> 00:27:18.078 routinely reported sort of molecular feature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:18.080 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.900$ the ultra high mammaprint status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:20.900 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.226$ So all of these patients had

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:22.226 \rightarrow 00:27:23.460$ to have high mammaprint result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}23.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}25.112$ High MAMMAPRINT defines patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:25.112 \rightarrow 00:27:26.764$ superficially benefit from chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:26.764 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.463$ but within that high mountain

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:28.463 --> 00:27:30.107 group you can devise an agent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:30.110 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.200$ they actually introduce their system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:32.200 --> 00:27:33.970 The device to group smaller print

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:33.970 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.949$ high high and some Withrow high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}35{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}37{.}546$ So the small print we throw higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}37{.}546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39{.}689$ MP two group is the subset among the

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}39.689 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41.094$ ER positive patients who benefited

 $00:27:41.152 \rightarrow 00:27:42.386$ and it's really, really elegant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}42.386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}43.526$ You can't see that right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}43.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}45.870$ So the HR positive MP1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}45.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}47.098$ there's no difference whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:47.098 --> 00:27:48.633 you get chemo plus durva,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}48.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}50.341$ but if you are MP two then

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:50.341 --> 00:27:51.330 Nirvana improves your PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:51.330 --> 00:27:52.770 It's same for pembrolizumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}52{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}54{.}570$ with the other two arms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}54{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}56{.}130$ And what's even nicer when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}56{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}57{.}528$ look at the molecular features

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:57.528 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.068$ of these empty two patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}59{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}00{.}810$ the area are positive but

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}00{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}02{.}202$ their ER signaling and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:02.210 --> 00:28:02.540 Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:02.540 \rightarrow 00:28:04.850$ sort of the gene signatures that typically

 $00:28:04.850 \rightarrow 00:28:06.699$ associated with endocrine sensitivity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:06.700 \longrightarrow 00:28:07.321$ this is low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:07.321 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.563$ So that's the group let's see

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:08.563 \rightarrow 00:28:10.376$ are positive but least likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}10{.}376$ --> $00{:}28{:}11{.}620$ benefit from endocrine treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:11.620 \longrightarrow 00:28:13.650$ They have sort of a higher proliferation

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:13.650 \rightarrow 00:28:15.139$ signature which also makes sense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:15.140 \rightarrow 00:28:17.030$ So they are more sensitive to chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:17.030 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.897$ and we also saw this in the the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:18.900 \rightarrow 00:28:20.690$ the chemotherapy arms and but

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:20.690 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.958$ we didn't really see a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}22{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}24{.}988$ difference in the immune micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}24{.}988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}27{.}100$ in in immune signature genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}27{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}30{.}594$ So again we hope to launch the prospective

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:30.594 \rightarrow 00:28:32.436$ study that would validate this concept.

00:28:32.440 --> 00:28:34.816 With the routinely available essay we

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}34{.}816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}37{.}113$ could actually identify a group that

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}37{.}113 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}39{.}360$ will be nefit from the same way as

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:39.360 \rightarrow 00:28:41.887$ triple negative disease benefited from

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}41{.}887 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44{.}027$ including immune checkpoint the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}44{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}45{.}902$ So just to summarize these clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}45{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}47{.}424$ partially the paradigm shift that

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:47.424 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.957$ happened in the past sort of 20

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:48.957 --> 00:28:50.766 years is that the best way to treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}50.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}52.326$ most stage two and stage three

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}52{.}326 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54{.}016$ triple negative patients is new

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:54.016 --> 00:28:55.609 adjuvant chemotherapy and the best

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}55{.}609 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}56{.}929$ PCR rates are accomplished about

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}56{.}929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}59{.}016$ two third of the patients having a

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:59.016 \rightarrow 00:29:00.566$ competent navigation of the cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:29:00.570 - > 00:29:01.998 the same happened in her two

- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:01.998 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.474$ positive disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00{:}29{:}02{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}04{.}178$ Don't talk about this because it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:04.178 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.030$ really predated at least by 1015 years,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- 00:29:06.030 -> 00:29:07.077 the immunotherapy revolution
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:07.077 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.520$ and there are a lot of really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:09.581 \rightarrow 00:29:11.566$ interesting studies that will push
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:11.566 \rightarrow 00:29:13.551$ the survival even further among
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00{:}29{:}13.614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}15.539$ those who have residual disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00{:}29{:}15{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}17{.}328$ So there are new studies that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:17.328 \longrightarrow 00:29:19.201$ are launched in that space that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- 00:29:19.201 --> 00:29:21.037 I kind of highlighted for you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:21.040 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.595$ So what's next,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00:29:21.595 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.780$ right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769
- $00{:}29{:}21.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}22.890$ So what's going to be the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556
- $00:29:22.935 \rightarrow 00:29:24.519$ next paradigm shift in the next 10 years?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00:29:24.520 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.656$ And I think the this is really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

00:29:27.660 --> 00:29:30.215 I I see two really potentially very

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

00:29:30.215 --> 00:29:32.358 high impact fields which we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00:29:32.358 \rightarrow 00:29:34.118$ improve again survival within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00:29:34.118 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.116$ next 5 to 10 years and which is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00{:}29{:}36{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}38{.}460$ So wait a second.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:40.990 \rightarrow 00:29:43.622$ Yeah. So what is coming up with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}29{:}43.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}45.905$ concept that could we detect molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}29{:}45{.}905 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}49{.}101$ relapse in solid tumors the same way as NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:49.101 \rightarrow 00:29:51.465$ we detect molecular relapse in leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}29{:}51{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}53{.}374$ So if you see that with PCR that

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:53.374 \rightarrow 00:29:55.119$ your genomic abnormalities returned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}29{:}55{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}56{.}428$ then a second round of treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:56.428 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.622$ at that point would actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:57.622 \rightarrow 00:29:59.017$ cure some people from leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:59.020 \rightarrow 00:30:01.127$ So could the same paradigm apply to

- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:01.127 \rightarrow 00:30:02.961$ to sometimes it didn't really have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:02.961 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.438$ good ways to catch this and we didn't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:30:05.438 --> 00:30:07.378 really have good effective drugs
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:07.378 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.168$ either 5610 years ago to test this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:09.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.154$ but now we have we have most molecular.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:11.160 \dashrightarrow 00:30:13.265$ Essays that can pretty reliably
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:30:13.265 00:30:15.917 identify and the SEC DNA is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:15.917 \rightarrow 00:30:18.237$ particularly tumor informed C DNA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:30:18.240 --> 00:30:20.256 So if you have a high C DNA level
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:20.256 \rightarrow 00:30:22.023$ that's starting to rise while you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:22.023 \rightarrow 00:30:23.866$ are in the surveillance of follow
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:23.866 \rightarrow 00:30:25.678$ up stage of the initial curative
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:25.678 \rightarrow 00:30:27.604$ therapy as the city then rises,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:30:27.604 \rightarrow 00:30:29.970$ unfortunately it's almost sure bad that you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:30:30.035 --> 00:30:32.201 will have a recurrence clinical recurrence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:32.201 \longrightarrow 00:30:34.609$ within the next seven or eight months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}30{:}34{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}36{.}640$ So could we intervene at that point

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:36.640 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.736$ when people are still sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:38.736 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.284$ micrometastatic but the micrometastasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:40.284 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.080$ is raising its ugly head?

