WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:09:37" NOTE recognizability:0.792

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:04.518$ Just a minute after noon, so I'd like to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:00:04.520 --> 00:00:06.428 A few people are still arriving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:06.430 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.083$ but I'd like to to welcome everybody today

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:10.083 \longrightarrow 00:00:12.834$ to the Cancer Center ground grand Rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:00:12.840 --> 00:00:14.810 And for those of you who who don't know me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:00:14.810 --> 00:00:16.181 I'm Mark Lemmon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:00:16.181 --> 00:00:19.600 I'm stepping in for Eric Weiner today

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:19.600 \dashrightarrow 00:00:22.950$ because Eric is otherwise engaged.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:22.950 \longrightarrow 00:00:25.440$ I'm mark them and I'm deputy

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}00{:}25.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}28.429$ director of of the Cancer Centre.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}00{:}28.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}33.042$ And so I'm I'm I'm channeling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:33.042 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.210$ Actually, which is why I won't do it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:36.210 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.137$ But the great,

 $00:00:37.137 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.339$ great to have you all here and great to have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:40.340 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.874$ Louise Escobar Hoyos and rose and

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:43.874 \longrightarrow 00:00:47.803$ we know Zikula to talk with us

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:00:47.803 --> 00:00:51.753 today and we so we begin with with

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}00{:}51.753 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}54.518$ Doctor Louisa has Escobar holes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:54.520 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.005$ Who is an assistant professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:00:57.005 --> 00:00:58.496 of the rapeutic radiology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:00:58.500 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.642$ She received her Masters degree in

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}01{:}00.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}02.462$ Biomedical Sciences at the University

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:02.462 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.765$ at Del Valley in Cali in Colombia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}01{:}04.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}06.438$ And then as a Fulbright Scholarship,

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:06.440 --> 00:01:08.690 pursued a cache in in cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:08.690 --> 00:01:10.038 molecular and cellular pharmacology

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}01{:}10.038 --> 00{:}01{:}11.386$ at Stony Brook University,

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:11.390 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.390$ where she was mentored by

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:13.390 --> 00:01:14.590 Doctor Kenneth Schroyer,

00:01:14.590 --> 00:01:16.225 then completed her postdoctoral training

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:16.225 \dashrightarrow 00:01:18.210$ at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:18.210 --> 00:01:20.800 Commented by Doctor Stephen Stephen

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:20.800 --> 00:01:23.390 Leach and Omar Abdel Wahab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:23.390 \longrightarrow 00:01:26.946$ and the overarching goal of Doctor Escobar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:26.950 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.710$ Hoyos's lab is to develop new

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:29.710 --> 00:01:31.589 approaches to tackling pancreatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:31.589 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.427$ and lung cancers with lots of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:34.430 --> 00:01:36.006 Really very exciting work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:36.006 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.888$ Exciting new work going on and lots

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:38.888 --> 00:01:41.103 of innovation and specifically her

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:41.103 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.898$ team is currently trying to seeking

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}01{:}43.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}46.283$ to understand and target somatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:46.283 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.089$ mutations and importantly aberrant

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:48.089 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.303$ RNA processing in these tumors in

 $00:01:50.303 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.130$ order to to develop novel therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00{:}01{:}53.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}55.398$ So it's a great pleasure to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:55.398 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.730$ you start us off.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

 $00:01:56.730 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.508$ Louisa and I look forward very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.780325306666667

00:01:58.508 --> 00:02:01.020 to your talk, so please take it away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882051635384615

 $00:02:02.630 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.892$ Wonderful thank you Mark. Let me just

NOTE Confidence: 0.882051635384615

 $00:02:05.892 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.928$ can everyone see my presenter mode.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882051635384615

 $00:02:08.930 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.995$ Sorry not my presenter. My full slide

NOTE Confidence: 0.592765046166667

 $00:02:11.670 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.120$ slide that's all very good perfect. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:02:14.130 --> 00:02:16.447 thank you Mark again for that Nice

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}02{:}16.447 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18.189$ introduction and thank you every one

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:18.189 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.241$ for participating today in in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:20.241 \dashrightarrow 00:02:21.950$ Cancer Center grand rounds and I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:21.950 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.136$ excited to share with you a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:24.136 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.935$ of the research that we've been doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:25.986 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.874$ in our lab in terms of finding how

 $00:02:27.874 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.540$ altered our release by splicing is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}02{:}30.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}32.730$ driver event for pancreatic cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}02{:}32.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}35.906$ So if your disclosures I'm part of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:02:35.906 --> 00:02:38.488 Scientific Advisory Board of QDX Diagnostics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:38.490 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.062$ I won't be presenting the work

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:40.062 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.789$ that I have with them today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:02:41.790 --> 00:02:43.326 I'll be talking about this compound.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:43.330 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.195$ This small molecule inhibitor of

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}02{:}45.195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}47.403$ splicing that has been provided to

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:47.403 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.398$ us by age 3 biomedicine and currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:49.398 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.560$ we're in discussions to launch a

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:51.560 \longrightarrow 00:02:53.470$ clinical trial using this compound.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}02{:}53.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}54.970$ Based on the research that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:54.970 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.340$ going to show you today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:02:56.340 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.080$ So for many of you,

 $00:02:59.080 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.450$ it's not unheard of that pancreatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}03{:}01.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04.479$ cancer is a very lethal malignancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:04.480 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.420$ and in here is just plotting

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:07.420 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.380$ the survival over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:09.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.969$ For the major cancers and what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}03{:}10.969 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}12.931$ can see in this evidence is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}03{:}12.931 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}14.761$ unfortunately we haven't been able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:03:14.818 --> 00:03:16.883 make that much improvement in the five

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}03{:}16.883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18.781$ year survival rate of pancreatic cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:18.781 \longrightarrow 00:03:21.478$ and this could be attributed to many reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}03{:}21.478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}23.764$ It's it's a. It's a disease that

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:23.764 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.690$ is diagnosed once it has been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:25.690 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.710$ It's already systemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:26.710 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.730$ The first line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:03:27.730 --> 00:03:29.842 chemotherapy and immunotherapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:29.842 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.250$ are ineffective,

 $00:03:31.250 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.185$ and the available targeted therapies

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:33.185 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.385$ are only available to 1% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:35.385 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.710$ the cases that have actionable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:36.710 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.564$ actionable mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:37.564 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.699$ So there is a really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:39.700 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.108$ Strong clinical need to understand more of

