WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:03:44" NOTE recognizability:0.848

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:01.692$  Welcome everybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:01.692 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.408$  This is the first ground round

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

00:00:06.408 --> 00:00:10.800 of 2022 and I am very glad to

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:10.800 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.311$  hoster with Doctor Jessica Davis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:13.311 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.896$  That is an incredible uprising.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00{:}00{:}15.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}18.875$  Star pediatric pathology and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00{:}00{:}18.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}22.322$  bone and soft tissue I will give

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:22.322 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.800$  you a brief review of our career.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:24.800 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.417$  Doctor Jessica Davis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:26.417 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.190$  Ryan now is a pathologist at Oregon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:30.190 \dashrightarrow 00:00:33.316$  At the Science University in Portland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

00:00:33.320 --> 00:00:36.702 OR where since 2019,

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:36.702 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.554$  she also redirector of surgical pathology.

 $00:00:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.092$  She gotta do it actually from

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00{:}00{:}43.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}45.600$  the same university in Portland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.696$  And then she did a monatomic AP and

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:49.696 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.233$  CP Fellowship in a University of

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00{:}00{:}53.233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}57.384$  California in San Francisco and did

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:00:57.384 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.269$  also a short fellowship which started

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:01:01.269 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.230$  coughing and you can see that from

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:01:04.303 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.244$  the beginning of her career she was

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

00:01:07.244 --> 00:01:10.256 interested not only in pediatric pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667 00:01:10.260 --> 00:01:11.853 but in bone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00{:}01{:}11.853 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}17.615$  And so for a tissue she did Ben,

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

00:01:17.615 --> 00:01:21.755 a pediatric pathology fellowship

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00{:}01{:}21.755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}25.260$  in Seattle Children Hospital

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:01:25.260 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.835$  over Seattle and she's board

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

00:01:28.835 --> 00:01:32.130 certified in pediatric pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.535734651666667

 $00:01:32.130 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.196$  Jumping ahead,

00:01:33.196 --> 00:01:36.394 I want to mention that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:01:38.510 --> 00:01:42.899 2020 she was nominated by our Society

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:01:42.899 --> 00:01:46.148 of Pediatric Pathology for the lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:01:46.150 --> 00:01:51.267 Strauss Award visa is an award that

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:01:51.267 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.109$  recognizes the best paper published by one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:01:56.109 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.298$  our members in a reputable journal and the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:01.300 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.328$  And then the presenter has

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:04.328 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.240$  to be under 40 years of age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:07.240 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.660$  So she is young and the paper that point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:10.660 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.488$  which is actually the main focus of air

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00{:}02{:}14.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}17.960$  of strongest focus of our career area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:17.960 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.780$  was responding with spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:02:19.780 --> 00:02:21.600 of pediatric ENT tracker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:21.600 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.088$  arranging missing comma tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:02:25.090 --> 00:02:29.690 So coming back, she has been very productive.

00:02:29.690 --> 00:02:34.058 She is being the Co author of more

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:02:34.058 --> 00:02:38.010 than 40 peer reviews article.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:38.010 \dashrightarrow 00:02:41.574$  She obviously has participated in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:41.574 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.295$  huge number of abstract and she is

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:45.295 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.590$  a very author of two books and Co.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

00:02:48.590 --> 00:02:50.678 Author of numerous chapters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:50.678 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.140$  particularly as she has a five chapter in VW.

NOTE Confidence: 0.589781010769231

 $00:02:55.140 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.050$  In the recent every 5th edition of A WHO.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:00.220 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.216$  Book The Blue Book for a soft tissue sarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

00:03:04.220 --> 00:03:06.284 Also entering about obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00{:}03{:}06.284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}10.168$  soft tissue of the pediatric age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:10.168 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.728$  She is more than anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

00:03:13.730 --> 00:03:16.520 a very sought after speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:16.520 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.512$  She started with a couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:18.512 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.274$  international talk at the beginning

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:20.274 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.119$  of his career over career,

 $00:03:22.120 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.438$  but now she is talking about at

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00{:}03{:}25.438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}27.654$  least five international talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:27.654 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.446$  In the in the recent year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:31.450 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.016$  international class,

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:33.016 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.148$  regional and local talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:36.150 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.029$  She is some grant funding and some

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

00:03:41.029 --> 00:03:43.669 collaboration with pharmaceutical society

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:43.669 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.414$  is pharmaceutical company which she

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:46.414 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.648$  will disclose in relation to her work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00{:}03{:}49.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}53.474$  She is is doing and in addition she

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:53.474 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.974$  does enormous amount of work as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:03:56.974 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.200$  central pathology review for a number.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:00.200 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.336$  Over protocol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:01.336 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.176$  either inside the way Children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:04.180 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.101$  Oncology society and some Phase 1B and

 $00:04:09.101 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.810$  another trial again for the children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:13.810 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.580$  Oncology society she is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:19.580 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.922$  Part of a research Society of

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:22.922 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.150$  pediatric pathology research group

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

00:04:25.241 --> 00:04:28.713 interest and she is very busy because

NOTE Confidence: 0.604750868888889

 $00:04:28.713 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.250$  she's very director over large.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

00:04:33.630 --> 00:04:36.360 I theology department,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

00:04:36.360 --> 00:04:39.056 I am sure I haven't not cover everything

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

 $00:04:39.056 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.226$  in addition to she is very active.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

00:04:41.230 --> 00:04:43.939 She is energetic person during a young

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

00:04:43.939 --> 00:04:46.847 year she was in Africa in Tanzania,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

 $00{:}04{:}46.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.690$  working in a center that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

 $00{:}04{:}50.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}53.954$  covered in medicine in Tanzania.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

 $00:04:53.954 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.314$  But besides that she is splendid speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

 $00:04:58.314 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.240$  So welcome Jessica and

NOTE Confidence: 0.67951371

 $00:05:00.240 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.490$  I give the floor to you.

 $00:05:03.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.019$  Thank you so much for that very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945911412857143

 $00:05:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.052$  very kind introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945911412857143

 $00:05:06.052 \longrightarrow 00:05:07.772$  It's really my pleasure to

NOTE Confidence: 0.945911412857143

00:05:07.772 --> 00:05:09.518 speak to all of you today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945911412857143

 $00{:}05{:}09.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}13.088$  I really hope you guys enjoy this talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896538693333333

 $00:05:17.190 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.528$  Hopefully you can see my screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896538693333333

 $00:05:18.530 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.082$  Please let me know if you have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.896538693333333

 $00{:}05{:}20.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.440$  problems with viewing the PowerPoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:23.660 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.440$  This slide shows you my university as I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:27.440 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.510$  talking to Raphaela earlier this morning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00:05:29.510 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.099$  My hospital is situated up on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}05{:}31.099 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32.680$  hillside which is not the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00{:}05{:}32.680 \rightarrow 00{:}05{:}34.100$  strategic planning for our hospital,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:34.100 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.074$  but it does give us the unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:36.074 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.320$  opportunity for me to commute to work

 $00:05:38.320 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.324$  sometimes via the Portland aerial tram.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

00:05:40.330 --> 00:05:42.689 So if you have not visited Portland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:42.690 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.524$  please, I welcome you to come visit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

00:05:44.530 --> 00:05:46.726 I'm always happy to take guests

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:46.730 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.070$  and provide tours of our hospital.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}05{:}49.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}51.016$  You can commute between our two campuses

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:51.016 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.814$  via the Portland Aerial tram, which.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:52.814 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.730$  The main campus is up on this hillside and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00:05:55.800 \longrightarrow 00:05:58.579$  our other campuses down at the waterfront.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:05:58.580 \longrightarrow 00:05:59.768$  Without further ado,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

00:05:59.768 --> 00:06:02.144 I will go into our talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

00:06:02.150 --> 00:06:03.620 which today I've been titled,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:03.620 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.879$  What's in a name as we Kind of delve

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:05.879 \longrightarrow 00:06:08.147$  into the somewhat controversial topic

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:08.150 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.730$  with lots of recent discoveries talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:10.730 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.450$  about our current understanding

00:06:12.514 --> 00:06:14.089 of infantile fibrosarcoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:14.090 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.092$  which I've spent a lot of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:16.092 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.950$  career focusing on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:16.950 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.570$  and this newer provisional category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:19.570 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.490$  called Entracque,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:20.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.330$  rearranged spindle cell neoplasms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:22.330 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.860$  which was a new entity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:23.860 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.900$  In the recent edition of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:25.900 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.130$  5th edition of the 2020 bonus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:28.130 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.379$  soft tissue WHO.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

00:06:31.380 --> 00:06:31.995 As alluded to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}06{:}31.995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}34.293$  I do need to disclose that I serve as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00{:}06{:}34.293 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}35.913$  consultant for the conglomerate of Bear,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}06{:}35.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}38.878$  Laakso and Illy Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:38.880 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.270$  This has to do with the work

00:06:42.270 --> 00:06:45.490 within tyrosine kinase inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:45.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.793$  So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:45.793 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.914$  as a pathologist I like to start

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:47.914 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.930$  with the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

00:06:48.930 --> 00:06:51.210 I think it's very Lester Tieve

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:51.210 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.689$  as we get through this topic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:06:53.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.089$  So this is a case that I first became

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}06{:}57.089 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}59.104$  interested in and track tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00:06:59.110 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.890$  So this patient initially presented in 2011.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:02.890 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.110$  This was an infant boy who presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:06.110 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.098$  at birth with somewhat of an ambiguous

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}07{:}09.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}11.510$  mass or asymmetry of his foot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:11.510 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.010$  and there was a biopsy performed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00:07:13.010 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.017$  at 9 days of age and that was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:15.020 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.912$  Subsequently followed by resection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00{:}07{:}16.912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}19.750$  This is a photomic rograph of that

 $00:07:19.823 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.480$  resection and you can kind of see

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:22.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.572$  the spectrum of morphology seen at

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:24.572 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.066$  this low power image. On the right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:27.066 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.418$  You can see these somewhat monotonous

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:29.418 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.565$  land spindle cells infiltrating

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:31.565 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.245$  into skeletal muscle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:33.250 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.133$  Over here on the right you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:35.133 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.534$  see them infiltrating into fiber

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:36.534 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.148$  adipose tissue in the center of

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

00:07:38.148 --> 00:07:39.764 the photo micrograph and more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9255400411111111

 $00:07:39.764 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.469$  cellular confluence of sheets of

NOTE Confidence: 0.925540041111111

 $00:07:41.469 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.970$  spindle cells on the left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00{:}07{:}45.850 --> 00{:}07{:}47.875$  This is the same tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:07:47.875 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.090$  at higher magnification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:07:49.090 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.862$  Again, looking at the end of the

00:07:51.862 --> 00:07:53.950 individual cell cyto morphology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:07:53.950 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.743$  the tumor cells are bland within this tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00{:}07{:}57.743 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}00.269$  that mitotic rate was quite low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:00.270 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.321$  At highest you could get to about

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:02.321 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.770$  2 mites and 10 higher power fields,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:04.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.650$  but cells are ovoid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:06.650 \longrightarrow 00:08:07.590$  somewhat primitive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:07.590 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.228$  looking in a collagenase to mix

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00{:}08{:}09.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}10.811$  with drama but quite infiltrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:10.811 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.555$  infiltrating between the individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00{:}08{:}12.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}14.735$  skeletal muscle fibers or reaching

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.438$  in somewhat fibrous septae

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:16.438 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.674$  between fibroadipose tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

00:08:17.680 --> 00:08:19.444 But other areas were more cellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.86661655125

 $00:08:19.444 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.289$  in confluent sheets of tumor cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}08{:}23.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.704$  So the initial biopsy in the resection

00:08:25.704 --> 00:08:26.930 specimen looked quite similar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}08{:}26.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}29.440$  both histologically and by immunophenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:08:29.440 --> 00:08:33.688 that IHC profile was fairly nonspecific,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:08:33.690 --> 00:08:39.290 with patchy expression of SMAD CD34

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.340$  and beta catenin were negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:41.340 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.260$  Classic curious type was performed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:43.260 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.688$  I'm not sure if you still

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:44.688 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.400$  do this at your institution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:46.400 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.256$  I think that this is largely going away,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:08:49.260 --> 00:08:50.964 although I would argue

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:50.964 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.668$  there's still some utility.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:52.670 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.393$  And trisomy eight was present in classic

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}08{:}55.393 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}08{:}57.505$  karyotype and ATV 6 fluorescence

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}08{:}57.505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59.685$  inside 2 hybridization or fish

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:08:59.685 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.939$  was performed which was negative.

00:09:01.940 --> 00:09:04.946 So at the time of this biopsy and resection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}09{:}04.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}07.250$ a descriptive diagnosis was rendered

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:07.250 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.099$  of low grade spindle cell neoplasm

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:10.099 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.943$  with a fairly robust comment written

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}09{:}12.943 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}15.536$  and a differential diagnosis of

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:09:15.536 --> 00:09:18.824 infantile fibrosarcoma as a diagnostic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:18.824 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.350$  possibility or some sort of fibromatosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:21.350 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.860$  and if this were some sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:09:23.860 --> 00:09:26.120 Fibromatosis really the question is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:26.120 \longrightarrow 00:09:27.503$  well, what type?