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}30{:}42.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}43.600$ So that's an idea of a second line.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:30:43.600 -> 00:30:45.340 I look in the rapy and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:45.340 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.500$ actually lead a study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:46.500 \rightarrow 00:30:48.840$ We have a study in that space that that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:48.840 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.827$ exactly this idea in your positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:50.827 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.497$ patients who are receiving endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:52.558 \rightarrow 00:30:54.630$ therapy but start to have a rising CDN,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:54.630 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.154$ they randomized the full

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:56.154 \rightarrow 00:30:57.678$ Western public cycling and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:57.680 \rightarrow 00:31:00.312$ And we'll just continue with their standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:00.312 \rightarrow 00:31:02.850$ of care treatment and get treatment

 $00:31:02.850 \rightarrow 00:31:05.085$ when they become clinically symptomatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:05.090 \dashrightarrow 00:31:06.585$ So the other potentially paradigm

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:06.585 --> 00:31:08.458 shifting idea is really that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:08.458 \dashrightarrow 00:31:10.068$ could cure some metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}31{:}10.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}12.070$ So you have metastatic disease kind of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:12.070 \dashrightarrow 00:31:13.910$ current dogma is that you will die from it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:13.910 --> 00:31:15.266 It may take many, many years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:15.270 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.522$ but ultimately people die.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:16.522 \rightarrow 00:31:18.400$ I'm not sure that this actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:18.455 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.750$ has to happen like this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:19.750 \rightarrow 00:31:21.850$ So what happened in the past five,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:21.850 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.022$ six years is that you really

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:24.022 \rightarrow 00:31:25.790$ understood much more clearly that

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}31{:}25.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}27.830$ only that there are multiple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:27.830 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.978$ Different types of meds,

00:31:28.978 --> 00:31:30.126 not just some medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:30.130 --> 00:31:31.303 Disease doesn't exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:31.303 --> 00:31:32.867 There's a homogeneous entity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.160$ just like the breast cancer doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:34.160 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.593$ exist to looking. It doesn't exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:35.593 --> 00:31:36.637 It's a useful concept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:36.640 --> 00:31:37.680 But practically really these

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:37.680 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.240$ are all very there are many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:39.240 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.706$ many different types of leukemias that

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:41.706 --> 00:31:44.050 require different approaches and treatments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}31{:}44.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}45.250$ different types of breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}31{:}45{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47{.}308$ And the same way like metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:47.308 \dashrightarrow 00:31:48.680$ disease is also heterogeneous.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:48.680 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.056$ So the novel stage for disease is unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:51.056 \rightarrow 00:31:53.639$ because it never received any prior therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:53.640 - 00:31:55.032 That's obviously very different

- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:31:55.032 \rightarrow 00:31:56.424$ from somebody relapsing and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:31:56.424 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.150$ having a metastatic disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:31:58.150 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.404$ After they went through all the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:31:59.404 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.482$ treatments that I showed you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:32:00.482 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.477$ in the new adjuvant setting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00{:}32{:}01{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}04{.}396$ the chemotherapies was embolism and what not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:32:04.400 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.965$ So curing those folks with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:32:05.965 --> 00:32:07.880 existing therapies is a long shot,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:32:07.880 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.518$ but curing those folks who never had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:32:09.518 \rightarrow 00:32:10.961$ any therapy with the combination of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:32:10.961 \rightarrow 00:32:12.840$ drugs is probably not such a long shot.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00{:}32{:}12.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}15.038$ And there are many case reports and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- $00:32:15.038 \rightarrow 00:32:16.877$ oncologists who practice for a long time.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:32:16.880 --> 00:32:18.835 All have an ecdotal cases of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286
- 00:32:18.835 --> 00:32:19.617 metastatic patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:19.620 \rightarrow 00:32:21.125$ particularly with her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:32:21.125 --> 00:32:22.630 disease because her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:22.680 \rightarrow 00:32:24.216$ disease had the best drugs initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:24.216 \rightarrow 00:32:25.560$ the her two targeted drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.457$ but now we have good drugs for

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:27.457 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.760$ for triplet disease as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:32:28.760 --> 00:32:31.178 And also for your poster disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:31.180 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.460$ so this paradigm that really

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}32{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}34{.}758$ kind of put into the mind of many

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:34.758 \rightarrow 00:32:36.353$ practicing physicians that some her

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}36{.}353 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}38{.}100$ two positive cancer can be cured.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:32:38.100 --> 00:32:40.206 I think it's kind of increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:40.206 \rightarrow 00:32:42.720$ applicable to the other subtypes as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:42.720 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.348$ So we hope to do a study that would

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}45{.}348 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}47{.}312$ actually focus on covad especial

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:32:47.312 --> 00:32:49.706 group of her of metastatic patients,

 $00:32:49.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.545$ they de Novo newly diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:51.545 \rightarrow 00:32:52.646$ metastatic patients particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:52.646 \rightarrow 00:32:54.399$ with oligo metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:54.400 \rightarrow 00:32:56.659$ so that we could really get rid of all

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:56.659 \dashrightarrow 00:32:58.889$ the known homicides and what's left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}58{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}59{.}444$ Is micromass,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}59{.}444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}01{.}383$ but we can deal with micro Mets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:01.390 \rightarrow 00:33:03.086$ That's the success story that I showed you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:03.090 \rightarrow 00:33:04.780$ That's how adjuvant therapy improves

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:04.780 \rightarrow 00:33:06.818$ survival after removing the the primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:06.818 --> 00:33:08.564 breast cancer in the lymph nodes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:08.570 --> 00:33:09.752 the systemic therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}09{.}752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}12{.}116$ Washes and and kills them

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:12.116 --> 00:33:13.540 at the Micromax.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}13{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15{.}129$ So I think this better than probably

 $00:33:15.129 \rightarrow 00:33:16.828$ will hold up in stage four disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}16.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}18.274$ and the vision is very simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:18.280 \rightarrow 00:33:20.305$ So in in five or ten years you don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}20{.}305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22{.}507$ call these patients the oligo metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:22.510 --> 00:33:23.900 stage four patients stage four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:23.900 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.228$ but you call them stage 3C.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:26.230 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.150$ Because they are deep, sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:28.150 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.880$ Because then they will be curable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:30.880 \dashrightarrow 00:33:33.085$ So I'm going to move on to some other

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:33.085 \rightarrow 00:33:35.149$ projects that I also find amazing and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}35{.}149 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}37{.}237$ just wanna share you some of the results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:37.240 \rightarrow 00:33:39.382$ So why do some women develop breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:39.382 \rightarrow 00:33:41.218$ cancer 20-30 years earlier than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:41.218 \rightarrow 00:33:43.206$ average or median age even in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:43.264 \rightarrow 00:33:45.139$ absence of any germline mutation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:45.140 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.810$ Actually that's the majority of

 $00:33:46.810 \rightarrow 00:33:48.480$ young women with breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:48.480 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:33:50.524 It's only a minority who has broken

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:50.524 \rightarrow 00:33:51.920$ mutations rather identified mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.380$ So we had two ideas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}53{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55{.}940$ One was that each is the strongest non

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:55.940 \rightarrow 00:33:58.217$ genetic risk factor for breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:58.220 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.314$ So could you actually sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:00.314 \rightarrow 00:34:01.710$ hypothesize that young women?

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:34:01.710 --> 00:34:04.015 Could be breast cancer actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:04.015 \rightarrow 00:34:05.859$ experience an accelerated epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:05.859 \longrightarrow 00:34:07.419$ age of their breast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}07{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}09{.}396$ So this was an idea that Erin Hofstatter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:09.400 \rightarrow 00:34:10.846$ our former colleague picked up and

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}10.846 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}12.531$ we did a series of publications

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}12{.}531 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}14{.}196$ that actually suggests that this

 $00:34:14.196 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.195$ is indeed happening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}15{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}17{.}468$ So it shows you this insert from

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:17.468 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.209$ the the clinical epigenetics paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:19.209 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.659$ in 2018 shows this the most sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:21.659 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.340$ of simply and clearly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:23.340 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.461$ So what you should what you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}25{.}461 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}27{.}594$ there is each acceleration in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}27{.}594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}29{.}898$ normal breast tissue of women who

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:29.898 \dashrightarrow 00:34:32.237$ had breast cancer later and the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:32.240 \rightarrow 00:34:33.605$ Epigenetic age acceleration of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:33.605 \dashrightarrow 00:34:34.970$ who never develop breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}34{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}37{.}282$ So we did this with the Susan Comment

```
NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476
```

 $00{:}34{:}37{.}282 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}39{.}805$ Tissue Bank and with some tissues from here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.330$ So you see that there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.050$ significant acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:43.050 \rightarrow 00:34:44.942$ So epigenetically speaking based

- NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476
- $00:34:44.942 \rightarrow 00:34:46.834$ on the methylation signature,

 $00{:}34{:}46{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49{.}162$ the breast normal breast tissues of

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:49.162 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.139$ woman who subsequently developed breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:51.139 \rightarrow 00:34:53.729$ cancer is older than their chronological age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}53{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55{.}641$ And we don't see this to such