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:42.108 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.540$ these tumors and develop new treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:44.540 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.367$ So just to introduce a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:46.367 \longrightarrow 00:03:47.849$ of the mutational landscape for

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:47.849 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.459$ these tumors and mainly today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:03:49.460 --> 00:03:50.936 I'm talking about pancreatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:50.936 \longrightarrow 00:03:53.150$ ductal at no carcinomas or petax,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}03{:}53.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}55.684$ the most common form of pancreatic cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:03:55.690 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.922$ so we know that there are driven by a

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:03:57.922 --> 00:03:59.944 first mutation, first hit mutation,

00:03:59.944 --> 00:04:01.536 activating mutations in cameras,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}01.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}04.109$ and also is very common to find

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:04:04.110 --> 00:04:04.638 T53 mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:04.638 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.222$ so we'll talk about a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:06.222 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.770$ bit more of these mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:07.770 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.227$ There is also sometimes it appears that

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:10.227 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.009$ other tumor suppressors are mutated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:12.010 \longrightarrow 00:04:14.516$ and then after these four top genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}14.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}16.386$ There's really a sea of mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:04:16.386 --> 00:04:18.879 that appear at a very low frequency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}18.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}22.000$ so using mouse models over the

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:22.000 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.095$ last 1520 years or so we have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}24.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}25.963$ able to kind of dissect a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}25.963 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}27.667$ bit the genetics of this disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:27.670 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.836$ We know that the normal pancreas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}29.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}31.484$ if we engineer key rest mutations

 $00:04:31.484 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.200$ into the US and ourselves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:33.200 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.040$ these mice will start develop,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:35.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.568$ panning or pancreatic intraepithelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:37.568 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.573$ lesions that will progress into

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:04:40.573 --> 00:04:42.938 pancreatic cancer if we add

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:42.938 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.240$ an additional mutation in P50.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

00:04:45.240 --> 00:04:46.488 And so basically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:46.488 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.877$ this is this tumor follows kind of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}49.877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}52.229$ two hit hypothesis notes and model

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}04{:}52.229 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.378$ and all with the with you know to

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:55.378 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.790$ enhance the activity of kieras over the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:04:58.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.575$ Now for many years we've known about

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00{:}05{:}00.575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}02.349$ these two mutations driving this disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:05:02.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.744$ but really we haven't made much effort

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:05:04.744 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.672$ to understand how these oncoproteins

 $00:05:06.672 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.612$ cooperate in the case of pancreatic cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:05:09.620 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.844$ and even other tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885106782105263

 $00:05:10.844 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.680$ So a few years ago when

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:05:12.750 --> 00:05:15.279 I was gonna start as a postdoc at MSK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:15.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.458$ these studies came out in the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:18.458 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.148$ subtypes of pancreatic cancer with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:21.148 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.650$ squamous and basal subtype being the

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:23.650 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.538$ most aggressive molecular subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}05{:}25.538 \to 00{:}05{:}28.170$ And when you look into what genes are

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:28.232 \longrightarrow 00:05:30.657$ differentially expressed into the subtype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:30.660 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.909$ there is a small subset of genes that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:33.909 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.017$ overexpressed in this molecular subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:36.020 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.044$ And when you look into their mutation status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:38.050 \longrightarrow 00:05:39.402$ they're highly associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:39.402 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.476$ gain of function mutant, P. 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:05:41.476 --> 00:05:43.624 And these genes that are being

 $00:05:43.624 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.490$ enriched are the majority are codeine

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:46.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.566$ for splicing regulatory proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}05{:}48.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}50.594$ So after I read these reports I kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:50.594 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.400$ of got interested on understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.872$ a little bit more alternative RNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:54.872 \longrightarrow 00:05:57.409$ splicing and just to remind everyone

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:05:57.409 --> 00:05:58.645 during alternative splicing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:05:58.650 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.258$ Not only we remove the introns of genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:01.258 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.747$ but also there could be a selective

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:03.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.172$ retention or skipping of exons and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:06:06.172 --> 00:06:09.018 can lead to proteins that had opposite

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:09.018 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.622$ functions or no protein being formed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}11.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}13.415$ And we all have our favorite gene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}13.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}15.586$ and sometimes we don't study the

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:15.586 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.377$ alternative splicing of these gene

 $00:06:17.377 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.372$ and this pathway in general is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}19.372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}21.170$ very potent and plastic that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:21.170 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.340$ actually explain a lot of the features

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:23.340 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.440$ that happen in cancer cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:25.440 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.694$ So based on those reports I

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:28.694 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.576$ asked the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:29.576 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.340$ is there a connection between mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}31.395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}33.466$ and P53 and alterations in RNA splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:33.466 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.245$ and so first we took the RNA sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:06:36.245 --> 00:06:38.393 from many patients and we divided

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}38.463 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}40.538$ them into three different groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}40.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}42.180$ either if they had truncating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:06:42.180 --> 00:06:44.450 Mutations in P53 meaning loss

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:06:44.450 --> 00:06:46.653 of function mutations of P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:46.653 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.568$ gain of function mutations or

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}48.568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}50.543$ mutations that make the protein

00:06:50.543 --> 00:06:52.799 going from a tumor suppressor to

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:06:52.799 --> 00:06:55.151 an uncle protein or wild type P53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}06{:}55.151 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}56.956$ And we compared this glycine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:56.960 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.840$ Differences between these tumors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:06:58.840 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.210$ in the case of pancreatic cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:01.210 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.610$ the most common hotspot missense

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:03.610 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.470$ mutations are these four listed here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:06.470 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.210$ So here are the 1st results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:08.210 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.706$ So in in the X axis you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}07{:}10.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}12.519$ a measurement of alternative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:07:12.520 --> 00:07:15.229 Slicing of axons and the different tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:15.230 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.606$ and here is each one of the mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}07{:}17.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}20.410$ 53 compared to the wild type P53 tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}07{:}20.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}22.930$ and each one of the hotspot mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:22.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.166$ compared to truncated P53 and what you

 $00:07:25.166 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.404$ are can appreciate is that all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}07{:}27.404 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.614$ hotspot gain of function mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:29.614 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.698$ change alternative splicing and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:31.698 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.230 \text{ R}175 \text{ one of the most common ones}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.594$ actually changes the most.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:34.594 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.299$ So based on those correlation