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}09{:}27.503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}29.347$  This wasn't classic morphology

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:29.347 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.845$  for a desmoid type fibromatosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}09{:}31.845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}34.435$  and beta catenin was negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636 00:09:34.440 --> 00:09:35.268 I'll be it. NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:09:35.268 --> 00:09:35.820 We know. NOTE Confidence: 0.82199063636363636

00:09:35.820 --> 00:09:38.970 Particularly in infantile forms of desmoid,

 $00:09:38.970 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.028$  often beta catenin could be negative and

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}09{:}41.028 \to 00{:}09{:}43.500$  upward of 25% of cases, although again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:43.500 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.516$  the morphology was not classic for for this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:09:46.520 --> 00:09:49.224 Could this be some sort of Lipo fibromatosis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636 00:09:49.230 --> 00:09:49.518 Again, NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

00:09:49.518 --> 00:09:51.534 the morphology is not classic for this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:51.540 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.288$  There were cellular areas and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:54.290 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.317$  I said this was rendered a

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00:09:56.317 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.785$  descriptive diagnosis was rendered

NOTE Confidence: 0.821990636363636

 $00{:}09{:}57.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}59.253$  with a differential diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:01.810 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.700$  So I think it's important for us

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:03.700 \longrightarrow 00:10:06.301$  to kind of delve into the past to

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:06.301 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.615$  understand our where we are today

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:08.615 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.580$  with our understanding of infantile

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:10.657 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.165$  fibrosarcoma as well as other tumors.

00:10:13.170 --> 00:10:16.131 And so you know, where did this

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:10:16.131 --> 00:10:17.910 term infantile fibrosarcoma begin?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:17.910 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.776$  So this term was first coined in 1976.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:20.776 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.544$  In this paper written by Chung and Denzinger.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:10:23.550 --> 00:10:25.290 Prior to this point in time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:25.290 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.800$  other terms were used to

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:26.800 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.310$  obviously describe the same tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:28.310 \dashrightarrow 00:10:30.278$  The tumor existed before this paper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:30.280 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.020$  Terms such as just fibrosarcoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:10:32.020 --> 00:10:33.324 juvenile fibrosarcoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:33.324 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.768$  etc were used in this paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00{:}10{:}36.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.380$  which was a study out of the FIP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:39.380 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.056$  the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.646$  These two authors looked specifically at

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:10:44.646 --> 00:10:47.790 tumors only in young pediatric patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:47.790 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.750$  so it's not that these tumors didn't

 $00:10:49.750 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.907$  exist in older patients and or adults,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:51.910 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.232$  but they only looked at cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:10:54.232 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.980$  in children 5 and under.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:10:56.980 --> 00:11:01.204 They found 53 cases that they thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:01.204 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.596$  had recurrent morphologic features and

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:04.596 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.220$  some similar clinical demographics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:07.220 --> 00:11:09.170 This included ultimately children from

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:09.170 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.340$  birth to four years of age with a median.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:12.340 \longrightarrow 00:11:13.720$  Age of three months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:13.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:16.703$  The locations are what we now kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:16.703 --> 00:11:19.235 except for infantile fibrosarcoma or IFC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:19.240 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.140$  including locations in the extremities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:21.140 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.060$  back trunk, head and neck,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:22.060 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.012$  and retroperitoneum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:23.012 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.344$  They were able to kind of define

 $00:11:26.344 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.669$  the recurrent morphology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:28.670 \longrightarrow 00:11:33.010$  I'll be it they note in this manuscript

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:33.010 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.630$  the morphology was quite heterogeneous

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:35.630 \longrightarrow 00:11:37.916$  with the most common morphologies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:37.916 --> 00:11:40.628 which we know today of spindle cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:40.630 --> 00:11:41.998 arranged in long fascicles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:41.998 --> 00:11:43.708 including some cases with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:43.708 --> 00:11:45.249 herring bone like morphology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:45.250 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.266$  which is pictured here on the right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:47.270 --> 00:11:49.462 Other cases had spindled,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:49.462 --> 00:11:51.654 or primitive stellate cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:51.654 --> 00:11:53.670 arranged haphazardly in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:53.670 \longrightarrow 00:11:55.350$  myxoid to collagenous stroma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:11:55.350 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.385$  Often with admix,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:11:56.385 --> 00:11:57.765 chronic inflammation and many

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00{:}11{:}57.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}59.683$  cases have what they described

00:11:59.683 --> 00:12:01.327 as parasitic vascular pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:12:01.330 --> 00:12:02.670 which we would now probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:02.670 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.474$  described as Hemangioma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:12:03.480 --> 00:12:07.780 parasitic or branching actrec vessels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:07.780 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.350$  They noted in this paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:09.350 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.920$  that of these 53 cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:12:10.920 --> 00:12:13.902 many of them had prior diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:13.902 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.230$  of many other tumor designations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:17.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:19.614$  ranging from schwanoma to

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:19.614 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.594$  Rhabdomyosarcoma to many other entities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:22.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.168$  and indeed only nine of these 53 cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:25.168 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.247$  were actually diagnosed as fibrosarcoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00{:}12{:}27.247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}29.527$  prior to their histologic review.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:29.530 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.520$  So I'm gonna dump this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:30.520 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.896$  I FS 1.0 AKA the old,

00:12:32.900 --> 00:12:36.449 although 1976 isn't actually that long ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:36.450 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.358$  Moving forward from 1976.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:40.360 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.528$  Morphology really was the mainstay of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:43.528 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.640$  diagnosis for infantile fibrosarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:12:45.640 --> 00:12:47.248 In that original manuscript,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:12:47.248 --> 00:12:49.258 in several manuscripts moving forward,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:49.260 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.465$  it became apparent that using

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:51.465 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.670$  conventional karyotype could also be

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00{:}12{:}53.737 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}56.172$ a useful diagnostic adjunct because

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:56.172 \longrightarrow 00:12:58.607$  there was nonrandom chromosomal gains

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:12:58.682 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.117$  in infantile fibrosarcoma which was

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:01.117 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.552$  different than in adult fibrosarcoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:03.560 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.135$  which shared similar morphology but

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:06.135 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.710$  lacked these nonrandom chromosomal gains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.141$  Specifically nonrandom chromosomal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:13:10.141 --> 00:13:13.480 Gains could be seen in chromosomes 2,

 $00:13:13.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.044$  eight, 1117 and 20,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:15.044 \longrightarrow 00:13:16.999$  and as highlighted in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:13:16.999 --> 00:13:18.180 specific karyotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:18.180 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.268$  we can see TRISOMIES in 1117 and 20.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:21.270 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.314$  So many manuscripts highlighted

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:23.314 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.358$  this and moving forward,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:13:25.360 --> 00:13:27.088 particularly through the 70s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:27.088 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.816$  eighties and early 90s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:28.820 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.026$  This was used as a diagnostic adjunct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

 $00:13:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.380$  And then we reached a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:13:34.380 --> 00:13:37.014 pivotal moment in 1998 where there

NOTE Confidence: 0.94753440625

00:13:37.014 --> 00:13:39.170 was a paradigm shift in how we

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}13{:}39.237 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41.532$  think about and diagnose infantile

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}13{:}41.532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44.586$  fiber sarcoma. 2 separate groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:13:44.586 --> 00:13:47.226 including Paul Sorenson's lab up in

00:13:47.226 --> 00:13:48.746 British Columbia and Brian Rubin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:13:48.750 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.506$  who's now a very well known bonus of

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:13:52.506 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.474$  tissue pathologist at the Cleveland Clinic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:13:54.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.135$  Both of these groups identified a novel

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:13:59.135 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.124$  and recurrent translocation and 12 to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:02.124 --> 00:14:04.203 Health 15, which is the ET V6

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:04.203 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.157$  and track 3 gene fusion in both

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}14{:}07.157 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}09.353$  infantile fibrosarcoma as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}14{:}09.353 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}11.705$  the analogous tumor in the kidney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:11.710 --> 00:14:12.964 Congenital mesoblastic nephroma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:12.964 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.890$  which is highlighted both in break apart

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:15.949 --> 00:14:17.869 fish for ETV Six which I'm sure many

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:17.869 --> 00:14:20.332 of us are very familiar with which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:20.332 --> 00:14:22.464 really become a mainstay of diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:22.464 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.730$  For these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:23.730 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.114$  From this point on as well as by

00:14:27.114 --> 00:14:29.524 classic singer sequencing and so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:29.524 --> 00:14:31.216 this was really a pivotal moment

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:31.216 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.380$  in how we think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:32.380 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.129$  About infantile fibrosarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}14{:}34.129 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}37.044$  Because this genetic translocation was

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:37.044 --> 00:14:39.739 identified in a very high frequency

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:39.739 \longrightarrow 00:14:42.274$  in these two tumor types and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:42.274 --> 00:14:44.773 moving on from this point in time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:44.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.410$  this was identified in upward

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.310$  of 70 to 90% of cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:48.310 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.080$  and so this could be used

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:50.080 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.930$  as a diagnostic tool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:51.930 \longrightarrow 00:14:53.820$  So going back to the original case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:14:53.820 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.868$  I shared this case recurred three

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:14:56.868 -> 00:14:58.392 years following presentation.

 $00:14:58.400 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.392$  We're now at about 2014 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}01.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}03.466$  excisional biopsy, excuse me, and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:03.466 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.996$  Incisional biopsy was performed on

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:05.996 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.570$  that recurrence which now shows.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.295$  Recurrence is the much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:10.295 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.985$  cellular component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:10.990 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.514$  arranged in long fascicles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:15:13.514 --> 00:15:16.038 Some admixed chronic inflammation

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:16.040 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.922$  scattered mitoses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:16.922 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.450$  but still the mitotic rate is fairly low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:20.450 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.018$  My toes is in this case were about

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:23.018 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.662$  5:00 and 10:00 at this point in

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}25.662 \rightarrow 00{:}15{:}27.602$  time the diagnosis still remained

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}27.602 --> 00{:}15{:}28.850 \ \mathrm{somewhat} \ \mathrm{descriptive},$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:28.850 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.310$  unclassified spindle cell sarcoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}31.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}34.385$  but now really favoring infantile

 $00:15:34.385 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.182$  fibrosarcoma despite the lack

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:36.182 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.654$  of any TV sticks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:15:37.660 --> 00:15:39.332 Rearrangement by fish and

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:39.332 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.840$  again at this point in time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:15:41.840 --> 00:15:44.396 in the way most pathologists practiced,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:44.400 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.864$  without having an ATV.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:45.864 \longrightarrow 00:15:47.694$  16 we arrangement because of

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:15:47.694 --> 00:15:49.832 that pivotal moment from 1998

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}49.832 \rightarrow 00{:}15{:}52.092$  most people relied very heavily

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}52.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}54.725$  on identification of that ETV 6

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:15:54.725 --> 00:15:57.104 and track 3 gene rearrangement to

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}15{:}57.104 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}59.120$  diagnose infantile fiber sarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:15:59.120 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.278$  This wasn't universal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:16:00.278 \longrightarrow 00:16:02.208$  and some institutions still would

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:16:02.208 \longrightarrow 00:16:03.800$  diagnose based on morphology,

00:16:03.800 --> 00:16:06.096 and that's what happened in this case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00{:}16{:}06.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}08.220$  so following this diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:16:08.220 --> 00:16:10.340 The patient underwent chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:16:10.340 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.540$  including two cycles of ifosfamide

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:16:12.540 --> 00:16:13.420 and doxorubicin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:16:13.420 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.597$  and then two cycles of ifosfamide alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:16:15.600 --> 00:16:16.085 Unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

00:16:16.085 --> 00:16:18.510 the tumor continued to progress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867496481764706

 $00:16:18.510 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.670$  and the patient underwent amputation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:23.080 \longrightarrow 00:16:24.910$  Here are some other photo

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}16{:}24.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}26.374$  micrographs of this tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}16{:}26.380 \to 00{:}16{:}29.260$  demonstrating that there was significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:29.260 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.988$  intratumoral heterogeneity with

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:30.988 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.966$  other areas of the tumor having

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:33.966 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.714$  more significant myxoid stroma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:35.720 \longrightarrow 00:16:38.261$  There are areas of vascular highly gnosis

 $00:16:38.261 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.560$  which just this very eastern feel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:16:43.434$  like highland deposition around the vessels

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:16:43.434 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.999$  as well as increased chronic inflammation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:16:47.000 --> 00:16:49.028 The immunohistochemical profile remained

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}16{:}49.028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}52.361$  unchanged with no expression of S 100

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:16:52.361 --> 00:16:56.470 or CD 34, but Patchy SM expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:16:56.470 --> 00:16:58.714 Unfortunately, one year later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}16{:}58.714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}00.926$  the patient presented with

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}17{:}00.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}03.556$  difficulty breathing was found to

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:03.556 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.660$  have innumerous lung metastasis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:05.660 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.840$  and on Histology the lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}17{:}07.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}09.584$  metastasis was very reminiscent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}17{:}09.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}13.200$  His original tumor and subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.810$  recurrence again with fibroblastic spindle

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:16.914 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.218$  cells arranged in these fascicles.