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:55.641 \dashrightarrow 00:34:57.609$ extent in the control patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}57{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}59{.}370$ And then and then we had some follow

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:59.370 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.958$ up patients which really kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:35:00.958 \dashrightarrow 00:35:02.608$ papers that explained that it's mostly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:35:02.610 -> 00:35:04.438 Polycom related genes whose

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:04.438 \rightarrow 00:35:06.266$ methylation pattern is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}06{.}266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}08{.}340$ with this age acceleration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}08{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}10{.}940$ and this last paper on the review in

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:10.940 \rightarrow 00:35:13.183$ science advances shows that actually every

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}13.183 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}15.845$ cell proliferation adds a little bit of

 $00:35:15.845 \rightarrow 00:35:18.050$ epigenetic aging to to the tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}18.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}20.808$ And there is a share of epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:20.808 \rightarrow 00:35:23.001$ signature between cancers and normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:23.001 \rightarrow 00:35:25.710$ cells and it relates to aging and it

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:25.710 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.895$ relates to ultimately cell divisions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:27.900 \rightarrow 00:35:30.516$ But it's probably not the full story though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:30.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.340$ So what's the rest of the story?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}32{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}34{.}293$ So family history is a predictive risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}34{.}293 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}36{.}614$ factor even in the absence of any

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:36.614 \rightarrow 00:35:38.399$ detectable hyper reference gene mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:35:38.400 --> 00:35:40.125 right? So something you inherited

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:35:40.125 --> 00:35:41.160 increases your risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:41.160 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.200$ even if it's you can't see it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:35:44.200 --> 00:35:46.960 Polygenic risk scores that use individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}35{:}46{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}49{.}233$ snips that are individually associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:35:49.233 \rightarrow 00:35:51.795$ with risk to a very small extent,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:35:51.800 \rightarrow 00:35:53.284$ sum them up and you've made them
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:35:53.284 \rightarrow 00:35:54.799$ by the risk that they confer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:35:54.800 \rightarrow 00:35:55.960$ That's a polygenic risk score.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:35:55.960 \rightarrow 00:35:56.342$ However,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:35:56.342 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.016$ even the best ones today using several
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- 00:35:59.016 --> 00:36:00.932 100 risks polygenic risk and have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:36:00.932 \rightarrow 00:36:03.000$ a lot of missing heredity in them.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:36:03.000 \rightarrow 00:36:05.296$ So they don't explain this complete story.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00{:}36{:}05{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}07{.}524$ So we have this other idea that could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00{:}36{:}07{.}524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09{.}504$ the combination of non recurrent rare
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00{:}36{:}09{.}504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}11{.}209$ germline variants and cancer relevant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:36:11.209 \dashrightarrow 00:36:13.029$ genes determined individual risk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:36:13.030 \dashrightarrow 00:36:14.326$ So because they are not recurrent.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:36:14.330 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.286$ Missed them in in indigenous studies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:36:16.290 \rightarrow 00:36:16.621$ right,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:16.621 \rightarrow 00:36:18.607$ because they start out finding individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}18.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}20.292$ snips that are associated because

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:20.292 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.188$ they are recurrent in the mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:22.188 \rightarrow 00:36:23.810$ state of India's cancer population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:36:23.810 --> 00:36:25.460 But if it's not recurrent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}25{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}27{.}760$ you won't see it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:27.760 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.767$ So this is an idea that really kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}29{.}767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}31{.}637$ wanted me for quite a while since this

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}31{.}637 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}33{.}807$ paper came out from the 1000 Genome Project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.316$ which showed that all of us

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:35.316 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.320$ here have different faces.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}36{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}38{.}714$ And the reason we have different faces

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}38{.}714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}41{.}185$ is this amazing set of variation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:36:41.185 --> 00:36:43.870 Snips and Jermaine Snips and other

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:43.870 \rightarrow 00:36:47.720$ genomic variations that we are born with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:47.720 \rightarrow 00:36:50.456$ So an average person carries about
$00:36:50.456 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.648$ 20 and 50 to 350 genes that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}36{:}53{.}648 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}55{.}016$ a loss of function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:55.020 \rightarrow 00:36:56.490$ That's probably the reason why I have

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:56.490 \rightarrow 00:36:57.879$ this poor voice and small stature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:36:57.880 --> 00:36:58.582 But anyway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:36:58.582 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.039$ so the point is that this low

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:01.039 \rightarrow 00:37:03.707$ frequency events that occur in unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}03.707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}05.947$ combination individuals might set the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}06.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}08.400$ stage that what additional events

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}08{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}10{.}780$ matter or cause the transformation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:37:10.780 --> 00:37:14.285 So it's a combinatorial effect, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}14.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}15.890$ So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}15.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}17.995$ We put these hypothesis forward

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}17{.}995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}20{.}100$ that really that functional germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:20.169 \dashrightarrow 00:37:22.339$ variants as potential Co oncogenes.

 $00:37:22.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.632$ And this actually I think there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}24.632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}26.960$ something that covers on the screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

00:37:26.960 --> 00:37:28.675 Yeah, so you can't see this well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:28.680 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.505$ but this model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}29{.}505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}31{.}430$ the the nice thing about models is

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:31.485 \rightarrow 00:37:33.649$ they predict testable hypothesis, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:33.649 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.743$ So this particular idea that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:35.743 \rightarrow 00:37:37.432$ Germans polymorphisms all of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}37{.}432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}39{.}172$ together said this theme stage for

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}39{.}172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}41{.}342$ what counts as an oncogenic event and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:41.342 \dashrightarrow 00:37:43.296$ eventually this is the totality of

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}43.296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}45.376$ abnormalities that lead to cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00{:}37{:}45{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}48{.}173$ So it's this sort of testable leads

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:48.173 \rightarrow 00:37:50.300$ to this testable hypothesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:50.300 \rightarrow 00:37:52.448$ right that cancers in younger patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667

 $00:37:52.450 \rightarrow 00:37:53.440$ This is correct.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:37:53.440 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.420$ They should have more germline variants
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:37:55.420 \rightarrow 00:37:57.003$ because they need fewer somatic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:37:57.003 \rightarrow 00:37:58.951$ events to reach a threshold, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00:37:58.951 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.755$ The sexual disturbance that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6637680666666667
- $00{:}38{:}00{.}755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}03{.}010$ pushed them over to to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:38:03.094 \rightarrow 00:38:04.440$ become malignant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:38:04.440 \rightarrow 00:38:06.150$ And theoretically you could also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}38{:}06{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}08{.}635$ use this idea to develop a cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}38{:}08{.}635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}10{.}405$ gene systems integrity score that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:38:10.405 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.369$ captures how far a cell or tissue is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:38:13.369 \rightarrow 00:38:14.837$ from this malignant transformation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:38:14.840 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.210$ So we started to study that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}38{:}17{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}19{.}352$ And this is a paper that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}38{:}19{.}352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}21{.}469$ touching postdoc in my lab did.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}38{:}21{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}23{.}534$ So we asked this really fundamental
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}23{.}534$ --> $00{:}38{:}25{.}568$ simple thing that a mazingly not a

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:25.568 \rightarrow 00:38:27.368$ lot of people actually studied before

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:27.368 --> 00:38:29.175 that what's the relationship between NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:29.175 \rightarrow 00:38:32.276$ the person's age of that each of your NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:32.276 --> 00:38:34.862 diagnosis of cancer and the germline NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:34.862 --> 00:38:37.550 variant load in cancer relevant genes. NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:37.550 \rightarrow 00:38:39.050$ So what are cancer relevant genes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:39.050 - 00:38:41.143 So we just put from the literature

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}41{.}143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}43{.}410$ and from from review articles about

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}43{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}45{.}685$ 1500 genes which are experimentally

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:45.685 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.505$ validated that they alter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:47.510 --> 00:38:48.854 They've played an important

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:48.854 \rightarrow 00:38:50.198$ biological role in cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}50{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}51{.}320$ And when you see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:51.320 \dashrightarrow 00:38:52.930$ it's actually pretty obvious and

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:52.930 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.305$ it's really beautiful, right.