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:36.299 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.930$ studies we started asking well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:07:37.930 --> 00:07:40.090 Is P53 changing splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:40.090 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.710$ and pancreatic cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:41.710 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.360$ So we went ahead and developed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00{:}07{:}43.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.240$ Three different model system patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:45.240 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.120$ derived organoids where we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:47.184 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.900$ actually shut off the expression of

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:48.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.556$ the mutant P 53 and after doing deep

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

00:07:51.556 --> 00:07:53.366 RNA sequencing and splicing analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:53.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.282$ we can see that there are these different

 $00:07:56.282 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.218$ exons that are either preferentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:07:58.218 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.513$ retained in red or preferentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:00.513 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.337$ spliced out in the context of mutant

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:03.340 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.728$ P53 in complex to complement this

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:05.728 \longrightarrow 00:08:08.650$ model we generated a murine cell line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:08:10.895$ also with the same capacity

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:10.895 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.510$ to shut down mutant P 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82737753052631600:08:13.510 --> 00:08:14.142 And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:14.142 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.722$ we were seeing these changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.827377530526316

 $00:08:15.722 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.080$ or swapping of axons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:17.080 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.380$ And lastly, we took a

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:20.380 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.172$ pancreatic precancer mouse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}08{:}22.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}24.532$ panning organoids where we knocking

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}08{:}24.532 --> 00{:}08{:}27.536$ the mutation of our 175 and again we

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:27.536 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.581$ were seeing that even in early stages

 $00:08:29.581 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.053$ after early 19 of the mutation we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:32.053 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.556$ seeing this differential splicing of exons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:34.560 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.630$ so we wanted to ask,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:35.630 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.520$ what are the specific features

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.608$ of these exons that are being

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:39.608 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.936$ either retained or skipped?

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:40.940 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.622$ And we found that there is this that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:43.630 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.766$ The retention of these axles is not random.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:46.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.714$ All the promoted axons after splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:48.714 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.824$ those ones that are going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:50.824 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.036$ retained in the mature M RNA are highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:08:53.036 --> 00:08:55.424 enriched for seas while they're repressed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:08:55.430 --> 00:08:57.950 exiles were highly enriched in a S&G's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:08:57.950 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.656$ suggesting that this was pretty much

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:00.656 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.429$ a program established in these cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:03.430 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.854$ so we wanted to focus on what were

 $00:09:05.854 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.302$ the MRE's that were being coded by

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:08.302 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.333$ these gain of of policy axons and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}09{:}11.333 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}14.150$ here we're summing into one of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:14.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.578$ Barneys Gap 17.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:15.578 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.958$ We're in mice and human.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:09:17.960 --> 00:09:19.010 This Exxon 17,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:19.010 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.760$ which is a policy Axon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:20.760 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.563$ is alternatively spliced,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:22.563 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.770$ and here are the raw sequencing of

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:26.879 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.678$ the of the reeds of this Axon and

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}09{:}28.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}30.214$ what you can appreciate is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:30.214 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.174$ whenever the mutant P 53 is present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}09{:}32.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}33.815$ there is higher rates versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:09:33.815 --> 00:09:35.450 when you knock it down.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:35.450 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.124$ There is a decrease on the

 $00:09:37.124 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.240$ retention of these Axon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:38.240 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.120$ but not the neighboring axons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:40.120 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.674$ and we saw this pattern across

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:41.674 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.644$ the marine cell line that we had

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:43.644 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.104$ engineer in the panning organized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:45.110 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.590$ That we had also crisped.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:47.590 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.310$ So from here we actually went and said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571 00:09:50.310 --> 00:09:50.644 well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:09:50.644 --> 00:09:52.648 let's go back to patient derived

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:52.648 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.001$ samples and let's see if the retention

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}09{:}55.001 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}57.271$ of these policy accounting gap 17 is

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:09:57.271 --> 00:09:58.896 it exclusive for the R175 mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:09:58.896 \longrightarrow 00:10:00.737$ or is it also found in other

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:00.737 --> 00:10:02.640 gain of function mutants of P53?

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:02.640 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.490$ And the answer was yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:04.490 --> 00:10:07.392 it's actually retained and not only are 175,

 $00:10:07.392 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.862$ but other gain of function mutant P53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}10{:}09.862 \longrightarrow 00{:}10{:}12.746$ As you can appreciate here from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:12.746 --> 00:10:15.120 targeted PCR. So then the question what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571 00:10:15.120 --> 00:10:16.476 It was well, NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:16.476 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.188$ what is the consequence of incorporating

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:19.188 --> 00:10:21.899 policy exons into M RNA's over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:21.900 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.820$ and so when we started looking at all

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}10{:}23.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.004$ of the M RNA's that were incorporating

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:26.004 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.360$ policy axons in the presence of mutant P.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:28.360 --> 00:10:28.744 53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:28.744 --> 00:10:31.432 we found that a family of proteins

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:31.432 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.600$ called the GPA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}10{:}32.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}35.528$ the GPA's activating proteins or gaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:35.528 \longrightarrow 00:10:38.460$ were actually gaining these policy Axon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.004$ In fact 25% of total gaps encoded by

00:10:41.004 --> 00:10:43.395 the human genome were gaining policy

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:43.395 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.921$ exons and just to remind everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571 $00:10:45.930 \dashrightarrow 00:10:47.184 \text{ The gaps do.}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:47.184 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.274$ They actually accelerate the GTP

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:10:49.274 --> 00:10:51.206 hydrolysis of Ras proteins so

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:51.206 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.586$ they bring it from the on state,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:53.590 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.950$ which is bound to GTP to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:10:56.950 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.269$ off state bound to GDP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}10{:}59.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}01.205$ And just to give you a sense of what,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:11:01.210 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.520$ how was this exon impacting the

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00{:}11{:}03.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}05.941$ protein we were seeing that these

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:11:05.941 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.341$ policy actions were inframe and when

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:11:08.341 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.928$ they got translated they encoded.