00:17:21.220 --> 00:17:22.340 At this point in time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}17{:}22.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}25.020$  this is now circa 2015,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:17:25.020 --> 00:17:28.020 2016 and luckily our understanding of

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:28.020 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.479$  these ETV six negative spindle cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:31.479 \longrightarrow 00:17:34.594$  tumors with Histology reminiscent IFZ

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:17:34.594 --> 00:17:37.034 had changed and we'll get into this a

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:37.034 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.786$  little bit more detail at this point in time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:17:38.790 --> 00:17:40.630 A pan track antibody was

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:40.630 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.102$  applied to this tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:17:42.110 --> 00:17:44.274 demonstrated here with diffuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}17{:}44.274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}46.979$  cytoplasmic staining by Pan Track,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:46.980 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.640$  IHC and next generation sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:49.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.840$  At this point in time by a DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:51.840 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.190$  hybrid capture methodology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:17:53.190 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.135$  Was performed which demonstrated ATP

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}17{:}56.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.660$  M3 and Track 1 gene rearrangement.

 $00:18:00.660 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.530$  So let's delve into end track for a minute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:04.530 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.890$  What is end track?

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333 00:18:05.890 --> 00:18:06.230 Well, NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:06.230 --> 00:18:07.964 end track is actually a family

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:07.964 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.154$  of genes which encode a series of

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:10.154 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.769$  tropomyosin receptor kinase is there

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:11.769 \longrightarrow 00:18:13.809$  are three of them and track 1/2

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}18{:}13.809 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15.610$  and three which encode the proteins

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:15.610 --> 00:18:16.990 Trek AB&C respectively.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:16.990 --> 00:18:19.290 In normal development these play

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:19.290 --> 00:18:21.269 a really integral role,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}18{:}21.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}23.034$  particularly in embryologic

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:23.034 --> 00:18:24.210 neural development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:24.210 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.450$  There's been a lot of work done

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.578$  by Eric Wong at UCSF on this.

00:18:28.580 --> 00:18:30.086 Unfortunately don't have time to go

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}18{:}30.086 \to 00{:}18{:}32.510$  into details. That's very fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333 00:18:32.510 --> 00:18:33.790 In adults. NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:33.790 --> 00:18:35.974 There is probably still some role of

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:35.974 \longrightarrow 00:18:37.505$  entracque in synaptic pruning again

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:37.505 --> 00:18:39.388 and have time to get into this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:39.390 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.482$  but very fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333 00:18:40.482 --> 00:18:41.210 In general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}18{:}41.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.170$  these play a role in cell cycle regulation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:43.170 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.306$  cellular proliferation and cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:45.306 --> 00:18:45.840 differentiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.268$  What we're going to focus on today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:47.270 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.570$  though, is end tracking cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:50.570 --> 00:18:51.137 So you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:51.137 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.803$  while I am a bone and soft tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:52.803 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.278$  in pediatric pathologist and we're

 $00:18:54.278 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.055$  gonna spend most of our time

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:18:56.055 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.868$  talking about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:56.870 --> 00:18:57.414 Interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:18:57.414 --> 00:19:00.678 Entrekin cancer was actually first described

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:00.678 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.510$  in the 1980s in colorectal cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:19:03.510 --> 00:19:05.685 So timeline of Discovery actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:05.685 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.259$  begins back in the 1980s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:07.259 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.473$  Not a lot of press was

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:09.473 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.910$  made at that point in time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}19{:}11.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}14.340$  because in track in carcinomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:14.340 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.770$  occur at very low frequencies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:16.770 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.888$  So we're talking less than 1%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:18.890 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.030$  Most of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:20.030 \dashrightarrow 00:19:23.254$  Maybe upward of 2% in colorectal cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:23.254 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.662$  Moving forward to the late 80s.

00:19:26.670 --> 00:19:28.926 In Trek 1 fusions were described

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}19{:}28.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}30.430$  in papillary thyroid carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:30.430 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.510$  This is kind of an intermediate frequency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:33.510 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.790$  particularly in pediatric.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333 00:19:35.790 --> 00:19:37.310 PT sees. NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.046$  Fusions occur at higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:39.046 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.348$  frequency frequency than,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}19{:}40.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}42.354$  say a dults where B RAF point

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00{:}19{:}42.354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}44.210$  mutations are much more common,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:44.210 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.870$  but really this was kind of underated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:46.870 \longrightarrow 00:19:48.364$  Discoveries, interesting biologically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:48.364 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.858$  but really this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:19:49.860 --> 00:19:51.934 Pivotal moment again was in 1998,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:19:51.934 --> 00:19:53.430 where ENTRACQUE gene fusions

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

00:19:53.430 --> 00:19:55.684 were discovered in a tumor where

NOTE Confidence: 0.841494113333333

 $00:19:55.684 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.562$  they occurred at a high frequency

 $00:19:57.562 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.501$  and at this

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:19:58.567 --> 00:20:01.023 point in time the game kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:01.023 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.070$  changed because now end track could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:03.070 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.871$  used as a diagnostic adjunct because

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:04.871 --> 00:20:07.076 it occurred at such a high frequency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:07.080 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.576$  Then again there was kind of this lulove.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:09.580 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.080$  Yes, this is interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:11.080 \longrightarrow 00:20:14.400$  We can use it diagnostically until kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:14.400 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.760$  about the time of this patients metastasis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:17.760 \longrightarrow 00:20:19.970$  because something else different unchanged.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:19.970 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.000$  Have no tank and have changed this

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:22.000 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.376$  figure a little bit because an important

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:24.376 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.536$  thing that happened was we introduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:26.601 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.731$  next generation sequencing into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:28.731 --> 00:20:30.448 clinical realm and then another

 $00:20:30.448 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.058$  important thing that happened was

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:32.058 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.049$  first generation in truck inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:20:37.530$  Entered clinical trial testing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:37.530 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.560$  so with this and with the development

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:39.560 --> 00:20:41.710 of these new pharmaceutical agents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:41.710 --> 00:20:44.464 including Larry checked and interest and

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:44.464 --> 00:20:47.884 if getting FDA approval for treatment of

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:20:47.884 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.394$  entracque fusion positive solid tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}20{:}50.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}52.682$  Now discovery of end track fusions not

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:52.682 --> 00:20:55.480 only could be used as diagnostic adjuncts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}20{:}55.480 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}20{:}57.965$  they actually were predictive of

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:20:57.965 --> 00:21:00.450 therapeutic response and so this

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:00.531 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.920$  really led to a lot of excitement in

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:03.920 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.260$  clinical treatment as well As for

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:06.260 --> 00:21:08.674 testing and wanting to make sure

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:08.674 \longrightarrow 00:21:11.014$  we could discover these tumors and

 $00:21:11.014 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.428$  diagnose diagnose them appropriately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.530$  This led to an explosion of

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:15.530 \longrightarrow 00:21:16.494$  literature in pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:16.494 \longrightarrow 00:21:18.950$  This led to an explosion of kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:19.022 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.407$  revisiting morphology of these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:21.410 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.519$  So between 2016 and 2019 there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:25.519 --> 00:21:28.544 numerous publications going back and

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:28.544 --> 00:21:32.024 looking at these tumors with nonclassic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.974$  the noncanonical translocations

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:33.974 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.566$  and re describing them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:36.570 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.824$  Some were described as fibromatosis like some

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:38.824 --> 00:21:41.118 were described as having HPC like features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:41.120 --> 00:21:45.514 some as I FS like some is imt like and

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:45.514 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.727$  that really led to the paper that I was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:50.727 --> 00:21:53.541 We had the fortune of presenting

00:21:53.541 --> 00:21:54.830 Mylotte Strauss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:54.830 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.735$  Presentation on which was this

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:21:56.735 --> 00:21:59.109 paper that we published in a JSP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:21:59.110 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.896$  really looking at a the largest series

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:01.896 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.698$  to date of molecularly characterized

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:22:04.698 --> 00:22:07.452 pediatric tumors with molecularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:07.452 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.300$  confirmed entracque January arrangements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:22:09.300 --> 00:22:11.764 Our goal of this was to characterize

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}22{:}11.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}14.559$  these tumors and look at the relationship,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667 00:22:14.560 --> 00:22:15.760 if any,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}22{:}15.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}19.360$  to those if z harboring the canonically

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:22:19.360 --> 00:22:22.730 TV's eccentric 3 gene rearrangement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:22.730 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.740$  This is our case selection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:24.740 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.176$  Most of our cases came from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:22:27.176 --> 00:22:29.239 retrospective review from 2 institutions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}22{:}29.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}31.255$  including Seattle Children's with the

 $00:22:31.255 \longrightarrow 00:22:33.871$  help of Doctor Aaron Rasinski and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}22{:}33.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36.400$  from UCSF where I was faculty at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:36.400 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.168$  A few other cases came from a wonderful

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:39.168 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.070$  group of collaborators which we used for

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}22{:}42.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}45.430$  morphology but not from for outcome studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667 00:22:45.430 --> 00:22:45.898 Ultimately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:45.898 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.770$  we had 30 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}22{:}47.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}50.378$  which doesn't seem like a lot for large

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:50.378 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.160$  clinical trials between New Years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:52.160 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.428$  studying very rare tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:22:53.428 --> 00:22:55.013 It's actually like I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.010$  the largest cohort to date.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:22:57.010 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.356$  We had 12 classic fusions and 18

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:23:00.356 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.312$  variant fusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:23:01.320 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.204$  And you'll note here that there is

00:23:04.204 --> 00:23:07.199 a variety of diagnosis rendered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}23{:}07.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}09.228$  The cases that were diagnosed as

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}23{:}09.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}11.709$  IFS up front were those cases where

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:23:11.709 --> 00:23:14.173 we could confirm with fish for ETV

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:23:14.241 --> 00:23:16.166 6 some cases without confirmation

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:23:16.166 --> 00:23:18.683 of fish word called IFC upfront.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667 00:23:18.683 --> 00:23:19.266 Again, NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00:23:19.266 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.598$  that's really institutional preferences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}23{:}21.600 --> 00{:}23{:}23.854$  If you relied on fish or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

00:23:23.860 --> 00:23:26.225 you'll note by classic karyotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.854546992666667

 $00{:}23{:}26.225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}28.590$  that there were nonrandom chromosomal

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:28.663 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.283$  gains in those chromosomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:30.283 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.903$  I mentioned and both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:31.910 \longrightarrow 00:23:33.605$  The canonical translocation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:33.605 \longrightarrow 00:23:37.560$  as well as the non canonical translocations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:23:37.560 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.326$  The clinical summary of patients age,

 $00:23:40.330 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.498$  sex, location and the size of the tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}23{:}42.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}44.905$  There was no statistical difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}23{:}44.905 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}48.100$  between any of the fusion subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:48.100 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.465$  Really, we wanted to take

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:49.465 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.830$  a look at the morphologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:50.830 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.122$  The morphologic patterns were

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:23:53.122 --> 00:23:55.987 similar between all fusion subtypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}23{:}55.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}58.741$  with a few exceptions which I'll point

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:23:58.741 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.041$  out the most common patterns were indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00{:}24{:}02.041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}05.095$  these long fascicles of spindle cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:24:05.100 --> 00:24:07.300 Other tumors second most common

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:07.300 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.060$  pattern was haphazardly arranged.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:09.060 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.955$  Delatorre spindle cells in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:24:10.955 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.850$  myxoid matrix and many tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:24:12.850 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.940$  Had these HPC like vessels.