00:38:54.305 -> 00:38:56.735 So people who develop cancer at

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}56{.}735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}59{.}540$ an older age have fewer germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}59{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}01{.}898$ alterations in these cancer relevant genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:01.900 - 00:39:03.110 People who develop cancer at

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:03.110 --> 00:39:04.700 younger age have a much higher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}04.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}07.902$ these are age bins by years of 10 and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:07.902 \rightarrow 00:39:10.079$ opposite is seen in the somatic space.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:10.080 \rightarrow 00:39:11.760$ So people will develop cancer at their ages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:11.760 --> 00:39:12.675 Prostate cancer folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:12.675 - 00:39:14.200 have a lot of mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:14.200 \rightarrow 00:39:15.495$ whereas people who develop cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:15.495 \rightarrow 00:39:17.520$ at an early age have fewer somatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:17.520 --> 00:39:17.809 Positions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}17{.}809 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}19{.}543$ and we knew this from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39{:}19.543 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}20.410$ pediatric literature actually.

 $00{:}39{:}20{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}21{.}502$ Pediatric cancers don't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:21.502 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.790$ a heck of a lot of mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:23.790 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.589$ So that's actually a really nice story

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:25.589 \rightarrow 00:39:27.257$ that that supports this idea that

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:27.257 \dashrightarrow 00:39:28.667$ somehow that's the combined effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:28.670 \rightarrow 00:39:30.254$ And if you have a lot of germline hits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:30.260 --> 00:39:33.098 you need need a fewer random

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:33.098 \rightarrow 00:39:35.959$ somatic hits to push you over.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:35.960 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.908$ In this paper view,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:36.908 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.643$ it kind of did you think a

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}38{.}643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}40{.}167$ little bit deeper and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:40.170 \rightarrow 00:39:42.750$ so cancers which actually are highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}42.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}44.690$ linked to environmental factors for

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:44.690 \rightarrow 00:39:46.850$ lung cancer for example that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:46.850 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.765$ actually tend to have a lot more

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}48.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}50.190$ somatic events and some somatic

- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- 00:39:50.190 --> 00:39:51.462 mutations from somatic origin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:39:51.462 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.052$ from germline in other cancers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:39:53.052 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.909$ kind of coffee.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}39{:}53{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}55{.}958$ So in between and some of them are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- 00:39:55.958 --> 00:39:57.429 actually like testicular germs,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00:39:57.430 \rightarrow 00:39:59.755$ atoms are dominated by germline
- NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667
- $00{:}39{:}59{.}755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}02{.}080$ hits rather than somatic hits.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}40{:}04{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}07{.}189$ But then this this location OK so
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}40{:}07{.}189 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}09{.}345$ why 1500 genes so probably are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}40{:}09{.}345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}11.650$ there more genes related to cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:40:11.650 \rightarrow 00:40:14.219$ So we we asked this question whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:40:14.219 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.157$ what's the what's the totality
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:40:16.157 --> 00:40:18.062 of cancer relevant human genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}40{:}18.062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}20.976$ and the name we came up with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:40:20.976 \rightarrow 00:40:22.676$ really simple concept that if.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:22.680 \rightarrow 00:40:24.235$ Core cancer genes are important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}24{.}235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26{.}185$ and we define core cancer genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:40:26.185 --> 00:40:27.865 actually from a clinical panel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:27.870 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.192$ the MSKCC impact panel that's clinically

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}30{.}192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}32{.}620$ used to define actual permutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}32.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}35.052$ So these hypothesized the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:35.052 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.092$ genes that interact in a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:38.100 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.785$ Putting putting interaction network or

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}39{.}785$ --> $00{:}40{:}42{.}392$ the string network that there's a lot of NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:42.392 \rightarrow 00:40:43.837$ different ways to measure interactions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}43.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}45.422$ So genes that interact with the core

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}45{.}422$ --> $00{:}40{:}46{.}977$ genes will be somewhat important and NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}46{.}977 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}48{.}909$ genes that interact with this one step

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:40:48.955 --> 00:40:50.419 remove genes will also be important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}50{.}419 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}51{.}996$ to some extent but probably less.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}51.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}54.082$ And then those which are three four

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}40{:}54.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}56.136$ steps removed are even less important.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:40:56.140 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.079$ So we wanted to test this hypothesis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:40:58.080 \rightarrow 00:41:00.168$ but as you get closer to the close genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:00.168 \rightarrow 00:41:02.476$ then you would have increasing connectivity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}02{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}04{.}892$ That's one mathematical way to measure
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}04.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07.760$ the importance of gene as you get closer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:07.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.513$ So one step.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:08.513 \rightarrow 00:41:10.019$ Both from from core cancer genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:10.019 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.245$ then it's going to be more important
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:41:12.245 --> 00:41:12.885 than survivability.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:12.890 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.996$ We can check this in genome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}14.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}17.030$ wide CRISPR and ASARONE screens.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}17{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}18{.}465$ Also predicted genes which are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}18.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}19.326$ one step removed,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}19{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}21{.}451$ 2 steps removed are more important than
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:21.451 --> 00:41:23.306 those which are three steps removed

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:23.306 --> 00:41:25.385 in terms of having large number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}25{.}445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}27{.}161$ somatic mutations in in Kansas and NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:27.161 --> 00:41:29.420 that they will be under a stronger

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:29.420 \rightarrow 00:41:31.270$ negative selection in the germline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:31.270 --> 00:41:31.590 right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:31.590 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.870$ because they are important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.186$ And in many of these genes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:34.186 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.562$ are important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:34.570 \rightarrow 00:41:36.579$ cancer are important in many other things

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:36.579 \rightarrow 00:41:38.547$ and that's exactly defined in this paper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:38.550 \rightarrow 00:41:40.166$ And this just shows you the numbers though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:40.170 -> 00:41:42.658 So one or two step remove genes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:42.658 \rightarrow 00:41:44.869$ our genome is about 10,000 genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:44.870 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.910$ So actually probably the cancer 11

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:46.910 --> 00:41:49.090 genes space is much much bigger,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:49.090 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.978$ just don't know about a lot of these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:50.978 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.725$ and of course they're importance is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}41{:}52.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}55.810$ not as important as a P53 mutation but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:55.810 \rightarrow 00:41:57.890$ nevertheless they contributes very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:41:57.890 \rightarrow 00:42:01.189$ likely contribute to the biological disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:01.190 \rightarrow 00:42:02.667$ So where are you going with this?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:02.670 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.015$ So what you actually want to do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}42{:}05{.}015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07{.}710$ really is so address cancer as a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}42{:}07{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}10{.}128$ cellular transformation as as a a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:42:10.211 --> 00:42:13.028 defect in a in a in a complex system.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:13.030 \rightarrow 00:42:15.598$ So complex systems fail through unique
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}42{:}15{.}598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}18{.}250$ combinations of individual non lethal events.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:42:18.250 --> 00:42:19.587 I mean just think about this if
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00{:}42{:}19.587 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.064$ you would run the statistics on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:21.064 \rightarrow 00:42:22.204$ what's causing plane crashes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

- $00:42:22.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.254$ even find anything.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:23.254 \rightarrow 00:42:24.994$ Because even though flying through
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:42:24.994 --> 00:42:26.309 a storm is a risk,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:26.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.984$ but many many planes fly through
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:42:27.984 --> 00:42:29.782 storms have any problem, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:29.782 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.146$ pilot sleeping or not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:42:31.150 --> 00:42:31.800 Been trained,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:31.800 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.075$ it's a lot of happens that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:34.075 \rightarrow 00:42:36.238$ despite of this sort of human errors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:36.240 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.071$ the plane survives,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:37.071 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.733$ you don't even know about it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:38.740 \rightarrow 00:42:40.516$ So it's really a unique combination
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:40.516 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.700$ that brings down points.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.359$ And so that's the thing that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- 00:42:43.359 00:42:45.177 actually try to see whether we could.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925
- $00:42:45.180 \rightarrow 00:42:46.836$ So some of these unique combination

 $00{:}42{:}46.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}47.940$ of Germany and some

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}42{:}47{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}49{.}961$ of the events into a score and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:49.961 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.010$ they ultimately visualize it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:51.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.953$ They did a little bit of a sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:53.960 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.760$ preliminary kind of effort in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.851$ few years ago with wavey she trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:57.851 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.790$ to kind of map all the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:59.853 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.949$ abnormalities that particular cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}01{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}04{.}118$ As and visualize it in a standardized way

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

00:43:04.118 --> 00:43:06.763 in these papers we try to resurrect

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:43:06.763 \rightarrow 00:43:08.963$ this really delighted that Susan Coleman

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:43:08.963 \rightarrow 00:43:10.898$ actually accepted this challenge for

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:43:10.898 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.158$ their hecaton in March next year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}13.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.189$ So we're going to lead A-Team to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}16.189 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18.990$ try to develop this Kansas score. Umm.