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:11:10.930 --> 00:11:12.156 For prolines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:11:12.156 --> 00:11:15.328 highly rich proline tails in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

00:11:15.328 --> 00:11:17.482 sea terminus of the parties and

 $00:11:17.482 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.274$ here is just an example to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.698071543428571

 $00:11:20.274 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.264$ you that actually these are

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:22.270 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.520$ different molecular weights of the protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:24.520 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.290$ Here is the promoted by

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:26.290 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.070$ P53 with the policy Exxon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:28.070 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.774$ And here's the repressed

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:11:29.774 --> 00:11:31.904 P53 isoform of gap 17.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:11:31.910 --> 00:11:33.378 Without the policy Axon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:33.378 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.580$ so both can be produced and

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:35.654 \longrightarrow 00:11:37.489$ translated in in the self.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:37.490 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.332$ So at this point we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:39.332 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.950$ faced with the question well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}11{:}40.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}45.644$ What happens with the CARAS state of either

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:11:45.644 --> 00:11:48.830 GTP bound state or GDP bound bound state?

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:48.830 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.236$ Whenever you have a plus policy

 $00:11:51.236 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.809$ gap 17 or a minus policy gap 17,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:54.810 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.750$ and so we did this in cell experiments

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:11:57.750 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.650$ where we actually first overexpress

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:00.650 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.575$ either the policy gap 17 or the minus

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:04.575 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.676$ policy gap 17 and we actually did a

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:12:07.676 --> 00:12:10.636 pull down to capture GTP bound K rest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:10.640 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.848$ And then we did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:12:11.848 --> 00:12:14.111 We used an antibody that it's only

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:14.111 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.415$ recognizing the mutant form of kiras

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:12:20.144$ to determine the the levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}12{:}20.144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.443$ active cares in these cells and

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:23.443 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.558$ what we found was interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.800$ which is in the presence of policy gap 17.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:28.800 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.960$ The isoform promoted by mutant P.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:30.960 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.470 53.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:31.470 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.040$ The levels of active care as were

 $00:12:35.040 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.060$ actually maintained.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}12{:}36.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}38.508$ However, as soon as we overexpress

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:12:38.508 --> 00:12:40.810 the minus policy gap 17 that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:40.810 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.730$ Isoform that is repressed by mutant P 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:43.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.907$ We saw that the levels of active

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:45.907 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.873$ care has decreased and also the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:12:47.873 --> 00:12:49.811 active levels of Arc which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}12{:}49.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}51.872$ downstream of of cameras were

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:12:51.872 --> 00:12:53.126 also significantly decreased,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.906$ and so it was interesting to see kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:55.906 \longrightarrow 00:12:58.684$ of like the different effects on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:12:58.684 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.589$ active form of Keras in the presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}13{:}01.589 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.466$ or absence of this gap 17 isoforms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:04.470 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.927$ So then we went and did a

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:06.927 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.190$ self free essay where we took

 $00:13:09.190 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.030$ while type carrots or mutant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}13{:}11.030 --> 00{:}13{:}11.818 \ {\rm The \ arrest},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:13:11.818 --> 00:13:14.576 and we incubated it with either the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:13:14.576 --> 00:13:17.192 policy gap 17 or the minus policy gap

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:17.192 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.292$ 17 and what you can see is that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:20.292 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.828$ was no much difference in the cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:22.828 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.460$ Free assays in terms of their capacity

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:13:25.534 --> 00:13:27.819 to hydrolyze GTP bound cameras,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}13{:}27.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}30.277$ and this was very odd and surprising

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:30.277 \longrightarrow 00:13:33.173$ to us because actually in the cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}13{:}33.173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}34.941$ they were maintaining different

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:34.941 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.240$ levels of Keras bound to GTP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:37.240 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.400$ So this made us go back to the drawing

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:39.400 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.060$ board and start thinking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.550$ What happens in the context of

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:43.550 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.929$ cells in the activity of gaps?

 $00:13:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.372$ It turns out that gaps are

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:48.372 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.000$ usually cytoplasmic proteins that

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:13:50.067 --> 00:13:52.167 when calls to deactivate Keras,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:52.170 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.300$ they go to the membrane and

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:54.300 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.170$ that's when they actually promote

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:13:56.170 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.070$ the hydrolysis of the GTP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:13:58.070 --> 00:14:00.296 What we were seeing was the following

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:00.296 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.262$ and the presence of mutant P53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:14:02.262 --> 00:14:04.734 When you have the policy gap

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:14:04.734 --> 00:14:05.970 17 being expressed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:05.970 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.965$ the gap mainly localizes into

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:07.965 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.430$ the title plasm of the cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00{:}14{:}10.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}12.074$ Even when we gave it signals

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:12.074 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.850$ to go to the membrane.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:14:13.850 --> 00:14:15.926 However, when you knock down P.

00:14:15.930 --> 00:14:17.950 53 out of the cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:17.950 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.145$ you can see that there is this the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:21.145 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.730$ gap 17 that is now not expressing policy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

00:14:24.730 --> 00:14:27.736 Exxon now can more likely reach

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:27.736 \longrightarrow 00:14:30.376$ the membrane and promote the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:30.376 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.987$ hydrolysis of Keras.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:31.990 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.048$ And so we were excited to find

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:34.048 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.681$ these because that led us to

NOTE Confidence: 0.900612551666667

 $00:14:35.681 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.277$ a model where we had for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:14:37.342 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.052$ first time kind of discover

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}14{:}39.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40.762$ how these two owner proteins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:14:40.770 \longrightarrow 00:14:42.760$ mutant cares and mutant 53

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:14:42.760 \longrightarrow 00:14:44.352$ synergizes in the following.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}14{:}44.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}46.920$ OK, our model suggests that in the presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:14:46.920 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.115$ of a wild type B 53 or the loss of P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:14:50.115 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.840$ the cells actually lose policy

 $00:14:52.840 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.670$ axons across multiple M RNA's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}14{:}55.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}58.974$ mainly the gap in RNA's and after

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:14:58.974 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.082$ this M RNA gets translated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:01.082 \longrightarrow 00:15:03.530$ It encodes gaps that actually are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:03.610 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.322$ efficient at reaching the membrane and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:06.322 --> 00:15:09.505 being more efficient at hydrolyzing GTP

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:09.505 --> 00:15:12.475 bound cameras and promoting tumor growth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:12.480 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.430$ but not as much as.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:14.430 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.128$ When you have the hotspot mutant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:16.130 \longrightarrow 00:15:18.398$ because now this time you are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}15{:}18.398 \rightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.126$ gaining a policy Axon and when that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:21.126 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.394$ mRNA gets translated it has now