 $00:24:15.940 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.140$  A couple exceptions existed

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:18.140 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.790$  the canonical translocation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:24:19.790 --> 00:24:24.487 Fusions were more likely to have abundant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:24:24.490 --> 00:24:26.065 chronic inflammatory cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:24:26.065 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.690$  which could be mistaken for

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:24:28.690 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.538$  an IMT and the variant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:30.538 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.134$  Fusions were more likely to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:24:32.134 --> 00:24:34.084 this biphasic pattern, noted here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}24{:}34.084 \longrightarrow 00{:}24{:}37.260$  On the bottom left with more collagen eisd

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:37.334 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.568$  stroma juxtaposed to a more primitive cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:40.570 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.694$  Other patterns that we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:42.694 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.349$  seeing were a myoid appearance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:24:45.350 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.306$  Many of the tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:46.306 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.155$  almost all of them had at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:48.155 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.965$  focal areas that were fibromatosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:24:49.970 \longrightarrow 00:24:51.704$  Like a few of the tumors

 $00:24:51.704 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.290$  which has been written about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:53.290 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.890$  particularly in this provisional category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:24:55.890 --> 00:24:58.179 written in The Who of quote and

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:24:58.179 --> 00:24:59.919 track rearranged spindle cell tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:24:59.920 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.236$  or these prominent hyalinized

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:01.236 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.716$  vessels and a few tumors had this

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:25:03.716 --> 00:25:05.488 very prominent nuclear palisading,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.225$  which could be mistaken for

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:08.225 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.960$  save Eric bodies in Schwannoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00{:}25{:}10.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}12.880$  So when I look back at our study

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:12.880 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.007$  and I look this time we looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:15.007 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.587$  at patients 25 and under,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}25{:}16.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}18.165$  but yet our median age was still

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:18.165 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.569$  four months in the locations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:25:19.570 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.898$  essentially the same as in that

 $00:25:21.898 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.978$  original paper from the 1970s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:25:23.978 --> 00:25:25.562 And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:25:25.562 \longrightarrow 00:25:29.260$  our three common patterns in our main image,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:25:29.260 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.840$  and I ask myself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:25:30.840 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.444$  is this IFS 2.0 AKA the the new and yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:35.444 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.616$  we molecularly characterize all this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:37.620 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.250$  But I have flashbacks to FS 1.0 AKA the old.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.307$  So I feel like we did a lot of work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:44.310 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.560$  but I think we can learn a lot from

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:46.560 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.650$  the past and attribute a lot to Cheng

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}25{:}49.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}52.239$  Enzinger where they really did a

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:52.239 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.717$  great job of characterizing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

00:25:54.717 --> 00:25:58.960 morphology of these tumors back in 1976.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:25:58.960 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.444$  I think we did learn a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:26:00.444 --> 00:26:01.710 from this manuscript, however,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:01.710 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.490$  so looking at those cases where

 $00:26:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:26:06.384$  fish was performed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:06.384 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.874$  this is a great example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:07.880 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.350$  This was a one year old with a very large

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:26:10.416 --> 00:26:12.172 hand mass of 6.4 centimeters and mass

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:26:12.172 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.699$  in a one year old is pretty gigantic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:26:14.700 --> 00:26:18.356 We performed hand track I see in all

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:18.356 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.648$  of these cases and you can see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00{:}26{:}20.648 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}\:} > 00{:}26{:}22.514$  that we have nice nuclear expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:22.573 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.918$  suggested that there is indeed a fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:26:24.920 \longrightarrow 00:26:26.800$  However, the fish was negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556 00:26:26.800 --> 00:26:27.256 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:26:27.256 --> 00:26:29.080 on DNA hybrid capture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556 00:26:29.080 --> 00:26:29.848 And yes, NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

00:26:29.848 --> 00:26:32.536 this indeed actually did have a fusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:26:32.540 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.892$  so we did have a pretty significant

 $00:26:34.892 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.935$  subset of cases where fish

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:36.935 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.867$  essentially were false negatives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88535028055556

 $00:26:38.870 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.150$  So going back and looking at our case

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:42.150 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.356$  selection of our retrospective review

NOTE Confidence: 0.885350280555556

 $00:26:44.356 \longrightarrow 00:26:47.050$  cases where we originally started with

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:26:47.127 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.364$  29 cases, we had five cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:26:49.364 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.800$  that had positive fish up front.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:26:51.800 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.500$  We had 18 total cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:26:55.500 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.375$  It didn't have that either

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:26:57.375 \longrightarrow 00:26:59.540$  had fish that was unknown or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:26:59.540 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.380$  Not performed or it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:01.380 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.852$  performed and was negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:02.860 --> 00:27:05.680 Six of those ended up having

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:05.680 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.090$  Canonical translocation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:07.090 --> 00:27:09.269 four of those originally had

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:09.269 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.717$  ETV 6 fish that was negative,

 $00:27:11.720 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.526$  so you know what does that mean?

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:13.530 \longrightarrow 00:27:15.329$  Well, that means we had a false

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:15.329 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.639$  negative rate of our fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:16.640 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.758$  There was about 1/3 of cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:18.760 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.956$  so kind of a word to the wise if

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:20.956 --> 00:27:23.258 you're doing it V6 fish is your

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:23.258 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.900$  primary detection method for ifs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}27{:}24.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}27.280$  There is a significant risk of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}27{:}27.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}29.369$  false negative and you may want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}27{:}29.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}31.122$  perform another testing modality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:31.122 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.312$  Either pan track ihcc or

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:33.312 --> 00:27:35.350 next generation sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:35.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.574$  If your clinical suspicion of IFS is high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:39.580 --> 00:27:41.180 By immunohistochemistry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:41.180 --> 00:27:43.990 kind of standard IIC,

 $00:27:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.760$  including SM, A CD34, and S-100.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:46.760 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.020$  There was no difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:49.020 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.715$  between fusion subtypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:50.720 \longrightarrow 00:27:53.317$  so in the literature there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:53.317 --> 00:27:55.839 lot of things written about S.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:27:55.840 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.102$  100 and CD 34 in the provisional

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:27:59.102 --> 00:28:01.452 category of entrec rearrange

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}28{:}01.452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}04.429$  mesenchymal tumors and you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}28{:}04.429 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06.967$  in this larger cohort we actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:06.967 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.597$  saw this both in the variant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667 00:28:09.600 --> 00:28:10.080 Fusions, NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:10.080 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.960$  as well as the canonical translocations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.632$  so I'm not sure we can use this to

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:16.632 \longrightarrow 00:28:19.172$  differentiate between and track one

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:19.172 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.722$  and track 3 gene rearrangements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:21.730 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.160$  What was helpful in our hands

 $00:28:24.160 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.394$  was looking at the staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:26.394 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.490$  patterns in pan track.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:28.490 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.074$  So we wrote a separate paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:28:30.074 --> 00:28:32.000 looking at Pan track sensitivity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:32.000 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.040$  specificity in the staining patterns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:28:34.040 --> 00:28:36.326 So looking at pan Track and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:36.326 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.283$  the different fusions in Pan

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}28{:}38.283 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}40.419$  Track one and two fuse tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:40.420 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.575$  we saw very strong diffuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:28:43.575 --> 00:28:44.837 cytoplasmic staining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00{:}28{:}44.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}47.857$  Whereas and in Trek 3 gene rearrangements,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:47.860 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.132$  this typically had weaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

00:28:49.132 --> 00:28:51.040 Although this is one of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:51.103 \longrightarrow 00:28:52.399$  robust training cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.198$  Weaker staining,

00:28:53.198 --> 00:28:55.991 and most commonly we saw nuclear staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.868726434166667

 $00:28:55.991 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.459$  and this we published also in Asia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:29:02.160 --> 00:29:04.428 So moving forward and I think what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:04.428 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.040$  most important, we spend a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:06.040 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.000$  time looking at the pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:07.000 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.650$  But what does this mean

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.970$  clinically for these patients?

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:29:09.970 --> 00:29:11.440 And so moving forward and looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:11.440 \longrightarrow 00:29:13.040$  at the risk of recurrence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:13.040 \longrightarrow 00:29:15.302$  metastasis and outcome for these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:29:15.302 --> 00:29:18.180 looking just at our retrospective review,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:18.180 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.022$  we can't use the other donated

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}29{:}20.022 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}21.250$  cases from our collaborators

NOTE Confidence: 0.9099117444444444

00:29:21.305 --> 00:29:22.920 'cause we'd have referral bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:22.920 \longrightarrow 00:29:24.820$  Overall, we had a recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:24.820 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.250$  rate of about 24%.

 $00:29:26.250 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.280$  All of these cases had positive margins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}29{:}28.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}30.176$  The metastatic rate of about 12%

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:30.180 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.650$  overall survival was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:29:31.650 --> 00:29:34.132 Quite gutted about 90\% of note

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:34.132 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.698$  about a third of these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:35.698 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.229$  were on targeted therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:37.230 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.099$  so these were patients that were enrolled

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:39.099 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.070$  at the time on the clinical trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:41.070 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.010$  primarily for lyrics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}29{:}44.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}46.145$  And similar to what was seen again

NOTE Confidence: 0.9099117444444444

00:29:46.145 --> 00:29:48.598 in that paper from editing or Chung

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}29{:}48.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}50.806$  was there was no correlation between

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}29{:}50.878 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}52.753$ risk of metastasis or outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.9099117444444444

 $00:29:52.753 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.628$  on the patients age location,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:54.630 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.585$  the fusion partner or mitotic

00:29:56.585 --> 00:29:58.149 rate or histologic pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:58.150 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.270$  and this is really important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:29:59.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.640$  'cause many of these cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:00.640 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.535$  particularly those that did not

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:30:02.535 --> 00:30:05.570 have any TV 6 gene rearrangement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:05.570 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.398$  noted up front,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}30{:}06.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}08.919$  were sent out to a variety of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:08.919 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.027$  institutions for second opinions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:11.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:12.764$  and many of these were actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:12.764 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.920$  called high grade sarcomas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9099117444444444

 $00{:}30{:}13.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}15.558$  So if you think about treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:30:15.558 --> 00:30:17.140 modalities for high grade sarcomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:30:17.140 --> 00:30:18.368 this is aggressive chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9099117444444444

 $00:30:18.368 \longrightarrow 00:30:19.903$  So why were they called

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:19.903 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.378$  high grade sarcoma as well?

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:21.380 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.644$  Many of these had very high mitotic rates,

 $00:30:24.650 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.080$  which is very classic for IFC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:27.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.187$  and they had necrosis and so how

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:30:29.187 --> 00:30:31.393 we grade sarcoma is if you think

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:30:31.393 --> 00:30:33.241 about the French system of grading

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

00:30:33.303 --> 00:30:35.459 is based on my post using necrosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.016$  so these would be over graded

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.246$  based on how we know these behave

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:40.246 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.820$  and then over treated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00:30:41.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.165$  and yet we know for IFS mitosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909911744444444

 $00{:}30{:}44.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48.195$  Necrosis don't matter for risk of outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:30:50.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.158$  So, as I alluded to in this original

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:30:52.158 --> 00:30:53.738 paper by Chung and Denzinger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}30{:}53.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}55.978$  they found the same thing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:30:55.978 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.011$  mitosis in necrosis aren't indicative

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:30:58.011 --> 00:31:00.356 of behavior other large studies.

 $00:31:00.360 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.483$  So this and the OR back study is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:31:03.483 --> 00:31:06.302 study clinical paper out of Europe

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:06.302 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.756$  from 2010 with about 90 FS cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:31:09.760 --> 00:31:11.540 These are not molecularly confirmed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:11.540 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.438$  so this would be all comers

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:14.438 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.030$  based on morphology with again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:17.030 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.450$  No, the outcome was about

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:19.450 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.750$  90% serve overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:22.750 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.150$  So in the years that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:24.150 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.990$  followed this manuscript,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:24.990 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.430$  which was published in 2018,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:27.430 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.127$  moving on to now we're in 2022.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:31:30.127 --> 00:31:33.943 The story is really moved beyond and trek,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}31{:}33.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}37.302$  and so this figure is from a manuscript that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:31:37.302 --> 00:31:38.850 actually just was published this month.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:38.850 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.546$  I had the pleasure of getting asked to

 $00:31:41.546 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.426$  write a review article on this topic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769 00:31:44.430 --> 00:31:45.210 And really, NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:45.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.940$  the last several years has been this

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:31:50.177$  explosion of literature of identification

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:50.177 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.180$  of other oncogenic drivers both in IFC.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}31{:}53.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}56.720$  And in what we now need to put quotes around,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:31:56.720 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.845$  quote and track rearranged spindle

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:31:58.845 --> 00:32:00.545 cell neoplasms because they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:00.545 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.459$  not just entracque anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769 00:32:02.460 --> 00:32:03.274 And really, NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:03.274 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.309$  this literature is shown a

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:05.309 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.168$  variety of genetic alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:07.168 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.400$  and other tyrosine kinases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:09.400 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.151$  and we're going to walk through these

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:12.151 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.348$  membrane brown receptor tyrosine kinases

 $00:32:14.348 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.430$  and other downstream kinases and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:17.430 \longrightarrow 00:32:21.280$  are focused in the map kinase pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:21.280 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.536$  So one of the first kinases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:23.540 \longrightarrow 00:32:26.492$  To be discovered to have alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:26.492 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.179$  in these tumors is in RET,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:29.180 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.824$  so two papers really focused on RET.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:32:33.824 --> 00:32:35.709 A paper by Cristina Antonescu

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:32:35.709 --> 00:32:36.840 and Chris Fletcher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:36.840 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.824$  and then a paper by myself and some

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:39.824 \longrightarrow 00:32:42.212$  wonderful colleagues looking at RET gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}32{:}42.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}44.570$  fusions and spindle cell neoplasms with

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:44.640 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.640$  significant overlap with the zentrack tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:47.640 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.504$  as demonstrated by these

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:49.504 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.436$  two photomicrographs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:50.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.464$  Here's a summary of the RET fusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:53.470 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.297$  In these tumors that have been published

00:32:55.297 --> 00:32:57.644 to date and not to go through all of this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:32:57.650 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.135$  but to point out a few highlights.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:00.140 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.948$  So when the RET story starts to unfold,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:02.950 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.805$  we start noticing that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:33:04.805 --> 00:33:07.230 isn't just in soft tissue tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89847485923076900:33:07.230 --> 00:33:07.880 but again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:07.880 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.505$  we start seeing cases that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:33:09.505 --> 00:33:11.209 are occurring in the kidney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:33:11.210 --> 00:33:13.400 So going back to 1998,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:13.400 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.712$  when Brian Rubin starts identifying that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:33:16.712 --> 00:33:18.730 the ETV's eccentric 3 gene rearrangement

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:18.730 \longrightarrow 00:33:20.590$  occurs not only in soft tissue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:20.590 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.774$  but in the kidney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}33{:}21.774 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}23.254$  and specifically in those tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:23.254 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.579$  described as congenital music,

 $00:33:24.580 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.116$  plastic nephroma we start

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:26.116 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.036$  seeing the same thing happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:28.040 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.371$  And this photo micrograph is of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:30.371 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.393$  tumor that we identified in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:33:32.393 --> 00:33:35.044 kidney with a clip 2 RET gene fusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:35.044 \longrightarrow 00:33:37.276$  and we also start seeing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:37.276 \longrightarrow 00:33:39.260$  a subset of these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:39.260 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.822$  despite S 100 and CD 34 expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:41.822 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.105$  which originally was touted as perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:33:44.105 --> 00:33:46.337 indicative of a benign entity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}33{:}46.337 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}48.780$  Lipo fibromatosis like neural tumor or

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:48.780 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.390$  actually a subset of these metastasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:53.390 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.890$  Moving forward to ALK another

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00{:}33{:}55.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}57.390$  receptor tyrosine kinase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:33:57.390 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.243$  I think most of us in the soft tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:34:00.243 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.670$  world for many years kind of thought

00:34:02.670 --> 00:34:05.190 of alk of being may be part and parcel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:34:05.190 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.102$  but at least mostly thought of as

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

 $00:34:08.102 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.884$  being seen inflammatory myofibroblastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:34:09.884 --> 00:34:12.602 tumor IMT when you first start

NOTE Confidence: 0.898474859230769

00:34:12.602 --> 00:34:13.961 seeing a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:14.038 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.048$  of publications and spindle cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:16.048 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.560$  tumors with that CD 34 and S 100

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00{:}34{:}19.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}22.560$  coexpression and a dults O2 case reports.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:22.560 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.476$  And then we recently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:24.476 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.869$  Published this small case series of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

00:34:27.869 --> 00:34:31.044 four patients in histo paths 2IN soft

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:31.044 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.558$  tissue and again two in the kidney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00{:}34{:}34.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}37.858$  So again, I FS and CMN's without

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00{:}34{:}37.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}39.934$  prior arrangements that look

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:39.934 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.430$  like ifs rather than IMT.