 $00:43:21.920 \rightarrow 00:43:23.941$ So the new classes of drugs, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:23.941 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.908$ So that's the last piece that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:43:25.908 --> 00:43:27.807 actually going to talk to you a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:27.807 \dashrightarrow 00:43:29.588$ bit because I'm so excited about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:29.590 --> 00:43:30.970 So metabolically, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:43:30.970 --> 00:43:34.190 rewiring is a major hallmark of cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:34.190 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.588$ yes. Yeah, we don't have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:35.588 \rightarrow 00:43:36.520$ drugs that exploit it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:36.520 \rightarrow 00:43:38.104$ So remember, a lot of chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:38.104 \rightarrow 00:43:39.472$ drugs interfere with DNA synthesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:43:39.472 --> 00:43:41.278 because you need to double your DNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}43{:}41{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}42{.}968$ but you need to also double your lipids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}43{:}42.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}44.860$ You also need to double your proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:44.860 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.578$ So why don't we have drugs in that space?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.205$ So we started off with the computational

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:50.205 \rightarrow 00:43:51.969$ biology project to look for.

 $00{:}43{:}51{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}54{.}790$ Most of isoenzyme diversity in cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:43:54.790 \rightarrow 00:43:57.210$ compared to corresponding normal tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}43{:}57{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}00{.}333$ So isoenzymes kind of more or less sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:00.333 \rightarrow 00:44:02.672$ could catalyze the same chemical reaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}02.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}05.059$ But they are different genes and sometimes NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:05.059 \rightarrow 00:44:07.426$ they are located in different compartments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}07{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}09{.}290$ So what you want to look at is is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:44:09.346 --> 00:44:11.736 particular isoenzyme becomes cancer dominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}11.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}14.064$ So this isoenzyme diversity gets lost because

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}14.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}16.660$ out of the three or four isoforms that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:16.660 \rightarrow 00:44:19.329$ produce the same sort of chemical reaction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}19{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}20{.}341$ one becomes dominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:20.341 \rightarrow 00:44:22.026$ That may be actually important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:44:22.030 --> 00:44:22.274 Analogy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}22{.}274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}24{.}470$ So if you're looking for is this sort of

 $00:44:24.525 \rightarrow 00:44:26.712$ change that the normal cell has kind of fun,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:44:26.720 --> 00:44:28.388 actually both sides of enzyme one

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:28.388 \rightarrow 00:44:30.310$ and two and the cancer actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:30.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.175$ one of these becomes dominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:32.180 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.958$ So we asked how many are these

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:33.958 \rightarrow 00:44:35.200$ in the human genome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:44:35.200 -> 00:44:37.624 So we again went to the TTC share

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:37.624 \rightarrow 00:44:40.145$ data and called all the human enzymes

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:40.145 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.421$ which have less than 5 isoforms

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:42.421 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.309$ to find to look for a pattern that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}45{.}309 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}46{.}666$ showed this cancer dominance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:46.666 \rightarrow 00:44:47.994$ Once we find this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}48.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}50.052$ then we looked whether we can see the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}44{:}50{.}052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}52{.}459$ in the CLA the cancer cell line encyclopedia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:52.460 \rightarrow 00:44:53.908$ Just to make sure that this is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:44:53.908 \rightarrow 00:44:54.930$ happening at a cellular level,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}44{:}54{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57{.}030$ not at the tissue level because the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}44{:}57{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}00{.}026$ TCG's tissue level and it also then
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:45:00.026 \rightarrow 00:45:02.098$ once we confirm those that they are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}02.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}04.032$ also dominant in a cancer cell line
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:45:04.032 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.755$ that enabled us to really check
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}05{.}755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}07{.}625$ whether this particular isoform is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:45:07.630 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.438$ is survival critical in the depth
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:45:10.438 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.050$ map data which is CRISPR.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}13.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14.580$ You have no card database.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}14.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}16.695$ And then the final hit you wanted to confirm,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:45:16.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.176$ so this is what we found.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}18{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}22{.}085$ So there are about 136 cancer breast cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:45:22.085 \rightarrow 00:45:24.960$ dominant isoenzymes that we find in the CG.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}24{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}27{.}102$ About 81 of these are also cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00{:}45{:}27.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}29.139$ dominant in breast cancer cell lines,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:45:29.140 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.568$ but 53 are important for survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

00:45:32.568 --> 00:45:34.053 When you knock it out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:45:34.060 \rightarrow 00:45:36.610$ you can sell lines, survival improves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:45:36.610 \rightarrow 00:45:38.270$ And about 44 of these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}45{:}38{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}40{.}184$ the locking out the the particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}45{:}40{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}42{.}080$ isoform is more important than knocking NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:42.080 \rightarrow 00:45:44.336$ out the other one and then you actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}45{:}44{.}389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}45{.}985$ meet all these three criteria then

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:45.985 \longrightarrow 00:45:48.751$ you end up with about 17 potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:45:48.751 \rightarrow 00:45:51.586$ targetable isoenzymes in breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}45{:}51{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53{.}662$ But we did this for a whole bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:45:53.662 \rightarrow 00:45:55.719$ of cancer types and the the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}45{:}55{.}719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57{.}713$ shared sort of cancel them in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00{:}45{:}57{.}713 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}59{.}958$ nicer form turned out to be a C1

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:45:59.958 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.550$ or acetyl coenzyme carboxylase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667

 $00:46:02.550 \rightarrow 00:46:05.446$ And this little uncertainty,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:46:05.446 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.795$ the things the right side for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9036241266666667
- $00:46:08.795 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.370$ you shows the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:46:10.370 \rightarrow 00:46:12.274$ the actual pattern expression pattern, right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}46{:}12.274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}14.859$ So the red one is a potential target and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:46:14.859 \rightarrow 00:46:17.001$ first column or the first sort of set by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}46{:}17.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}19.499$ the line start is the normal tissue and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:46:19.499 \rightarrow 00:46:21.560$ second column is the corresponding cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:46:21.560 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.995$ So you see that the blue goes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- 00:46:22.995 --> 00:46:24.309 down because it's lost in cancer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:46:24.310 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.630$ but then the red stays up.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}46{:}25.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}27.390$ So we actually looked at why this is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}46{:}27{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}29{.}908$ happening. It's maturation driven.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:46:29.910 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.248$ And but what is a C?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}46{:}31{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}34{.}229$ So C1 and C2 are actually the first literally
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}46{:}34{.}229 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}36{.}788$ the enzymes in fatty acid synthesis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.795$ They pre they are immediately

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}38.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}41.530$ before fast or fatty acid synthase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:41.530 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.430$ They convert acetyl coenzyme to NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:43.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.774$ Malaya coenzyme and this C1 is

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:45.774 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.270$ actually in the cytoplasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}47.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}49.070$ C2 is the mitochondrial membrane NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}49.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}50.870$ also regulates fatty acid breakdown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:46:50.870 --> 00:46:52.550 So if you block ACC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}52{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56{.}084$ you block fatty acid synthesis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}56{.}084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}58{.}440$ accelerate fatty acid burning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}58{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00{.}421$ So it turns out that actually this

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}00{.}421 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}02{.}013$ wasn't real skin of pharmaceutical NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}02.013 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}04.077$ companies for a long time because

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}04.077 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}05.817$ because as a target for Nash,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}05{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}09{.}438$ which is non Alcoholics started

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:09.438 \rightarrow 00:47:11.804$ hepatitis or fatty liver and it's also

 $00:47:11.804 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.979$ actually one of the major targets for