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}15{:}23.394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}26.339$ these reach domain of prolines that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:26.339 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.824$ prevented from reaching the membrane.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:28.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.618$ Maintaining an active care

00:15:30.618 --> 00:15:32.853 estate and more tumor growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:32.860 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.191$ So just to go back to our model and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:35.191 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.519$ the genetics of pancreatic cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.606$ So I've told you before that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}15{:}39.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}41.761$ needed Karras and mutant P 53 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:41.761 --> 00:15:43.549 what our findings had suggested is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:43.618 --> 00:15:45.767 that in the presence of just mutant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:45.770 --> 00:15:48.146 The rest you still have the active rest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:48.150 --> 00:15:50.910 but then when mutant P 53 comes specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:50.910 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.314$ the gain of function mutant of P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:53.314 --> 00:15:56.702 you Now have an altered RNA splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:15:56.702 --> 00:15:58.996 and and a feedback loop that now

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:15:58.996 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.030$ prevents the gaps from being active.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}01.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}04.009$ And then in this way you can enhance the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:16:04.009 --> 00:16:06.091 oncogenic signaling and activity of key

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:06.091 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.369$ areas and this is our model system currently.

 $00:16:09.370 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.176$ So that was great and we published

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:11.176 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.709$ this a couple of years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:12.710 \longrightarrow 00:16:14.222$ So then we came back into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:16:14.222 --> 00:16:15.850 lab and we started thinking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091 00:16:15.850 --> 00:16:16.276 well, NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:16:16.276 --> 00:16:18.832 how can we target RNA splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:16:18.832 --> 00:16:20.630 and pancreatic cancer cells?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:20.630 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.874$ And so recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}22.874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}25.866$ this small molecule compound,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}25.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.607~\mathrm{H3}~\mathrm{B}~8800$ it started being tested

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:28.607 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.229$ in phase one clinical trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:31.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.541$ and they got interested in our research

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}34.541 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}37.160$ with pancreatic cancer and mutant 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}37.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}39.610$ So basically what H3 B 8800 does.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:39.610 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.140$ It binds to one of the.

 $00:16:41.140 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.020$ Course splicing proteins as F3V1 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}44.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}46.428$ prevents this whole machinery the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}46.428 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}48.463$ splice osome to bind and recognize

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:16:48.463 --> 00:16:51.160 fully the M RNA's, and so we were.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:51.160 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.220$ Our hypothesis was well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:52.220 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.280$ if mutant P53 tumors really

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:16:54.280 --> 00:16:56.340 depend on ultra RNA splicing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:16:56.340 \longrightarrow 00:16:58.476$ they'd be more sensitive to toddler.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}16{:}58.480 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}17{:}00.930$ They would be more sensitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:00.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:03.380$ to any perturbation into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:17:03.471 --> 00:17:06.472 splicing machinery with the AD 800,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:06.472 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.130$ so we launched what we call a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}17{:}09.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}11.464$ mouse trial where we took mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:11.470 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.458$ That either had tumors that had

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:17:14.458 --> 00:17:16.958 mutant P53 in them, so that's red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:16.960 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.528$ or that lacked mutant 53 in one

 $00:17:19.528 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.812$ which are blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:20.820 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.442$ And then we randomize these animals

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:23.442 \longrightarrow 00:17:25.939$ to either receive 8800 or vehicle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:25.939 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.297$ And what you can appreciate is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:28.297 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.979$ that the solid lines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:29.980 \longrightarrow 00:17:32.256$ which are the animals that receive 8800,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:32.256 \longrightarrow 00:17:34.536$ they all benefited from having

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:34.536 \longrightarrow 00:17:36.360$ from receiving the compound.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:17:36.360 --> 00:17:36.753 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:36.753 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.718$ the animals that survive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

00:17:38.718 --> 00:17:40.697 benefited the most were those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:40.697 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.174$ ones that had mutant P53 in them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}17{:}43.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}44.686$ suggesting that these mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:44.686 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.820$ sensitizes these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:45.820 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.480$ To this lysine modulator.

 $00:17:48.480 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.600$ And when we did RNA splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00{:}17{:}51.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}53.606$ analysis and after we treated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:53.606 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.420$ these tumors with the 8800,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8646090091

 $00:17:55.420 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.020$ we can nicely see how.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:17:58.020 --> 00:18:00.174 H3 B 8800 was repressing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}18{:}00.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}02.600$ retention of that policy Axon in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:02.600 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.735$ cells in a function as a function

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:04.806 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.910$ depending on the concentration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:06.910 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.590$ So you know other words.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:18:08.590 --> 00:18:10.822 This compound was reversing the key

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}18{:}10.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}12.966$ splicing events that we had seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:12.966 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.094$ in the presence of mutant P. 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:15.094 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.712$ Lastly, we have now established a human

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:17.712 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.608$ model where we have isogenix cells that

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:20.608 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.890$ express different forms of mutant P.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:22.890 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.766$ 53 and we know that when we

00:18:24.766 --> 00:18:26.510 treat them with this compound,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:26.510 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.900$ the mutants and particularly are

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}18{:}28.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}31.290$ more sensitive to these compounds

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.084$ when you compare them to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:33.084 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.802$ counterparts when they don't have P53

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:34.802 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.877$ or when they have a wild type P53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:36.877 \longrightarrow 00:18:38.719$ So based on these results we

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:18:38.719 --> 00:18:41.108 are now in discussions with HB,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:18:41.110 --> 00:18:44.430 biomedicine and row Invad sciences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:44.430 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.350$ who recently bought the 88.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.685$ 100 compound because we would

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:47.685 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.020$ like to start a phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:49.020 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.580$ Two clinical trial where

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:50.580 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.140$ we combine Gemma Broxton,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:52.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.568$ which is one of the first

 $00:18:53.568 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.520$ gamma standard of care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:54.520 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.660$ chemotherapeutic lines for pancreatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:56.660 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.335$ cancer patients and start escalating

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:18:59.335 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.696$ doses of 8800 for patients whose

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:01.696 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.716$ tumors have gained a function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:03.720 --> 00:19:06.168 Mutant of P 53 so hopefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:06.168 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.340$ we can launch this soon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:08.340 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.270$ So let's back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:09.270 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.942$ Let's go back to you know what are

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:11.942 --> 00:19:14.540 the mutations that Dr pancreatic cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:14.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.748$ What have we understood

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:15.748 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.258$ and how can we target?