 $00:34:42.430 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.461$  This was a real pleasure to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:45.461 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.106$  write 'cause I had the honor to

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

00:34:47.106 --> 00:34:48.559 write this paper with Cheryl Coffin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:48.560 \longrightarrow 00:34:50.888$  who's really an expert in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:50.888 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.948$  field as she subsequently retired

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:52.948 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.668$  but still stays active.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:54.670 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.310$  These are some photomicrographs

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:56.310 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.849$  of these tumors, really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:34:57.849 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.703$  This is the the most inflammation

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

00:34:59.703 --> 00:35:01.519 that were present in these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:01.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.250$  so really doesn't have the robust chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:04.250 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.900$  inflammation that we associate with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:05.900 \dashrightarrow 00:35:08.570$  IMT and again these spindle cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.207$  tumors arranged in fascicles or more

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:11.207 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.559$  primitive cells in a myxoid matrix.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:13.560 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.488$  Here's a really great example of this kidney.

 $00:35:15.490 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.569$  This was a kidney tumor with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

00:35:17.569 --> 00:35:18.842 classic herring bone pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:18.842 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.447$  associated with IFS or CMN,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:20.450 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.879$  but with dual expression of CD 34

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00{:}35{:}22.879 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25.278$  and S 100 so again highlighting

NOTE Confidence: 0.822880801333334

 $00:35:25.278 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.790$  this can be seen and IFCMN.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:35:30.380 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.480$  Additional work has been done

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}35{:}32.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}34.160$  with met gene rearrangements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:35:34.160 --> 00:35:36.176 This seems to be less frequent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:35:36.180 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.000$  There's been two case reports showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:35:39.000 --> 00:35:41.527 met Gene rearrangements and IFSI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:35:41.527 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.409$  This is published by two wonderful

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}35{:}45.409 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}46.872$ clinical pediatric oncologist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:35:46.872 --> 00:35:49.714 Ajay Gupta, Guvna City who are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:35:49.714 \longrightarrow 00:35:52.218$  active in the children psychology group

 $00:35:52.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.540$  and what I loved about their paper is

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:35:54.540 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.206$  that while many of us have moved away

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:35:57.206 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.177$  from classic karyotype, we now can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:35:59.177 --> 00:36:00.772 Essentially perform some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:00.772 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.630$  same functions of classic karyotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}36{:}02.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05.486$  but by DNA and next generation sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:36:07.626$  Looking at copper copy number changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:07.626 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.459$  and so in this particular tumor we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

 $00:36:10.459 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.684$  see those same nonrandom chromosomal

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:12.684 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.497$  gains by DNA copy number evaluation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

 $00{:}36{:}15.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}18.205$  Looking at chromosomal gains in

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:18.205 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.300$  chromosome 1117 and 20 and so just

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:21.300 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.660$  like the original descriptions of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

00:36:23.660 --> 00:36:25.988 IFS with compatible translocation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:25.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.384$  this IFS with A met gene fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:28.390 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.086$  Same shows those same.

 $00:36:31.086 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.108$  Copy number changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:33.110 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.652$  FGFR 1 gene fusions have just recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:36.652 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.989$  been described in soft tissue tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:39.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.314$  For those of you who may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:42.314 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.890$  neuropathologist and the audience

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:43.890 \longrightarrow 00:36:46.314$  think you guys are more familiar

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:46.314 \longrightarrow 00:36:49.241$  with far in cleoma so FGFR also is

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:49.241 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.339$  a family of tyrosine kinase those

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:36:51.339 --> 00:36:53.697 one through 5 FGFR one specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:53.697 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.057$  had previously been described in two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

00:36:56.057 --> 00:36:58.406 cases of GI stromal tumors several

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:36:58.406 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.686$  years ago and just recently there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}37{:}00.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}02.890$  been one single case of a uterine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:02.890 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.897$  What was described as a neural fiber

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:04.897 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.682$  sarcoma within the spectrum of

 $00:37:06.682 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.550$  entrec fibrosarcomas with the uterus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:37:08.550 --> 00:37:11.592 So I'll talk about this briefly in a moment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:11.600 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.790$  but within this provisional category of

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:37:13.790 --> 00:37:15.764 entrec, rearranged spindle cell tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:15.764 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.866$  there is a subset of uterine fibrosarcoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:18.866 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.378$  as within traction rearrangements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:21.380 \longrightarrow 00:37:23.250$  That was originally described by

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:23.250 \longrightarrow 00:37:25.539$  Cristina Antonescu and then a more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

 $00{:}37{:}25.539 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}27.289$  recent study by Stanford Group

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}37{:}27.289 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}29.300$  has described a series of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.476$  As seen here, the large majority of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:32.480 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.582$  These uterine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}37{:}33.582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35.786$  Cyber sarcomas have entracque

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

 $00:37:35.786 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.888$  gene rearrangements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222200:37:36.890 --> 00:37:37.226 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

 $00:37:37.226 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.578$  one case in their series had an

 $00:37:39.578 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.008$  F for one gene rearrangement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:42.010 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.956$  Many of these tumors do show

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:44.956 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.049$  expression of CD 34 and S 100.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:48.050 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.610$  As seen here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}37{:}49.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}52.210$  this tumor is somewhat haphazardly

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}37{:}52.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}54.285$  arranged mildly more pleomorphism

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:54.285 \longrightarrow 00:37:57.147$  than many of the other cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:37:57.150 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.340$  Again, CD34 and S-100 expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.330$  No pediatric cases had been

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:04.330 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.124$  described until recently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9227971622222222

 $00:38:06.130 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.488$  We described 2 cases of FGFR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}38{:}08.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}10.710$  One pediatric ifz like tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00{:}38{:}10.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.430$  The first case we had actually was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.125$  case that we first sequenced when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:16.125 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.202$  were looking at our end Trek series.

 $00:38:19.202 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.686$  Back from 2018 it was a case that

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:22.686 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.920$  was sent to us from CHLA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:26.920 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.930$  And then a second case through

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.935$  routine clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:29.940 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.640$  Both were in very young children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:32.640 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.938$  one in the Perirectal region and

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:34.938 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.470$  one in the thigh.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:36.470 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.430$  Here are photomic rographs of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:38.430 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.090$  two cases and you can see here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:38:41.090 --> 00:38:44.120 Hopefully you can start to recognize

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:44.120 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.650$  these patterns that they're either very

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:38:46.650 --> 00:38:48.550 spindled or somewhat more primitive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:48.550 \longrightarrow 00:38:51.070$  appearing in ovoid and collogen eyes

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

00:38:51.070 --> 00:38:53.770 to myxoid stroma very infiltrative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:53.770 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.078$  so this case one is this fat

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:56.078 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.050$  that it's infiltrating.

 $00{:}38{:}57.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}59.022$  Here is actually submucosal

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:38:59.022 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.487$  fat in the perirectal region,

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:39:01.490 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.858$  and so I'm in the process

NOTE Confidence: 0.922797162222222

 $00:39:02.858 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.770$  of writing up this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00:39:03.827 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.449$  case series.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00:39:04.450 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.420$  Now this work was presented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00:39:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.270$  This last fall at the Society

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00:39:09.270 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.228$  for Pediatric pathology through

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00{:}39{:}11.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}12.812$  next generation sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00{:}39{:}12.812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}15.378$  These both had fusions that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

00:39:15.378 --> 00:39:17.334 thought to be considered at lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00:39:17.334 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.884$  to constitutive activation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9326616575

 $00{:}39{:}18.884 \to 00{:}39{:}21.188$  the kinase domain of FGFR 1.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:23.300 \longrightarrow 00:39:24.560$  These two patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.465$  one had a resection of the perirectal

00:39:27.465 --> 00:39:30.209 tumor and has no evidence of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:30.210 \longrightarrow 00:39:32.128$  Five years later, and the other patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:32.130 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.496$  like I said, is the more recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

00:39:34.496 --> 00:39:36.814 patient is being treated with targeted

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:36.814 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.016$  therapy and is alive with disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:39.020 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.038$  It's a very large tumor and

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:42.038 \longrightarrow 00:39:43.547$  was dubbed unrespectable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:43.550 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.768$  So now we've moved. Kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00{:}39{:}44.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}47.152$  We're going down this map kinase

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:47.152 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.653$  pathway and we've finished the receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00{:}39{:}49.653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}52.161$  tyrosine kinases that have to date

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

00:39:52.161 --> 00:39:54.546 been described and moving on to Abel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.420$  one which is a cytoplasmic kinase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:39:58.420 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.786$  We were able to describe 2 cases of gab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:01.790 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.202$  One able one fusions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00{:}40{:}03.202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}05.849$  one in an older adult woman who

 $00{:}40{:}05.849 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}08.084$  luckily had a partial response

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:08.084 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.872$  to treatment with imatinib.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:09.880 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.918$  She had an unresectable tumor and when

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

00:40:12.918 --> 00:40:15.858 in a child you can see this tumor here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:15.860 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.820$  one of the highlights of

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:17.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.996$  recognizing these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:19.000 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.316$  as I alluded to before this

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

00:40:21.316 --> 00:40:22.860 very dense perivascular Hila

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:22.937 \longrightarrow 00:40:24.935$  gnosis as seen in this tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

00:40:24.940 --> 00:40:25.265 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00{:}40{:}25.265 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.565$  this tumor had coexpression

NOTE Confidence: 0.77241933

 $00:40:26.565 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.530$  of CD 34 and S 100.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}40{:}31.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}33.906$  And then again, marching down this

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}40{:}33.906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}35.810$  pathway to downstream effector

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:40:35.883 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.299$  molecules or cytoplasmic kinases.

 $00:40:38.300 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.660$  Is braf? I'm going to go back again

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}40{:}40.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43.007$  to our original study and walk you

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:40:43.007 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.750$  down the rest of our key selection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:40:45.750 --> 00:40:48.422 'cause I kind of didn't walk down this

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:40:48.422 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.348$  part of our case selection on purpose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:40:51.350 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.030$  So in our original series,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:40:54.030 \longrightarrow 00:40:57.645$  we started with 29 cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:40:57.645 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.206$  that morphologically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:40:59.206 --> 00:41:04.218 We thought fit with ISS and of

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:41:04.218 --> 00:41:06.288 those large majority ended up

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}41{:}06.288 \to 00{:}41{:}08.740$  having ENTREC gene rearrangements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:08.740 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.247$  However, we excluded 5 cases from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:12.247 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.488$  paper because we either didn't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:15.488 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.770$  enough DNA for further sequencing or

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:18.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.335$  they had non entracque alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:21.335 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.335$  by NGS and there was five of those

 $00:41:24.340 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.602$  of those two in our original series

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:27.602 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.589$  had been graph point mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:30.590 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.067$  And those were kind of set aside

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:32.067 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.796$  at at that point in time because

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:33.796 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.356$  we wanted to focus this initial

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:35.414 \longrightarrow 00:41:36.939$  manuscript really on end track.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:36.940 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.306$  So we had these two initial index

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:39.306 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.779$  cases from this prior investigation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:41.780 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.380$  and ultimately we identified 12

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}41{:}45.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}48.260$  additional BRAF altered cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:41:48.260 --> 00:41:51.124 through routine clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:41:51.124 --> 00:41:51.840 Ultimately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}41{:}51.840 --> 00{:}41{:}54.200$  these 14 cases were published

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:54.200 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.616$  in modern pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:41:55.620 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.536$  We had cases ranging from congenital

00:41:58.536 --> 00:42:01.120 presentation to 32 years of age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:01.120 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.416$  with a median age of 6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:02.420 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.720$  Months 20% percent at birth and

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.104$  large majority by the first end of

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}42{:}08.104 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}10.060$  life there was a male predominance

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:10.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.272$  and again the sites had involvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:12.272 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.785$  were very analogous to what we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:14.785 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.219$  and what we think about for IFS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428 00:42:17.220 --> 00:42:17.610 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:42:17.610 --> 00:42:19.950 the morphology is very reminiscent to

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}42{:}19.950 \to 00{:}42{:}23.080$  what we see in Canonical translocation,

 $\begin{aligned} & \text{NOTE Confidence: } 0.865312028571428 \\ & 00:42:23.080 --> 00:42:23.605 \text{ tumors,} \end{aligned}$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:23.605 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.755$  spindle cell tumors arranged in fascicles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:26.760 \longrightarrow 00:42:28.410$  Other tumors looked much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:42:28.410 --> 00:42:30.060 primitive arranged in myxoid matrix,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:30.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:33.498$  and many had HBC like vessels.