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}13.979 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}16.160$ herbicides that we use in agriculture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}16{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}18{.}200$ Turns out that Pfizer actually had a drug NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:18.200 \rightarrow 00:47:19.968$ that worked amazingly well in people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}19{.}970$ --> $00{:}47{:}22{.}322$ They put it through several clinical trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}22.322$ --> $00{:}47{:}24.598$ and they established that it actually works,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}24.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}26.511$ it blocks the novel fatty acid synthesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:26.511 -> 00:47:28.729 as you see on that curve that ports.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:28.730 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.172$ The percent of the noble lipogenesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:31.172 --> 00:47:32.998 in people, it was also safe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:32.998 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.006$ except for one thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:34.010 --> 00:47:36.020 It caused a little bit of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}36.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}37.360$ hypertrigly ceridemia and made and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}37{.}416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}39{.}288$ caused a drop in platelet counts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.262$ You know, we play the games on 400,000,

- $00:47:41.262 \rightarrow 00:47:42.378$ so the politicians,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:47:42.378 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.402$ not the 200,200 thousand is actually,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:47:44.402 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.464$ it's a 50% drop.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}47{:}45{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}47{.}576$ But we don't even count this as a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- 00:47:47.576 --> 00:47:48.869 toxicity in chemotherapy because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:47:48.869 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.484$ it's a very safe level.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:47:50.490 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.894$ Nevertheless,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:47:50.894 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.914$ Pfizer felt that this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}47{:}52{.}914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}54{.}530$ warrants discontinuing the drug.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}47{:}54{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}56{.}834$ So we reached out to them and we actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:47:56.834 \rightarrow 00:47:58.737$ got the right to test this drug.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00{:}47{:}58.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}59.067$ In.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- 00:47:59.067 --> 00:48:00.702 In preclinical models and hope
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- 00:48:00.702 --> 00:48:03.539 to bring it back to the clinic if
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:48:03.539 \rightarrow 00:48:04.637$ these little promising,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- $00:48:04.640 \rightarrow 00:48:08.399$ but did the preclinical model look promising?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626
- 00:48:08.400 --> 00:48:10.626 So I don't really invitro data

 $00:48:10.626 \rightarrow 00:48:11.739$ because the invitro,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:11.740 \rightarrow 00:48:14.414$ you know metabolism is highly sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:14.420 --> 00:48:15.704 Dependent on how much fatty acid

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:15.704 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.399$ and one that you have in the media.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}17{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}19{.}938$ So this is the in vivo data in mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}19{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}22{.}060$ So this is PBX to macros that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}22.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}23.802$ contracted out for Jackson lab and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}23.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.530$ you see that this ACC inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}25{.}586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}27{.}841$ actually inhibits the growth although

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:27.841 --> 00:48:29.194 doesn't strike completely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:29.200 --> 00:48:31.960 The MDA MB 468 Genographic did here

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:31.960 --> 00:48:34.170 at Yale shows the same thing but the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}34{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}35{.}615$ most striking thing was synergy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}35{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38{.}244$ the doxorubic in and Vina Robin and

 $00{:}48{:}38{.}244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}40{.}464$ also with the collaborator is

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}40{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}42{.}240$ interested endocrine sensitive CVD

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}42.305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}44.585$ and resistance to develop the food.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:44.590 --> 00:48:47.830 Strand resistant MCF 7 cell line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}47{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}49{.}720$ she also showing you know xenograft

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:49.720 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.462$ model that there are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:51.462 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.728$ inhibited the growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:52.730 \rightarrow 00:48:54.488$ So this looks pretty promising to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}54{.}488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}56{.}854$ us and we do some additional studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}56{.}854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}59{.}486$ to really figure out more about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00{:}48{:}59{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}01{.}430$ synergy between chemotherapy agents and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00{:}49{:}01{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}04{.}510$ we hope to get this back from Pfizer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:49:04.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.510$ But how does this work?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:49:06.510 \rightarrow 00:49:08.946$ So the most interesting thing was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00{:}49{:}08{.}946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}11{.}360$ when we looked at what transcriptional

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:49:11.360 \rightarrow 00:49:14.391$ changes occur after exposure to this drug,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667
- $00:49:14.400 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.200$ what really was.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00:49:16.200 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.710$ Striking is the that there was a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00:49:19.710 \rightarrow 00:49:21.930$ dramatic increase in genes that are.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00:49:21.930 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.865$ Mediating and involved in unfolded
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00:49:24.865 \rightarrow 00:49:27.213$ protein response and upregulate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667
- $00{:}49{:}27{.}213$ --> $00{:}49{:}29{.}160$ endoplasmic reticulum stress.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00{:}49{:}29{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}31{.}550$ So our working hypothesis thereby
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667
- $00:49:31.550 \rightarrow 00:49:33.940$ inhibiting the Novo fattiest synthesis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00{:}49{:}33{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}36{.}005$ you actually alter the membrane
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667
- $00:49:36.005 \rightarrow 00:49:38.070$ composition of the endoplasmic reticulum.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667
- 00:49:38.070 --> 00:49:41.177 You know proteins have to find a threat
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- 00:49:41.177 --> 00:49:43.956 through the membrane to get into the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00:49:43.956 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.609$ endoplasmic reticulum for secondary
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667
- $00{:}49{:}45.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}48.070$ modifications and we think that by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667
- $00{:}49{:}48.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}50.178$ changing the endoplasmic reticulum lipid
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:50.178 \rightarrow 00:49:52.208$ composition we change this process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:49:52.210 \rightarrow 00:49:54.569$ Of of protein synthesis and in user

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:54.569 \rightarrow 00:49:56.044$ unfolded protein response which

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:56.044 \rightarrow 00:49:57.676$ eventually overwhelms the cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:49:57.680 \dashrightarrow 00:49:59.660$ So that's the project that we do in the lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00{:}49{:}59{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}01{.}598$ Look at the lipid membrane composition

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00{:}50{:}01{.}598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}03{.}884$ of of the endoplasmic reticulum as as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:50:03.884 \rightarrow 00:50:06.156$ far as we can and the lipid alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00{:}50{:}06{.}156 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}08{.}854$ in the cells exposed to this and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820944486666667

 $00:50:08.854 \rightarrow 00:50:10.935$ some some reporter systems to nail

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00{:}50{:}10{.}935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}12{.}957$ this as the mechanism of action.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:15.010 \dashrightarrow 00:50:17.929$ So I'm going to summarize this really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:17.930 \rightarrow 00:50:19.685$ So for those of you who are clinical fellows,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:50:19.690 --> 00:50:20.965 you know every clinical dilemma

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:20.965 \rightarrow 00:50:22.910$ that we discussed in a tumor boards,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:22.910 \rightarrow 00:50:25.046$ it's a research question asking for a study,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:25.050 \rightarrow 00:50:26.290$ some movies disheartened then
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:26.290 \rightarrow 00:50:28.150$ people come about saying that OK,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:28.150 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.186$ what should I research?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:29.186 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.481$ I mean what you should
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:30.481 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.589$ research is all around us.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:31.590 \rightarrow 00:50:33.347$ You just need to open your eye.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}50{:}33{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}35{.}135$ And so recognizing the prognostic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}50{:}35{.}135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}36{.}920$ importance of Pathologic CR residual
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}50{:}36{.}976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}38{.}661$ disease has left new treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:38.661 \rightarrow 00:50:40.346$ strategies and improved survival in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:40.398 \rightarrow 00:50:42.174$ triple negative disease and her two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:42.174 \rightarrow 00:50:44.652$ positive disease and I showed you how so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}50{:}44.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}46.267$ Molecular offices of these issues
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}50{:}46.267 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}47.947$ also gives some idea that how
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:50:47.947 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.160$ we could make it even better by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:50.160 \rightarrow 00:50:51.860$ studying the difference between

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:51.860 \rightarrow 00:50:53.560$ the nonresponders and responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:53.560 \rightarrow 00:50:55.020$ So immunotherapy established its

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:55.020 \rightarrow 00:50:57.210$ value in breast cancer and Robinson

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}50{:}57{.}273 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}59{.}463$ is now approved as as neoadjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}50{:}59{.}463 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}00{.}923$ therapy together with chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}00{.}986 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}02{.}596$ for all three primary disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}02.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}04.586$ It's also approved as first line