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:17.260 --> 00:19:19.508 To drive personalized medicine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:19.508 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.070$ so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:20.070 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.622$ as I mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:21.622 --> 00:19:23.562 we now understand that KIERAS

 $00{:}19{:}23.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.393$ mutations are the most common

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:25.393 --> 00:19:27.113 mutations and they are required

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:27.113 --> 00:19:29.030 hit mutation to form tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:29.030 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.918$ We know that 10% of the cases have

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}19{:}31.918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}33.368$ familiar pancreatic cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:33.368 --> 00:19:35.664 most of them have mutations in ATM

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:35.664 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.134$ and when they have these mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}19{:}38.134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}40.209$ they are giving PARP inhibitors

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}19{:}40.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}43.126$ and that's why we do molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:43.130 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.790$ molecular profiling industry rumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:44.790 --> 00:19:47.280 to identify this cohort of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:47.280 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.624$ To have actionable mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:49.624 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.968$ We also know that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:51.970 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.394$ as I mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:19:53.394 --> 00:19:56.110 that 30% of the sporadic pancreatic tumors,

00:19:56.110 --> 00:19:58.448 which are the most common ones are

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:19:58.448 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.673$ driven by gain of function 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:00.673 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.688$ And as I mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.012$ we're hoping to start a clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:05.012 \longrightarrow 00:20:06.218$ trial using 8800.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:20:06.218 --> 00:20:08.786 These glycine inhibitors to see if

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:20:08.786 --> 00:20:11.711 we can bring a targeted therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:11.711 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.787$ for these sporadic tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}20{:}13.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}15.974$ Now we're still facing the challenge

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:15.974 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.210$ that we still don't understand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:18.210 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.320$ 30. What is the mutation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.035$ That drives the other 30% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:23.035 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.610$ pancreatic tumors because we also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:25.610 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.591$ because we already know that the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:27.591 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.015$ 30% is driven by loss of function P.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:30.020 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.311 53.$

 $00:20:30.311 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.057$ So for these two last groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:32.060 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.457$ Unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:20:32.457 --> 00:20:35.633 right now we don't have any targeted therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

00:20:35.633 --> 00:20:38.718 or any trials that are going to launch here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:38.720 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.496$ so we were curious to know

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:40.496 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.680$ well what is sporadic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:41.680 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.068$ what other mutations, Dr,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:44.068 \longrightarrow 00:20:47.053$ sporadic tumors of pancreatic cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:47.060 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.022$ and so to answer that question

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:49.022 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.330$ I mentioned before that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:50.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.946$ You know there is a such a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:52.946 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.026$ large number of mutations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}20{:}55.026 \to 00{:}20{:}57.750$ appear in very low frequencies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:57.750 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.798$ but it's hard to study each one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:20:59.798 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.338$ these mutations to understand well.

 $00:21:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.355$ Are they driver mutations or

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00{:}21{:}03.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}04.967$ are they passenger mutations?

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:21:04.970 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.854$ And so we took an inform

NOTE Confidence: 0.832197701666667

 $00:21:06.854 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.110$ approach where we went

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:08.178 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.446$ back to the basic contact concept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:10.450 --> 00:21:11.962 Sorry of mutual esclusiva,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:11.962 --> 00:21:15.190 so just to remind everyone we know that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:15.190 --> 00:21:17.410 mutations may be mutually exclusive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:17.410 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.338$ meaning that if P53 is present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:20.340 --> 00:21:22.398 The mutation in P53 is present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}21{:}22.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}25.433$ then it would turn into a viable tumor cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:25.440 --> 00:21:28.420 If other mutation is present but not P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:28.420 --> 00:21:29.460 it could be viable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}21{:}29.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}31.116$ but if both mutations are present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:31.120 --> 00:21:32.860 it could be synthetic, lethal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:32.860 --> 00:21:35.182 and the mutual exclusivity of these

 $00:21:35.182 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.550$ mutations is because sometimes these mutual

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:37.550 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.836$ exclusive mutations either have the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}21{:}39.836 \to 00{:}21{:}42.328$ function or impact the same pathway and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:42.328 \longrightarrow 00:21:44.460$ that's what makes them driver mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.680$ So we started conducting a mutual exclusivity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:47.680 --> 00:21:50.159 analysis by taking advantage of C.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:50.160 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.910$ Bioportal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:50.910 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.160$ Which has the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:53.160 --> 00:21:56.100 Mutation signatures of over 3000

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:21:56.100 --> 00:21:59.040 patient samples of pancreatic cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:21:59.040 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.084$ and so the 1st results that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:01.084 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.046$ derive from this analysis are are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}22{:}03.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}05.080$ shown here in this volcano plot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}22{:}05.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}07.555$ So on the right hand side we have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:07.555 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.535$ mutations that Co occur with mutant P.

 $00:22:09.540 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.380$ 53 and in the left hand side we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}22{:}11.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}13.481$ have the mutations that are mutually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}22{:}13.481 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}15.605$ exclusive for P53 and this was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:15.605 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.714$ side of the volcano that we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:17.714 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.494$ interested in because this potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:19.494 \longrightarrow 00:22:21.793$ could tell us what mutations were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:21.793 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.127$ driving this disease aside from mutant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:24.130 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.208$ 53 so as a sa a proof of concept,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:27.210 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.794$ key results in the middle is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:28.794 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.586$ the first mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}22{:}29.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}31.508$ It appears for all of the tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:31.510 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.046$ but here's where it got surprising to us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:22:36.120$ One of the most mutually exclusive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:36.120 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.450$ mutations to P53 was mutation in SF3B1.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:39.450 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.310$ It's a score splicing protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:42.310 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.907$ Then it on this same side we

00:22:44.907 --> 00:22:46.669 have mutations in RBM 10,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}22{:}46.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}49.210$ which is another splicing factor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:49.210 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.935$ But on the core occurring

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:50.935 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.610$ side we had a U2AF1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:52.610 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.060$ again another mutation in another.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:22:54.060 --> 00:22:54.850 License factor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:54.850 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.220$ so if our hypothesis was true,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:22:57.220 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.999$ it's potentially that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:22:58.999 --> 00:23:00.778 mutually exclusive mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:00.780 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.972$ meaning S3B1 and RBM 10 could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}23{:}03.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06.918$ drivers of pancreatic cancer and just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:06.918 \longrightarrow 00:23:09.906$ assuming what type of mutations are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:23:09.906 --> 00:23:12.520 present in S4B1S4B1 in pancreatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:12.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:15.620$ cancer has a driver mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:15.620 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.804$ Very hot spot mutation in case 700.