 $00:42:33.500 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.985$  We don't need to go through this whole table.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:34.990 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.590$  It's found in the manuscript,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:36.590 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.486$  but to highlight a few things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:38.490 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.210$  there were indeed activating point mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:42:42.210 --> 00:42:45.946 Some were the very classic V 600 E,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:45.950 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.267$  But there were also some novel point

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:48.267 \longrightarrow 00:42:50.469$  mutations and then some of the tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428 00:42:50.470 --> 00:42:51.122 Excuse me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:51.122 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.404$  some of the tumors had novel fusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:53.410 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.446$  A couple of the tumors had

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:56.446 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.964$  multiple fusion transcripts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:42:57.970 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.968$  Here are some other photo micrographs

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:42:59.968 --> 00:43:01.939 of what these tumors look like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:01.940 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.690$  A couple of interesting things

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.790$  where identified.

 $00:43:05.790 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.400$  One of the tumors had heterologous

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}43{:}08.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}11.012$  differentiation form in the form of

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}43{:}11.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}12.774$  cartilage deposition which we've also

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:12.774 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.029$  seen in a couple of our end track tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:16.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.930$  As far as clinical outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:18.930 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.109$  we had one patient with metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:23.110 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.420$  We had four patients that

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.468$  are alive with disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428 00:43:25.470 --> 00:43:26.092 7 patients, NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:26.092 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.958$  no evidence of disease and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}43{:}27.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}29.549$  two patients died of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:43:29.550 --> 00:43:32.469 So while we have limited follow-up length,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:32.470 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.404$  it seems to be similar to what we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:35.404 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.350$  in patients with entracque tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:43:38.350 --> 00:43:40.924 A smaller series was also published

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}43{:}40.924 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}43.116$  by Christina Antonescu of five

00:43:43.116 --> 00:43:45.528 patients with the RAF gene fusions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:45.530 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.538$  but not point mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

00:43:48.540 --> 00:43:51.276 These have also been described the

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:51.276 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.220$  RAF alterations in CMN by European

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:54.220 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.820$  Group looking at either BRAF

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:56.820 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.084$  internal duplications or entrenching

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:43:59.084 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.580$  gene rearrangements in CMN.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00{:}44{:}01.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}04.604$  So we're seeing the same spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:44:04.604 \longrightarrow 00:44:07.420$  of alterations in IFS&CMN.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865312028571428

 $00:44:07.420 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.226$  So last but not least RAF one

NOTE Confidence: 0.86531202857142800:44:09.226 --> 00:44:10.000 which is also

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:10.060 \longrightarrow 00:44:10.720$  known as C.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:44:14.591$  RAF has also been described in IFS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:44:14.591 --> 00:44:16.759 This is a case report I had the

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:44:16.759 --> 00:44:18.488 pleasure of writing with Cheryl

 $00:44:18.488 \longrightarrow 00:44:22.368$  Coffin looking at a case of infantile

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:22.368 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.720$  fibrosarcoma which was actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:24.720 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.026$  diagnosed in 2010 was called a variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:30.026 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.480$  IFC and then was sequenced later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:32.480 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.600$  This is a more recent case I had of am

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:44:34.658 --> 00:44:37.600 at 4 RAF, 1 Gene Fusion again showing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}44{:}37.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}39.380$  These spindle cells to avoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:39.380 \longrightarrow 00:44:41.160$  cells within the same tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:41.160 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.432$  In this case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:42.432 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.400$  we had these very large dilated vessels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:44:45.400 --> 00:44:47.840 So again, how do we put all of this together?

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:47.840 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.544$  I realize this is really kind of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:44:50.544 --> 00:44:52.739 potpourri of genetic alterations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:52.740 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.310$  and it's really through looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:44:55.310 --> 00:44:58.730 at this map RASC kinase pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:44:58.730 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.840$  Even though this paper was

00:44:59.840 --> 00:45:00.728 just published this month,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}45{:}00.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}03.194$  I have to alter my own figure

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:03.194 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.680$  and add for one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:04.680 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.534$  and I think what's really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:06.534 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.407$  to note in this figure is that all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:09.407 --> 00:45:11.530 these signals through the same pathway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:11.530 --> 00:45:14.330 but also what's important is that many

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:14.330 \longrightarrow 00:45:17.660$  of these can be targetable alterations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}45{:}17.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}19.796$  so identifying these alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:19.796 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.398$  can help diagnostically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:21.400 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.505$  but they can also potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:23.505 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.347$  help therapeutically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}45{:}24.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}25.950$  particularly in these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.740$  While you know the outcomes are very.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.256$  Good for these tumors.

00:45:30.256 --> 00:45:33.040 Many of these tumors are quite large.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}45{:}33.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}35.704$  They can wrap around vital in their own

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}45{:}35.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37.381$  vascular structures and so resection

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:37.381 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.593$  can be quite morbid for these patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.816$  so having alternative the rapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:41.816 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.244$  options if resection is not a good option

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:45:46.244 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.280$  for the patient is very important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:49.280 --> 00:45:50.792 As I alluded to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:50.792 --> 00:45:51.548 talking about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:51.550 --> 00:45:53.412 you know what about this WO provisional

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:53.412 --> 00:45:54.730 category of quote and track.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}45{:}54.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}58.118$  Rearrange spindle cell neoplasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:45:58.120 --> 00:46:01.319 I had the unique opportunity of writing

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:01.319 --> 00:46:03.998 this chapter for the pediatric book

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:03.998 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.871$  and also for the derm soft tissue book.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:06.871 --> 00:46:09.400 So what do we know about this category?

00:46:09.400 --> 00:46:11.296 It's a broad category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:11.296 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.718$  It encompasses morphologies

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:12.718 --> 00:46:14.140 reminiscent of IFS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:14.140 --> 00:46:18.430 IMT Lipo Fibromatosis or MPNST.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:18.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.335$  One of the things that's described is

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:21.340 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.744$  that there can be variable CD34 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:23.744 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.436$  S-100 expression. As I alluded to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:25.440 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.457$  We can also see this in IFC.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:28.460 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.484$  The median age of this tumor type

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:31.484 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.816$  as opposed to EFS is really that

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:33.816 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.764$  it's more broad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:34.770 --> 00:46:35.300 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}46{:}35.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}39.010$  this can also be diagnosed in Pediatrics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:39.010 --> 00:46:41.125 It is controversial and unknown

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:41.125 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.240$  how this relates to IFC.

00:46:43.240 --> 00:46:45.824 Is this a spectrum of the same tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:45.830 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.670$  or these two different tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:47.670 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.694$  or these multiple tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:49.694 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.730$  And that's still up for debate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:52.730 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.740$  This came about by several early manuscripts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:55.740 --> 00:46:57.910 denoting it as a unique entity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:46:57.910 --> 00:46:59.941 now it's recognized that many of

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:46:59.941 \longrightarrow 00:47:01.666$  these tumors within this category

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}47{:}01.666 \operatorname{{\text{--}}}{>} 00{:}47{:}03.279$  actually have hybrid lesions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:47:03.280 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.030$  so this wasn't recent manuscript.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}47{:}05.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}07.599$  Looking at what was purely by broma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:47:07.600 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.448$  ptosis like tumor and then many of

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:47:09.448 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.165$  them actually have a more cellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}47{:}11.165 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}12.625$  component that looks more like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798 00:47:12.630 --> 00:47:13.230 If so, NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:47:13.230 --> 00:47:15.630 I think that there will be much more

 $00:47:15.700 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.838$  conversation about this tumor moving forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00{:}47{:}18.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}20.345$  The other controversial topic is

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:47:20.345 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.939$  the name of it as we now know that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

00:47:22.940 --> 00:47:26.534 This category has many more genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:47:26.534 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.930$  alterations outside of entracque,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845236798

 $00:47:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.360$  so this begs the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:30.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.884$  well, what's in a name in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:47:32.884 --> 00:47:34.394 review article for Hyster Path?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:47:34.400 --> 00:47:35.636 Jason Hornick was like can you

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:35.636 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.916$  please come up with another name

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:36.916 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.358$  for these tumors and I told him,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:38.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.960$  well, that's very hard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.860$  so there are some problems

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.380$  with the current nomenclature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:47:44.380 --> 00:47:46.221 Here are some examples, so you have

00:47:46.221 --> 00:47:48.539 a 15 year old boy with a lung mass,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}47{:}48.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}49.779$  pure fascicular architecture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:49.779 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.018$  There's no inflammation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:51.020 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.006$  and it has an ATV's eccentric.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:53.010 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.690$  3 gene fusion. You know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:54.690 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.370$  What do you call that is an IMT?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:47:56.370 \longrightarrow 00:47:58.586$  Is it a knife sits in the lung?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:47:58.590 --> 00:48:00.974 You have a 76 year old woman with

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}48{:}00.974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}03.181$  superficial soft tissue mass with fascicular

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:48:03.181 --> 00:48:05.870 architecture as a really high mitotic rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:05.870 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.665$  it expresses CD34 and S-100 as retained.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:10.670 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.981 \text{ H3K27 trimethyl ace.}$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:11.981 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.018$  Otherwise you might consider as

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:48:14.018 --> 00:48:15.746 an element centric 1 gene fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:48:15.750 --> 00:48:17.580 What do you call that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:17.580 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.085$  You have a one year old boy

 $00:48:19.085 \longrightarrow 00:48:20.700$  with a small intestinal tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:20.700 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.771$  Fascicular architecture and

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:21.771 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.199$  RAF 1 gene fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:48:23.200 --> 00:48:25.380 What do you call that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:48:25.380 --> 00:48:25.898 A CD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:25.898 \longrightarrow 00:48:27.970$  a 76 year old woman with a deep

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:28.040 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.469$  seated soft tissue mass CD 34 S

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:30.469 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.380$  100 with the gab one able fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:32.380 \longrightarrow 00:48:33.240$  What do you call that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:33.240 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.632$  So there's a lot of nuances in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}48{:}35.632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}37.699$  nomenclature which I always ask my trainees.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:37.700 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.560$  Well why do we name tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:39.560 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.420$  What's the point of naming tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628 00:48:41.420 --> 00:48:41.664 Well, NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:41.664 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.372$  I think the first and foremost reason

 $00:48:43.372 \longrightarrow 00:48:45.361$  is to inform and to communicate to

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:48:45.361 --> 00:48:47.160 our clinicians on the current tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.058$  So the case in front of us and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:50.058 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.164$  information that we're communicating

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:52.164 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.877$  is about prognostication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:53.880 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.528$  So if I say I FS to clinician.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:56.530 \longrightarrow 00:48:58.310$  That helps inform how that

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:48:58.310 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.090$  tumor is going to behave.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}00.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}02.290$  It informs treatment and management

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:02.290 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.050$  decisions and is predictive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:04.050 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.546$  It also is to help classify

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}06.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}08.210$  biologically and distinct entities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:08.210 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.918$  So an example of that is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}09.918 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}49{:}11.350$  recent separation of chicken beak,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:11.350 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.354$  or sarcomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:12.354 \longrightarrow 00:49:15.366$  into new and distinct diagnostic categories,

 $00:49:15.370 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.162$  so we don't want to lump those

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:17.162 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.827$  anymore into what used to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:49:18.827 --> 00:49:20.227 called Ewing's family of tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:49:20.230 --> 00:49:22.972 because they're distinct and they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:22.972 \longrightarrow 00:49:25.110$  different implications for prognosis and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:25.110 \longrightarrow 00:49:27.240$  and they are different biologically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:49:27.240 --> 00:49:29.028 Something I think most people forget

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:29.028 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.527$  about is also to aid in category

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}31.527 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}33.195$  categorization of cancer registries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}33.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}35.520$  So for epidemiologic studies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}35.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}38.399$  for learning long term long term

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00{:}49{:}38.399 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}40.794$  and this influences allocation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:40.794 \longrightarrow 00:49:43.800$  funding areas of future research etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:43.800 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.896$  So you know when we look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:45.896 \longrightarrow 00:49:47.940$  problems with our current nomenclature,

 $00:49:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.940$  we go back to these cases I presented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:49:49.940 --> 00:49:50.464 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:50.464 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.036$  one might think about this lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:52.036 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.489$  mass with the secular architecture

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:53.489 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.235$  and this 15 year old male.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

00:49:55.240 --> 00:49:56.260 And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:56.260 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.640$  how does that affect the clinical outcome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:49:58.640 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.020$  Most imt's do really well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:00.020 \longrightarrow 00:50:01.214$  but this patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:01.214 \longrightarrow 00:50:02.806$  this patient's disease metastasized

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:02.806 \longrightarrow 00:50:04.720$  and they died of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:04.720 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.816$  This 60 or 76 year old woman with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:07.816 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.129$  mask that had a really high mitotic rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:50:12.280$  And you might think it

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:12.280 \longrightarrow 00:50:13.430$  it would have done bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.908$  This patient actually was respected and has

00:50:15.908 --> 00:50:18.568 no evidence of disease many years later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:18.570 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.502$  This one year old boy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.879473628

 $00:50:20.502 \longrightarrow 00:50:21.790$  had this humor with

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:50:21.860 --> 00:50:24.228 a raft. 1 gene Fusion also was respected.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:50:24.230 --> 00:50:26.470 No evidence of disease and this last case

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:26.470 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.926$  was one of the ones I presented earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.550$  Had a partial response to

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}50{:}30.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}32.170$  imatinib is alive with disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}50{:}32.170 --> 00{:}50{:}35.187$  So thinking about how we use nomenclature

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}50{:}35.187 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}37.769$  to inform clinical decisions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:37.769 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.634$  future research and classification of

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:40.634 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.997$  tumours I think is really important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:44.000 \longrightarrow 00:50:45.456$  So what do I do and what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:50:45.460 --> 00:50:46.816 How do I write my reports?