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:04.586 \longrightarrow 00:51:06.900$ therapy for PD like 1 positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:06.900 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.277$ metastatic breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}08{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}10{.}450$ And I think we have a reasonably

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:10.450 \rightarrow 00:51:12.636$ decent explanation why you need the PD

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:12.636 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.430$ ligand one in the metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}14{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}16{.}425$ So we are about to launch studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}16{.}425 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}17{.}919$ to demonstrate that similar benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:17.919 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.949$ could be seen in a subset of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:19.949 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.110$ molecular defined subset,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:21.110 \longrightarrow 00:51:23.826$ small subset of ER positive breast cancers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:23.830 \rightarrow 00:51:25.672$ And we also have some promising
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:25.672 \rightarrow 00:51:27.548$ markers that could actually make this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}51{:}27{.}548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}29{.}324$ whole strategy safer and more cost
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:29.324 \rightarrow 00:51:30.913$ effective by tailoring the treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:30.913 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.785$ to those who really needed it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:32.790 \rightarrow 00:51:34.716$ But these you need validations and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- 00:51:34.716 --> 00:51:37.121 I think the most exciting sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:51:37.121 \rightarrow 00:51:39.233$ things on the horizon clinically is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- 00:51:39.233 --> 00:51:41.277 CDN surveillance and interventional
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- 00:51:41.277 --> 00:51:43.982 homophone macular relapse that might
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}51{:}43{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}46{.}108$ ultimately reduce further metastatic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}51{:}46.108 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}48.184$ recurrences and this understanding
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}51{:}48{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}50{.}779$ the molecular phylogeny of metastatic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:50.779 \rightarrow 00:51:53.014$ disease really prompted this idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:53.014 \longrightarrow 00:51:54.355$ that because the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}54{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}57{.}342$ Synchronous mats are very similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:57.342 \longrightarrow 00:51:59.876$ the primary tumors might be they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}59.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}01.809$ responding to the same way and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}01.809 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}03.723$ micro mats that remain after eradicating NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}03{.}723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}05{.}976$ those are also similar to the to them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}05{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}08{.}010$ So that the microbes that remain after

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:08.010 \rightarrow 00:52:09.804$ the primary tumor is being resected

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}09{.}804 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}11{.}834$ that may be approaching the same these

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}11.888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}13.784$ disease with the same strategy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}13.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}15.926$ we very successfully used in stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}15{.}926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}18{.}554$ three disease might actually cure a

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:18.554 \rightarrow 00:52:22.036$ small subset maybe 10% maybe 30% of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}22{.}036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}24.790$ the Novo metastatic stage four disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:24.790 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.243$ And.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- 00:52:25.243 > 00:52:27.508 There's a really deep portfolio
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:52:27.508 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.910$ of new classes of drugs.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:52:29.910 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.510$ And that's my last slide.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}52{:}31{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}33{.}862$ I apologize ahead of time for people who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- 00:52:33.862 --> 00:52:35.606 actually didn't make it to the slide,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:52:35.610 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.146$ but I ran out of space.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:52:37.150 \rightarrow 00:52:38.536$ But these are the various people
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}52{:}38{.}536 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}40{.}224$ who worked in my lab and contributed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:52:40.224 \longrightarrow 00:52:41.876$ the work that I showed you and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00{:}52{:}41{.}929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}43{.}417$ students and other collaborators
- NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714
- $00:52:43.417 \rightarrow 00:52:44.905$ and collaborators within Yale.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8774344
- $00{:}52{:}50{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}50{.}980$ So.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876696786363636
- $00:53:02.110 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.714$ Yeah, so. If you have any
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876696786363636
- $00{:}53{:}04{.}714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}06{.}800$ questions then feel free to.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876696786363636
- 00:53:06.800 --> 00:53:10.170 Ask yes, silly. I have.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70466318

 $00:53:13.600 \rightarrow 00:53:14.860$ Saying that, we were going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

 $00:53:17.980 \longrightarrow 00:53:21.016$ And you mentioned, right and when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

 $00:53:21.016 \rightarrow 00:53:23.890$ talked about the model especially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

 $00{:}53{:}23{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}27{.}672$ Negative. I want to know if you will

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

 $00{:}53{:}27.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}30.478$ consider rate in that model and it's so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:33.020 \rightarrow 00:53:35.414$ So actually Kim and and some other NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:35.414 \rightarrow 00:53:37.575$ previous lab members did they really

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:37.575 \rightarrow 00:53:39.705$ nice analysis trying to see whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}39{.}705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}42{.}084$ there is a immune difference between

NOTE Confidence: 0.8008066626666667

 $00:53:42.084 \rightarrow 00:53:44.625$ triple negative breast cancer by race.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:44.625 \rightarrow 00:53:47.500$ The hypothesis was that that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}47{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}50{.}517$ Stress and this sort of this weathering

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}50{.}517 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}52{.}680$ that that unfortunately many people

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:53:52.680 --> 00:53:55.062 with African American or Hispanic race

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}55{.}062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}57{.}492$ have to suffer would have an impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:57.492 \rightarrow 00:53:59.173$ on your immune immune system, right.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:53:59.173 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.037$ So the truth is that if there is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- 00:54:01.037 --> 00:54:02.803 such a thing, it's really subtle.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:02.803 \rightarrow 00:54:04.909$ We find some some really intriguing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:04.909 \rightarrow 00:54:06.788$ things around macrophages things,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:06.790 \rightarrow 00:54:08.956$ but whether this really holds up,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- 00:54:08.960 00:54:10.140 I'm not quite sure yet.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:10.140 \longrightarrow 00:54:11.771$ So I can send you the slides
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:11.771 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.230$ and we have some things,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8008066626666667
- $00{:}54{:}13.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}15.358$ some references there and we we see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}15{.}358 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}17{.}699$ some things but I'm not sure that it's.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:17.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.495$ It's really detectable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}18.495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}20.350$ There are other things that we haven't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}20{.}397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}21{.}972$ looked at but we plan to do which is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}21.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}23.650$ like inflammatory markers in the blood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}23.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}25.560$ But that's also kind of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:54:26.706$ biased by comorbidities.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}26.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}28.510$ So if you have a lot of other diseases,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:28.510 \rightarrow 00:54:30.390$ then it's just going to be high anyway.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.148$ And in terms of the models,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- 00:54:32.150 --> 00:54:32.892 you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- 00:54:32.892 --> 00:54:35.118 so Pathologic CI is equally good
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}35{.}118 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}37{.}544$ in terms of metastatic recurrence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:37.544 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.146$ regardless of race.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:39.150 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.766$ In fact,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- 00:54:39.766 --> 00:54:41.614 I personally have a really serious
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00:54:41.614 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.397$ doubt that there is any major
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}43{.}397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}44{.}912$ genetic sort of explanation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667
- $00{:}54{:}44{.}912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}47{.}640$ behind disparities and outcome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889
- $00{:}54{:}50{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}52{.}694$ So models that include in survival
- NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889
- $00:54:52.694 \rightarrow 00:54:54.325$ rates are problematic, right,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889
- 00:54:54.325 --> 00:54:56.700 because it perpetuated a risk

 $00:54:56.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.925$ factor that that maybe not true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

00:54:58.925 --> 00:54:59.985 So if your social,

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:54:59.990 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.290$ social circumstances change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:55:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.690$ Is there a question from online?