 $00:23:17.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.464 \to RBM$ 10 is mainly truncating mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:21.470 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.690$ So basically you're losing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:23:23.690 --> 00:23:26.982 function of RBM 10 and U2AF1 has

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:26.982 \longrightarrow 00:23:29.566$ a hotspot mutation in S34F.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:29.566 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.746$ So we our question was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}23{:}31.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}34.216$ are any of these three mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:23:34.216 --> 00:23:35.449 driving pancreatic cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:35.450 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.201$ And so we took advantage and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}23{:}38.201 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}39.380$ started generating genetically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:23:39.447 --> 00:23:40.968 engineered mouse models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}23{:}40.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}42.430$ So here's the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:42.430 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.620$ C model system where it's only

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:23:44.699 --> 00:23:46.599 driven by ACARAS mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:46.600 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.532$ And what we found and what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:48.532 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.215$ expected was that these animals

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}23{:}50.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}52.185$ should only form pannings or

 $00:23:52.185 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.080$ pancreatic and triphenyl neoplasias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:23:54.080 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.724$ those precancer states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}23{:}55.724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}00.260$ So then we cross this KC animal with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:24:00.260 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.530$ U2AF1 mutant animal for the S34F mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:24:03.530 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.600$ And what we found is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:24:05.600 --> 00:24:07.180 actually there are pannings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:24:07.180 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.196$ but not as much as we expected.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:24:09.200 --> 00:24:10.349 And most importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:24:10.349 \longrightarrow 00:24:13.030$ there was no Peacock in these animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:24:13.030 --> 00:24:13.932 But surprisingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:24:13.932 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.187$ the animals that had them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

00:24:16.190 --> 00:24:19.446 the Keras mutation and the SFRB 1 mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00{:}24{:}19.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.046$ for eign pancreatic tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037

 $00:24:21.046 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.748$ same as the animals that we cross to have K,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037 $00:24:25.750 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.266$ res, NOTE Confidence: 0.8599037 $00:24:26.266 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.330$ and RBM ten loss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:28.330 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.320$ So here's just the quantification

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:24:30.320 --> 00:24:31.912 done by our pathologist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:31.920 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.269$ who you can see that there is only pdac

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:34.269 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.578$ and the animals that have the nutrition

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}24{:}36.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38.527$ in S4B1 and the nutrition in our BM.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:38.530 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.034$ 10 There is more pannings also in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:41.034 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.448$ animals and they succumb to the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:43.450 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.677$ Very early on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:44.677 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.540$ so we are now in this hypothesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:47.633 \longrightarrow 00:24:51.377$ that we're trying to further test which is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:51.380 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.092$ We believe now that pancreatic cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}24{:}54.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}56.980$ cells that have a mutant carras

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:24:56.980 --> 00:24:59.450 actually require a splicing switch

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:24:59.450 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.578$ in order to become tumor cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:02.580 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.515$ and most likely the majority

 $00:25:04.515 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.946$ of these of these tumors will

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:06.946 --> 00:25:08.992 develop through a mutant P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:08.992 --> 00:25:11.456 which I showed you before how it

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:11.456 --> 00:25:13.039 drives alternative RNA splicing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:13.040 --> 00:25:15.600 but we're now fathering.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:15.600 --> 00:25:19.681 Starting how these SF 3B1 mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:19.681 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.069$ and RBM ten loss also drive the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}25{:}23.069 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}26.254$ the disease based on a splicing change,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:26.260 \longrightarrow 00:25:29.266$ and these animals are now being

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}25{:}29.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31.865$ characterized by a couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:31.865 --> 00:25:34.355 postdoctoral fellows in my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:34.360 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.584$ and so I just want to quickly mention

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}25{:}36.584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38.289$ that they have obtained really

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:38.289 \longrightarrow 00:25:40.094$ interesting results in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:40.094 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.350$ what are the splicing defects that

 $00:25:42.350 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.220$ these proteins mutated proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:44.220 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.720$ Are leading to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:45.720 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.420$ They are very similar to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:48.420 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.722$ P53 splicing changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:49.722 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.760$ We do tons of deep RNA sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:52.844 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.740$ into this model systems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:54.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.051$ We do several.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:25:56.051 --> 00:25:58.236 We run several algorithms to

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:25:58.236 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.618$ determine the splicing changes into

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:26:00.618 --> 00:26:03.480 not only the marine model systems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}26{:}03.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06.620$ but also patient derived samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:26:06.620 --> 00:26:08.804 I just want to skip quickly through

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:08.804 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.966$ this just so I can get here to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657298811111111

 $00:26:10.966 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.947$ how are we going to target these

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:12.947 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.809$ mutant splicing factor proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111 00:26:14.810 --> 00:26:15.626 So similarly,

 $00:26:15.626 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.730$ we use the 8800 compound and we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:18.730 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.128$ now finding that also these mutant

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:21.128 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.229$ cells are very sensitive to this compound.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:24.230 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.392$ We are also finding that these

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:27.392 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.402$ mutations confer sensitivity to certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:30.402 \longrightarrow 00:26:32.570$ chemotherapeutic agents. In this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:32.570 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.546$ In particular, the case 700 E.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111 00:26:34.546 --> 00:26:35.548 As of Feb,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:35.550 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.160$ one is more sensitive to

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}26{:}37.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}39.349$ gemcitabine than it is to five FU.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:39.350 \longrightarrow 00:26:41.516$ So this is important because these

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:41.516 \longrightarrow 00:26:43.294$ mutation profiling can also help

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657298811111111

 $00{:}26{:}43.294 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}45.226$ to decide what would be the best.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:45.230 \longrightarrow 00:26:47.242$ Chemotherapeutic agent who assigned

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:26:47.242 --> 00:26:50.260 to a particular patient and when

 $00:26:50.335 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.480$ we did combination studies on