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:46.820 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.385$  I think there's several different

 $00:50:48.385 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.637$  ways you can go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:50:49.640 --> 00:50:51.716 You can do an integrated report

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:51.716 \longrightarrow 00:50:52.754$  infantile fibrosarcoma with

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:50:52.754 --> 00:50:54.398 this particular gene fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:54.400 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.860$  I think that works sometimes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00.50.55.860 \longrightarrow 00.50.57.400$  I think that with that in trek,

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:50:57.400 \longrightarrow 00:50:58.840$  rearranged spindle cell tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:50:58.840 --> 00:51:01.720 I tried that once and it backfired.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:01.720 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.885$  So end track rearranged spindle

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:02.885 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.619$  tumor with the gab one evil fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}51{:}04.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}05.838$  You can see where that leads

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:05.838 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.210$  to a lot of confusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:07.210 --> 00:51:09.100 How can be an entry rearranged

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}51{:}09.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}11.132$  spindle tumor but have a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:11.132 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.960$  fusion and so more and more?

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.150$  I've opted for kind of.

00:51:14.150 --> 00:51:15.910 Like kinase driven spindle salt,

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:15.910 \longrightarrow 00:51:17.410$  tumors, sarcoma with a map,

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:17.410 --> 00:51:19.517 one raft 1 gene fusion and written

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:19.517 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.760$  a comment that this belongs to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:21.760 \longrightarrow 00:51:23.674$  family of tumors that includes IFS

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:23.742 --> 00:51:26.743 in this provisional WHO category and

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:26.743 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.409$  and discuss with my clinical team.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}51{:}30.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}32.335$  This is really important when we start

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:32.335 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.650$  thinking about targeted therapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:33.650 \longrightarrow 00:51:35.094$  as I alluded to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:35.094 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.899$  each of these alterations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:36.899 --> 00:51:39.050 I've discussed has options for

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}51{:}39.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}41.200$  the rapies and so discussing these

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}51{:}41.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43.855$  in your reports and with your

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:43.855 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.005$  clinicians is of utmost importance.

00:51:46.010 --> 00:51:47.768 Some follow up from the original

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}51{:}47.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}49.348$  case I presented some some

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:49.348 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.740$  questions that raises well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:50.740 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.208$  What is the diagnosis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:52.208 --> 00:51:54.410 How do we predict prognosis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:54.410 --> 00:51:56.800 IFS&N track spindle cell tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:51:56.800 \longrightarrow 00:51:59.720$  This is still an ongoing area of research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:51:59.720 --> 00:52:01.790 This patient ended up being put

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}52{:}01.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}04.018$  on a targeted end track inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:52:04.018 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.340$  and is still alive and currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00{:}52{:}06.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}08.600$  has no evidence of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:52:08.600 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.484$  The lug metastases cleared,

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:52:10.484 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.310$  so how long should these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

00:52:13.392 --> 00:52:16.017 be continued on ENTREC inhibitors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:52:16.020 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.705$  What does the post inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.705322231666667

 $00:52:17.705 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.053$  pathologic response look like?

00:52:21.140 --> 00:52:23.340 Currently I have ongoing collaborations

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00{:}52{:}23.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}26.666$  with Alex Lazar at MD Anderson and Palo

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

00:52:26.666 --> 00:52:29.298 de Toys in Italy we constructed a blinded

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

00:52:29.298 --> 00:52:31.547 central review to kind of help with

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:31.547 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.605$  his logic concordance in these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:33.610 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.746$  That work was presented at Setos and

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:36.746 \longrightarrow 00:52:39.929$  I'm still working to look at other

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:39.929 \longrightarrow 00:52:42.563$  predictive markers by Histology in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:42.653 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.635$  large group of these tumors as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:45.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.205$  And one of the say thanks for all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00{:}52{:}48.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}50.650$  my collaborators on these projects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68359183682353

 $00:52:50.650 \longrightarrow 00:52:53.037$  and I'm happy to take any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.792681665

 $00:52:57.340 \longrightarrow 00:52:58.980$  Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.792681665

 $00{:}52{:}58.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}01.622$  Jessica was a really beautiful talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.792681665

 $00:53:01.622 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.628$  and if anybody wanna ask question

 $00:53:04.628 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.175$  you can either unmute yourself and

NOTE Confidence: 0.792681665

 $00{:}53{:}08.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}11.184$  directly ask question or put it in

NOTE Confidence: 0.792681665

 $00:53:11.184 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.360$  the in the chat and I can read it up

NOTE Confidence: 0.792681665

 $00:53:14.360 \longrightarrow 00:53:17.230$  so the forum is open for question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.648$  But why do we are waiting

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:24.648 \longrightarrow 00:53:26.220$  for somebody to think?

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:26.220 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.536$  I have one question in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:28.536 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.080$  classical situation of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:30.157 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.452$  classical infantile fibrosarcoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:32.452 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.747$  with economical translocation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00{:}53{:}34.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}39.772$  what is will see as a going forward approach?

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

00:53:39.780 --> 00:53:43.988 C Steel surgery will be the main approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.741$  or you would see as a target

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:46.741 \longrightarrow 00:53:48.402$  therapy and alternative and

NOTE Confidence: 0.793582044

 $00:53:48.402 \longrightarrow 00:53:50.417$  first line type of approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

00:53:51.260 --> 00:53:53.462 I think it really depends on

 $00:53:53.462 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.600$  the situation for the patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00{:}53{:}55.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}57.688$  I think moving if it's receptable

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:53:57.688 \longrightarrow 00:53:59.780$  and it's an easy location.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

00:53:59.780 --> 00:54:00.458 Yes, surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:00.458 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.831$  More and more though if it's would

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:02.831 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.472$  be more if there would be any

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:05.472 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.402$  significant morbidity to that child

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:07.402 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.616$  they are using and track inhibitors

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

00:54:09.616 --> 00:54:12.028 up front followed by surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:12.028 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.364$  So there is much more appetite

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:15.364 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.344$  for having a low threshold

NOTE Confidence: 0.93591426

 $00:54:17.344 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.768$  to using targeted therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00{:}54{:}21.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}23.478$  OK Jessica, I really enjoyed your talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:23.480 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.952$  I wonderful. So one question is

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:25.952 \longrightarrow 00:54:28.017$  also the different prognosis in

00:54:28.017 --> 00:54:30.075 among the patient with the same,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:30.080 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.370$  like a translocation or the

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:32.370 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.744$  same kindness permutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:33.750 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.665$  Do you see any other like a like?

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:36.665 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.220$  A molecular changes in your NGS that

NOTE Confidence: 0.76744806

 $00:54:39.220 \longrightarrow 00:54:41.580$  may explain the different outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:54:42.350 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.510$  That's a really great question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:54:43.510 \longrightarrow 00:54:45.358$  so that's one of the things that we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

00:54:45.358 --> 00:54:47.837 trying, so I I right now have about

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

00:54:47.840 --> 00:54:50.353 60 cases and growing, and we're trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

00:54:50.353 --> 00:54:52.634 to look at if CDKN 2A alterations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:54:52.634 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.310$  which we've seen in a subset of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:54:55.310 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.240$  is one of the alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:54:57.240 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.784$  that may influence prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:54:58.790 \longrightarrow 00:55:00.054$  We also, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:00.054 \longrightarrow 00:55:01.950$  we're trying to gather all this

00:55:02.015 --> 00:55:03.718 information is at CDKN 2A.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:03.718 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.602$  Is it some of the nonrandom

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:05.602 \longrightarrow 00:55:06.230$  chromosomal gains?

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:06.230 \longrightarrow 00:55:08.516$  We need a pretty significant cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

00:55:08.516 --> 00:55:10.436 and have detailed follow-up of

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:10.436 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.404$  like length of time to metastasize.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976 00:55:12.410 --> 00:55:12.761 Etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

00:55:12.761 --> 00:55:14.867 To be able to risk stratify

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00{:}55{:}14.867 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}16.629$  those patients so you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:16.630 \longrightarrow 00:55:18.590$  could prognosis be influenced

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:18.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:20.550$  by those chromosomal games?

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:20.550 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.160$  CDKN 2A.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00{:}55{:}21.160 \to 00{:}55{:}23.295$  We haven't seen too many other recurrent

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:23.295 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.107$  molecular alterations outside of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00:55:25.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.570$  so we have pretty good DNA and RNA

00:55:29.570 --> 00:55:31.490 sequencing for most of our cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00{:}55{:}31.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}33.135$ so we haven't seen you know P53

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

 $00{:}55{:}33.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}34.860$  or other secondary hits out

NOTE Confidence: 0.889592976

00:55:34.860 --> 00:55:35.720 outside of CDKN

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00{:}55{:}36.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}39.394$  2A IC and also thank God it's more

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:39.394 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.026$  fun like a practice point view.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:41.030 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.420$  A lot of times when.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:42.420 \longrightarrow 00:55:44.260$  Something looks like IMT and

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00{:}55{:}44.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}46.508$  dogs or rice positive or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:46.508 \longrightarrow 00:55:49.130$  Do you just go like a further

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:49.130 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.780$  two like a proof there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:50.780 \longrightarrow 00:55:52.737$  really like a mutation in this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709180488333333

 $00:55:52.740 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.310$  like a protein or jeans?

NOTE Confidence: 0.954269608

 $00:55:55.750 \longrightarrow 00:55:56.920$  Sorry, can you repeat that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

00:55:56.950 --> 00:55:58.861 Yeah, so typically when we sign out

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

 $00:55:58.861 \longrightarrow 00:56:01.169$  you know I am T like you mentioned.

 $00:56:01.170 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.315$  I'm like sometimes this untracked

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

 $00:56:03.315 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.602$  tumors can morphologically

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

 $00:56:04.602 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.369$  resemble a lot of things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

00:56:06.370 --> 00:56:08.512 So if you say something like IMT

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

 $00:56:08.512 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.694$  and all positive are you done there

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

 $00:56:10.694 \longrightarrow 00:56:13.446$  or do you go to NGS or whatever

NOTE Confidence: 0.715956203666667

00:56:13.446 --> 00:56:14.938 mutational panel you have?

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00{:}56{:}16.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}18.039$  So I mean I I still have a morphologist

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:18.039 \longrightarrow 00:56:21.050$  at heart, so I start with morphology

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.810$  and also the clinical presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

00:56:23.810 --> 00:56:25.314 So do you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:25.314 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.818$  Obviously they're still IMT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00{:}56{:}26.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}28.458$  They're just imt's they look beautiful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:28.460 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.300 \text{ I imds}$ , and so in this blinded review,

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

00:56:31.300 --> 00:56:33.980 for example, that I did with Alex and

 $00:56:33.980 \longrightarrow 00:56:35.820$  Paolo that were these entrec tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:35.820 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.158$  where some of them I EMTs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:37.160 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.554$  Yes. So I think a subset of

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:39.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:41.920$  imt's can harbor and track.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:41.920 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.936$  So I start with the morphology and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:43.940 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.430$  And yes, I also use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:45.430 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.167$  I use pound track and elk and

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

00:56:48.167 --> 00:56:50.280 other IHC pretty liberally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:56:52.650$  But I have a low threshold

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

 $00:56:52.650 \longrightarrow 00:56:54.230$  to send for sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.758095731818182

00:56:54.230 --> 00:56:55.400 Thank you Yep.