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

00:55:05.690 --> 00:55:06.760 I should call you back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}11.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}13.708$ So there's this question online that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00{:}55{:}13.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}16.924$ Umm. Some body's relevant regretting

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00:55:16.924 \rightarrow 00:55:18.472$ their choice that they're not breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00{:}55{:}18.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}19.588$ on cologist and they agree with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}19{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}21{.}738$ That's the do patients with inflammatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00:55:21.738 \rightarrow 00:55:24.015$ breast cancer have higher response rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00{:}55{:}24.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}26.361$ to checkpoint inhibition and the agent

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00:55:26.361 \rightarrow 00:55:28.289$ setting regardless to applying results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00{:}55{:}28{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}29{.}350$ Yeah, that's a good one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

00:55:29.350 - 00:55:30.434 So you know inflammatory

 $00:55:30.434 \rightarrow 00:55:31.789$ breast cancer is a misnomer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00:55:31.790 \rightarrow 00:55:33.698$ It's really, it's a clinical description

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:33.698 \dashrightarrow 00:55:35.649$ that people came up and whatever

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:35.649 \rightarrow 00:55:37.486$ maybe the 19th century and because

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:37.486 -> 00:55:38.976 the breast looks like inflamed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}38{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}42{.}164$ it's red and hot and and swollen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00{:}55{:}42{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}44{.}172$ it looks like a skin infection and

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:44.172 \rightarrow 00:55:45.950$ very often primary care physicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:45.950 \rightarrow 00:55:48.030$ Give it antibiotics and it just gets worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:48.030 \rightarrow 00:55:49.494$ So inflammatory breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}49{.}494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}51{.}324$ actually is not particularly rich.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}51{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}54{.}378$ In fact it's pretty poor in immune cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00{:}55{:}54{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}55{.}361$ But we did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667

 $00:55:55.361 \rightarrow 00:55:56.996$ Actually the first whole genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:56.996 --> 00:55:59.268 sequencing of inflammatory breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:59.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:01.170$ hoping to find something and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- $00:56:01.170 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.290$ disappointed we didn't find
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667
- $00:56:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.940$ anything that actually defined this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667
- $00{:}56{:}05{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}08{.}330$ autonomically at the DNA sequence space,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- $00:56:08.330 \rightarrow 00:56:09.986$ but we find some interesting things.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667
- 00:56:09.990 --> 00:56:12.534 Again, TGF beta macrophage
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- $00:56:12.534 \rightarrow 00:56:15.718$ related markers show up there.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- 00:56:15.720 --> 00:56:17.202 As potentially contributing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- $00:56:17.202 \longrightarrow 00:56:19.178$ to the poor outcome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667
- 00:56:19.180 --> 00:56:19.760 But yeah,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- 00:56:19.760 --> 00:56:20.920 so inflammatory breast cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- $00:56:20.920 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.810$ is all the four subtypes and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667
- $00:56:22.810 \longrightarrow 00:56:24.560$ as far as we can tell today,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7017627916666667
- $00:56:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.485$ there is really no proton
- NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667
- $00{:}56{:}26{.}485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}27{.}640$ nomical genomic alteration.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667
- $00:56:31.010 \rightarrow 00:56:32.765$ So what type of preventive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:32.765 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.520$ interventions do you foresee for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:56:34.584 \rightarrow 00:56:36.489$ patients with high cancer score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:36.490 \longrightarrow 00:56:40.134$ So if you already have validated and

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:40.134 \rightarrow 00:56:42.310$ really effective prevention drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:56:42.310 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.088$ right, the moxen aromatase inhibitors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00{:}56{:}45.088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}48.260$ food and other drugs, the I type drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:56:48.260 \rightarrow 00:56:50.932$ but they have side effects and and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:56:50.932 \rightarrow 00:56:53.404$ think one way to use these cancer score

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:56:53.481 \rightarrow 00:56:55.897$ would be to if you're high risk that

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:55.897 \rightarrow 00:56:57.970$ you are close to this tipping point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:56:57.970 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.050$ I should say you that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00{:}56{:}59{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}59{.}770$ don't have that score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00{:}56{:}59{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}00{.}598$ It's working on it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667

 $00:57:00.598 \longrightarrow 00:57:02.129$ But it's the idea that if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:02.129 \rightarrow 00:57:03.319$ can tell that these biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:03.320 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.078$ tissue biopsy shows that you are

- NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667
- $00:57:05.078 \rightarrow 00:57:06.812$ close to this tipping point and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667
- $00:57:06.812 \rightarrow 00:57:08.312$ maybe you are willing to put
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667
- $00:57:08.312 \longrightarrow 00:57:09.739$ up with some additional.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667
- $00{:}57{:}09{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}10{.}280$ Umm.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8391099106666667
- $00:57:10.280 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.980$ Discomfort from a prevention drug.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- 00:57:17.620 --> 00:57:20.024 All right. Let's go ahead, Andrew.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- $00{:}57{:}20{.}024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}22{.}688$ A lot of times with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- 00:57:22.688 --> 00:57:24.969 people who have even PCR,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- $00{:}57{:}24{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}27{.}268$ they can relapse in the brain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- 00:57:27.270 00:57:29.130 And people sort of say that's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- $00:57:29.130 \longrightarrow 00:57:30.950$ due the blood brain barrier,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- 00:57:30.950 --> 00:57:33.915 but are there molecular alterations
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- $00{:}57{:}33{.}915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}37{.}750$ that predict frame labs or can you?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- 00:57:37.750 --> 00:57:39.436 No, I can't. But you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- $00:57:39.440 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.483$ I mean, that's the reason why I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:40.483 \rightarrow 00:57:41.698$ don't go to many of the meetings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}41{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}43{.}270$ because there are so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:43.270 \rightarrow 00:57:44.526$ interesting things to study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:44.530 - 00:57:47.306 I just enjoy them more but yeah so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:47.310 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.443$ so people tried that but they didn't find it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}49{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}51{.}106$ But what you bring up is illegal one right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}51{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}53{.}049$ So the pathologic CR is really good

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:53.049 \rightarrow 00:57:55.183$ but it's not a perfect predictor and

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:55.183 --> 00:57:57.476 for for there are many reasons why

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:57.476 --> 00:57:59.654 there should be a disconnect with

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}59{.}654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}01{.}384$ Pathologic CR improvement in survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}01{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}03{.}286$ So you can't cure people twice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:58:04.730$ So if you enroll a lot of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:04.730 \longrightarrow 00:58:06.070$ that are on stage one breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:06.070 \rightarrow 00:58:07.468$ cancer and the surgeon cure them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:07.470 \dashrightarrow 00:58:09.000$ it doesn't really matter whether

- NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394
- 00:58:09.000 00:58:10.530 they are chemosensitive or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}10{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}12{.}778$ But in terms of recurrences look to Silver

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:12.778 --> 00:58:15.130 Point out something that many oncologists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:15.130 \rightarrow 00:58:16.258$ Even breast oncologists may

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:16.258 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.668$ not be totally familiar with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:17.670 \longrightarrow 00:58:19.896$ So there are a number of studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:19.896 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.984$ that show now that the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:21.984 --> 00:58:24.102 sight of recurrence of the PCR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:24.110 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.196$ half of the time it's the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}26{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}28{.}916$ When you have no PCR residual disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:58:31.013$ then the brain is the first site

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:31.013 \rightarrow 00:58:32.978$ in about 10% and it goes along

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}32{.}978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}34{.}580$ with this idea that the brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}34{.}638 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}36{.}228$ is somehow a protected site.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}36{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}38{.}407$ And the question is then how they

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:38.407 \rightarrow 00:58:40.654$ actually can break this protection and NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00:58:40.654 \rightarrow 00:58:42.744$ really help avoid brain recurrences. NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 00:58:42.750 --> 00:58:44.580 There are some some really good NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00:58:44.580 \rightarrow 00:58:46.656$ initiatives in the in the her two NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00:58:46.656 \rightarrow 00:58:48.511$ positive space and some of the ADC NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00:58:48.568 \rightarrow 00:58:50.810$ may get in there triple 90 disease, NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 00:58:50.810 -> 00:58:53.010 but what actually would define NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 00:58:53.010 - 00:58:55.391 high risk for brain recurrence NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00:58:55.391 \rightarrow 00:58:57.766$ in terms of molecular markers? NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00:58:57.770 \rightarrow 00:59:00.426$ But they could find that in a reproducible NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394 $00{:}59{:}00{.}426 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}02{.}847$ and accepted sort of widely accepted way. NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172 00:59:06.360 --> 00:59:09.036 Thank you. Thank you for all NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172 $00:59:09.036 \rightarrow 00:59:11.618$ of you who have joined both NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172 $00{:}59{:}11.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}12.956$ in person and virtually. NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172 00:59:12.956 --> 00:59:15.402 This concludes our breast cancer NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172 $00:59:15.402 \rightarrow 00:59:16.906$ awareness month grand rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172 00:59:16.910 --> 00:59:17.590 Thank you so much. NOTE Confidence: 0.53831303 00:59:38.790 --> 00:59:41.000 Yeah.