NOTE Confidence: 0.747024905714286

00:57:00.250 --> 00:57:02.679 There is a commentary on the Charter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.747024905714286

 $00:57:02.680 \longrightarrow 00:57:06.375$  but I will read up visits from George

NOTE Confidence: 0.747024905714286

 $00:57:06.375 \longrightarrow 00:57:08.865$  Massage and he suggested maybe it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.747024905714286

 $00:57:08.865 \longrightarrow 00:57:11.510$  time to resurrect the term fibrosarcoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.747024905714286

 $00:57:11.510 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.280$  and that Gato molecular to avoid

 $00:57:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:57:16.476$  the way nomenklatura limitations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:20.920 \longrightarrow 00:57:22.280$  I like this suggestion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:22.280 \longrightarrow 00:57:24.789$  I think that there would be some

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:24.789 \longrightarrow 00:57:26.962$  backlash from adult BST pathologists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:26.962 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.934$  There's there's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:27.934 \longrightarrow 00:57:30.460$  so there's been this systematic desire

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:30.460 \longrightarrow 00:57:33.540$  to rid our world of fibrosarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:57:35.440$  At least the adult fibrosarcoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:35.440 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.960$  for more precise nomenclature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.804$  but I understand the desire to to want

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:39.804 \longrightarrow 00:57:42.635$  to do that at the same point in time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:42.640 \longrightarrow 00:57:44.040$  I think it's really hard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00{:}57{:}44.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}46.098$  you know, for many years we tried

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:46.098 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.188$  to get rid of you went from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:48.190 \longrightarrow 00:57:50.633$  To UPS to try to to rid

 $00:57:50.633 \longrightarrow 00:57:53.050$  the world of fibrosarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

00:57:53.050 --> 00:57:54.130 I think the nomenclature

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:54.130 \longrightarrow 00:57:55.210$  is just very confusing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:55.210 \longrightarrow 00:57:56.946$  You know, in an adult I I do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:56.950 \longrightarrow 00:57:58.290$  Adult bonus as you two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00.57.58.290 \longrightarrow 00.57.59.664$  we've really fibrosarcoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:57:59.664 \longrightarrow 00:58:02.412$  is so strictly reserved now for

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

00:58:02.412 --> 00:58:03.910 fibrosarcoma arising in DFS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:58:03.910 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.860$  and so the term fibrosarcoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:58:05.860 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.810$  itself is just so confusing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00{:}58{:}07.810 \longrightarrow 00{:}58{:}09.371$  and we've kind of created a mess

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

00:58:09.371 --> 00:58:11.289 of our own nomenclature sometimes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:58:11.290 \longrightarrow 00:58:13.887$  and it's it's hard to explain it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:58:13.890 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.058$  I often joke that it's created just to

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

00:58:17.058 --> 00:58:19.689 torture pathology residents and clinicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429 00:58:19.690 --> 00:58:20.506 So so yes,

 $00:58:20.506 \longrightarrow 00:58:22.138$  we do need to refine our

NOTE Confidence: 0.928599633571429

 $00:58:22.138 \longrightarrow 00:58:23.609$  nomenclature and in a better way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.823640398333333

00:58:31.180 --> 00:58:33.406 Without going too much into detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.823640398333333

 $00:58:33.410 \longrightarrow 00:58:36.738$  very specific engines use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:58:39.900 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.340$  So yes and yes or no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:58:44.340 --> 00:58:46.916 I think with NGS you have to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:58:46.916 --> 00:58:49.216 very careful because not all created

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:58:49.216 \longrightarrow 00:58:52.412$  equal and and not just. You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}58{:}52.412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}55.254$  I often see people bigger is better,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}58{:}55.260 \rightarrow 00{:}58{:}57.234$  and I don't think bigger is better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}58{:}57.240 \to 00{:}58{:}59.481$  You need to be mindful of what genes you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:58:59.481 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.998$  have and what the sequencing capacity is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:02.000 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.569$  So I'm fortunate that my institution is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:04.569 \longrightarrow 00:59:07.049$  affiliated with the night Diagnostic lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:07.050 \longrightarrow 00:59:09.124$  If you guys are familiar, it's a large.

 $00:59:09.124 \longrightarrow 00:59:10.964$  Molecular Reference lab and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:10.964 \longrightarrow 00:59:13.368$  you know for sake of simplicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:13.370 --> 00:59:14.246 And because it's a good lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:14.250 --> 00:59:16.614 I often send my sequencing to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:16.614 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.190$  the night diagnostic lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:18.190 --> 00:59:20.075 They were founded by Chris

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:20.075 --> 00:59:21.583 Corliss and Brian Druker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:21.590 --> 00:59:23.630 If you guys are familiar with Brian Druker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}59{:}23.630 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}59{:}25.688$ he was influential in and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:25.688 \longrightarrow 00:59:27.650$  know the development of GLEEVEC.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}59{:}27.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}29.018$  So I come from an institution

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:29.018 \dashrightarrow 00:59:31.107$  that has a long line of succession

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:31.107 --> 00:59:32.607 of targeted the rapeutics and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:32.607 --> 00:59:34.190 identification of tyrosine kinases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:34.190 --> 00:59:36.758 so it really benefits my my work and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:36.758 --> 00:59:39.117 partly why I came here so covering.

 $00:59:39.120 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.995$  Chinese alterations is not a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}59{:}40.995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}42.495$  problem for my sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:42.500 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.412$  That being said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:43.412 \longrightarrow 00:59:45.970$  I do a lot of content work and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:45.970 \longrightarrow 00:59:47.992$  just recently actually got a console

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:47.992 --> 00:59:50.000 for just not nodular fasciitis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:50.000 \longrightarrow 00:59:51.152$  but they're like, oh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:51.152 \longrightarrow 00:59:53.500$  we did the sequencing panel of 500 genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

00:59:53.500 --> 00:59:54.290 But ironically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:54.290 \dashrightarrow 00:59:57.055$  USP 6 wasn't actually included on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:57.060 \longrightarrow 00:59:58.180$  So just a word to the wise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00:59:58.180 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.890$  make sure that you understand which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $00{:}59{:}59.890 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}01.880$  genes are covered and the limitations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:01.880 \longrightarrow 01:00:03.040$  So USP 6, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:03.040 \longrightarrow 01:00:06.155$  is often an alteration of promoter swapping.

01:00:06.160 --> 01:00:07.732 So next generation sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:07.732 \longrightarrow 01:00:09.304$  often won't actually detect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:09.310 --> 01:00:11.518 USP 6 gene alterations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:11.518 --> 01:00:14.515 So just understanding the tests they

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:14.515 --> 01:00:17.365 are ordering is really important and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01{:}00{:}17.365 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}19.998$  why it might fail. I always you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:19.998 --> 01:00:20.330 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:20.330 \longrightarrow 01:00:22.877$  tell my trainees a test is a test and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01{:}00{:}22.877 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}25.067$  every test has its limitations and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:25.070 --> 01:00:27.887 even within my lab who I think is terrific,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01{:}00{:}27.890 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}30.913$  I recently had an IMT and they didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:30.913 \longrightarrow 01:00:32.718$  detect an out gene rearrangement

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:32.718 \longrightarrow 01:00:35.461$  and Chris Corliss who's an amazing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01{:}00{:}35.461 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}37.262$  molecular pathologist. He was like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:37.262 --> 01:00:38.906 Are you sure if your diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:38.906 \longrightarrow 01:00:39.878$  and I said yes?

 $01:00:39.880 \longrightarrow 01:00:41.664$  And then we did fish and it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:41.664 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.453$  fish positive and so he went back

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

 $01:00:43.453 \longrightarrow 01:00:44.743$  and manually read the sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:44.793 --> 01:00:46.578 reads and found the ALK gene fusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:46.580 --> 01:00:47.591 So you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8139573

01:00:47.591 --> 01:00:49.613 every every test has its limitations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837036658571429

 $01:00:56.090 \longrightarrow 01:00:59.524$  I can read it up for you by Rita Brad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837036658571429

 $01:00:59.524 \longrightarrow 01:01:02.450$  What do you think about pan track?

NOTE Confidence: 0.837036658571429

 $01:01:02.450 \longrightarrow 01:01:05.228$  A minister chemistry in epithelial tumor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.837036658571429

01:01:05.230 --> 01:01:07.960 Do you have any issue with specificity?

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:09.520 --> 01:01:10.756 Again, great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:10.756 --> 01:01:14.751 Thank you, I I. As a pediatric,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}01{:}14.751 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}15.859$  components of tissue pathologists,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:15.860 --> 01:01:17.410 I don't use it regularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:17.410 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.340$  in epithelial tumors.

 $01:01:18.340 \longrightarrow 01:01:19.448$  With a few exceptions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:19.448 \longrightarrow 01:01:21.830$  so I've used it a few times in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:21.830 \longrightarrow 01:01:23.465$  thyroid for Pediatrics and I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:23.465 --> 01:01:25.840 used it for secretory carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:25.840 \longrightarrow 01:01:27.724$  both in salivary glands and breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:27.724 --> 01:01:28.980 and some pediatric patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:28.980 \longrightarrow 01:01:32.548$  and it works well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:32.550 --> 01:01:34.937 Can I am very particular in how

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:34.937 --> 01:01:37.383 I titrate my Pantech ihcc so I

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:37.383 \longrightarrow 01:01:40.554$  validate it on a on tumor which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:40.554 \longrightarrow 01:01:42.730$  different than most institutions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:42.730 \longrightarrow 01:01:45.439$  so I have it titrated very low so I

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:45.439 \longrightarrow 01:01:48.168$  don't get so much background staining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:01:48.170 --> 01:01:51.354 It does mean that I am very aware

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:01:51.354 \longrightarrow 01:01:55.138$  that I can miss some check 3 fusions

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}01{:}55.140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}58.299$  so I I would say don't have very many

 $01:01:58.299 \longrightarrow 01:02:00.868$  issues with specificity because I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:00.868 \longrightarrow 01:02:04.072$  purposely titrated my stain that way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:02:04.080 --> 01:02:05.200 And so if it is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:02:05.200 --> 01:02:07.040 it is very blazingly positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:07.040 \longrightarrow 01:02:08.903$  I know it's positive but I do know that

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}02{:}08.903 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}11.039$  I have the risk of missing some Trek 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:02:11.040 --> 01:02:12.696 So if it's negative and I have a high

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:12.696 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.100$  level of suspicion, I send it for NGS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:16.100 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.778 \text{ I don't}.$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:16.778 \longrightarrow 01:02:18.812$  I and there was a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:02:18.812 --> 01:02:20.768 great paper by Jason Hornet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:20.770 \longrightarrow 01:02:22.058$  Go about, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:22.058 \longrightarrow 01:02:24.946$  kind of benefit of doing this for screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}02{:}24.946 \to 01{:}02{:}27.610$  for colorectal cancers or other cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:02:27.610 --> 01:02:29.801 and the number of cases you would

 $01:02:29.801 \longrightarrow 01:02:32.477$  need to screen to see the benefit and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:32.477 \longrightarrow 01:02:35.059$  basically the the summary of the paper is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:35.060 \longrightarrow 01:02:37.670$  It's not really worth it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}02{:}37.670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}39.678$  so I encourage you to read that for

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:39.678 \longrightarrow 01:02:41.827$  other kind of adult carcinoma screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:02:41.830 --> 01:02:43.510 I haven't personally done that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:43.510 \longrightarrow 01:02:45.718$  'cause I don't do that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:45.718 \longrightarrow 01:02:47.432$  my practice as much so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:47.432 \longrightarrow 01:02:48.642$  I think there would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:48.642 \longrightarrow 01:02:49.368$  some limitations there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:49.370 \longrightarrow 01:02:51.248$  I think that as the sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:51.248 \longrightarrow 01:02:52.500$  of path director here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:52.500 \longrightarrow 01:02:54.636$  I advocate for just for like lung cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}02{:}54.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}56.758$  We have a nice lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:56.758 \longrightarrow 01:02:58.697$  molecular panel and it covers

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:02:58.697 \longrightarrow 01:03:00.967$  all the lung cancer alterations

 $01{:}03{:}00.967 \longrightarrow 01{:}03{:}03.360$  including track out care as etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01{:}03{:}03.360 \to 01{:}03{:}05.745$  And I think that that is a better utility,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:03:05.750 \longrightarrow 01:03:07.266$  cost effectiveness and tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

 $01:03:07.266 \longrightarrow 01:03:10.406$  saving just to to be able to get

NOTE Confidence: 0.914309534

01:03:10.406 --> 01:03:12.376 everything done for that patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87412328625

 $01:03:18.520 \longrightarrow 01:03:21.742$  Well, any other question. Otherwise we

NOTE Confidence: 0.87412328625

01:03:21.742 --> 01:03:25.110 will let Jessica finish up her coffee.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89730571125

 $01{:}03{:}26.590 \to 01{:}03{:}28.518$  I'm happy to stay on for questions or

NOTE Confidence: 0.89730571125

 $01:03:28.518 \longrightarrow 01:03:30.660$  people can email me if they have questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.580027915111111

01:03:34.420 --> 01:03:37.354 Uh, I don't see anything more in the chat,

NOTE Confidence: 0.580027915111111

 $01:03:37.360 \longrightarrow 01:03:39.960$  so Jessica was really pleasure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.580027915111111

 $01:03:39.960 \longrightarrow 01:03:41.430$  And thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.580650506666667

 $01:03:41.820 \longrightarrow 01:03:43.998$  Thank you all.