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:52.480 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.535$ mixing gemcitabine with 8800 in

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:26:55.535 --> 00:26:57.979 mutant versus wildtype cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:26:57.980 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.804$ we can see that the mutant cells are

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:00.804 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.593$ more sensitive to the combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:02.593 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.555$ of jam and 8800 more so than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:05.555 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.049$ wild type cells suggesting that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:08.049 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.339$ combination of therapy could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657298811111111

 $00{:}27{:}10.339 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}12.634$ important to treating the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:27:12.634 --> 00:27:15.350 that have these K 700 E mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:15.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.622$ That's up 31,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:16.622 \longrightarrow 00:27:19.590$ so I just want to finalize by

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:27:19.697 --> 00:27:21.674 saying that I'm currently based

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:21.674 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.750$ on our findings on Mutant P.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:23.750 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.170$ 53 and mutant SFB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:25.170 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.430$ One and RBM 10 laws as the drivers,

 $00:27:28.430 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.615$ as pancreatic cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:27:29.615 --> 00:27:31.985 All of these mutations leading to

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:31.985 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.948$ changes in alternative splicing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:33.950 \longrightarrow 00:27:37.359$ We're hoping to also bring into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}27{:}37.359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39.303$ trial patients eligible patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:39.303 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.471$ that are case 100 mutant or have RBM

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:42.471 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.348$ 10 lost to be eligible for this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00:27:45.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.345$ Glycine anti silicene therapy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:27:47.345 --> 00:27:49.340 we wanna lounge in combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

00:27:49.407 --> 00:27:51.252 with Gemini and Gemini 8800 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.765729881111111

 $00{:}27{:}51.252 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}53.220$ so with that I wanna wrap up by

NOTE Confidence: 0.875053478

 $00:27:53.283 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.461$ saying thank you to everyone here

NOTE Confidence: 0.875053478

 $00{:}27{:}55.461 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}57.766$ for your attendance today to all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.875053478

00:27:57.766 --> 00:27:59.614 people in my lab who are leading

NOTE Confidence: 0.875053478

 $00:27:59.620 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.068$ this effort to all our collaborators

 $00:28:02.068 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.039$ and also to our funding sources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875053478

00:28:05.040 --> 00:28:06.732 Thank you very much and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.875053478

 $00:28:06.732 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.120$ take any questions. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:09.060 \longrightarrow 00:28:10.400$ Thank you so much Teresa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:10.400 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.520$ that was really fascinating

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00{:}28{:}12.520 \longrightarrow 00{:}28{:}16.160$ work at great, excellent stuff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

00:28:16.160 --> 00:28:19.843 If people have questions for Louisa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:19.843 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.014$ please put them in the chat and

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

00:28:23.014 --> 00:28:25.930 I can read them to her and she

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:25.930 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.340$ can go ahead and answer them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:28.340 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.510$ I had one quick question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

00:28:30.510 --> 00:28:32.970 While people are formulating their thoughts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:32.970 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.708$ which is it is intriguing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:36.710 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.348$ the mutations and the and effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:38.350 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.200$ and indeed the the the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:43.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.084$ 8800 are all focusing on you two.

 $00:28:46.090 \longrightarrow 00:28:50.790$ Do you have some? He's out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:50.790 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.870$ It may be migraines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.810624796

 $00:28:51.870 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.010$ but what does that mean, mechanistically?

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:28:55.130 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.490$ Yeah, thank you Mark.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:28:57.490 --> 00:29:00.320 So basically the compound targets

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:00.320 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.226$ mutant SF 3B1 and so it's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:03.226 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.970$ tumors have mutant SF 3B1.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:05.970 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.168$ They are more sensitive to this compound,

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:08.170 \longrightarrow 00:29:10.144$ so that's the case for S3 one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:10.150 --> 00:29:12.774 But we also know that the if if

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:12.774 --> 00:29:14.890 tumors highly depend on splicing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:14.890 \longrightarrow 00:29:17.992$ There there are more sensitive to

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00{:}29{:}17.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}20.335$ this compound because they cannot

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:20.335 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.945$ tolerate a double perturbation of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:22.945 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.099$ splicing changes and the splicing.

00:29:25.100 --> 00:29:29.293 Machinery and so that's how we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00{:}29{:}29.293 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}31.928$ attributing the sensitivity of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:31.928 --> 00:29:35.363 mutant P 53 and mutant RBM 10 to 8800,

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:35.363 --> 00:29:38.814 and I think more dissection of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:38.814 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.038$ mechanism of of the drug within you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:42.040 --> 00:29:45.008 Know RBM 10 and P53 can further elucidate

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:45.008 --> 00:29:48.486 why are they so sensitive to this compound,

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:48.490 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.722$ at least for P53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:49.722 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.570$ We know that in certain cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:51.637 --> 00:29:53.209 it reverses the effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

 $00:29:53.210 \dashrightarrow 00:29:55.590$ The splicing changes that mutant P 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.884566718333333

00:29:55.590 --> 00:29:56.410 Is promoting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00{:}29{:}58.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00.594$ Make makes sense and the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00:30:00.594 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.896$ question I had was that we're going

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00:30:02.896 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.090$ back to the gap 17 story. Do you see?

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00{:}30{:}06.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}09.196$ In other circumstances the if you look

 $00:30:09.196 \longrightarrow 00:30:12.040$ through other cells and and indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00:30:12.040 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.906$ tumors that aren't don't have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00:30:14.906 \dashrightarrow 00:30:17.630$ the gain of function P53 mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

 $00:30:17.630 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.678$ Do you see the the gap 17 with

NOTE Confidence: 0.786254627222222

00:30:21.678 --> 00:30:24.438 the policy Exxon in other places?

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:25.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.788$ Yeah, so that's a good question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:26.790 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.870$ So for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:27.870 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.670$ We've looked into other cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:29.670 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.660$ that are not key, rest driven,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

00:30:31.660 --> 00:30:34.172 but have this mutant form of P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:34.172 \longrightarrow 00:30:36.824$ and we see that indeed the

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:36.824 \dashrightarrow 00:30:39.070$ splicing changing gap 17 occurs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00{:}30{:}39.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}42.198$ Now we have also seen some other tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:42.198 \dashrightarrow 00:30:44.865$ where mutant P 53 is not present and

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:44.865 \longrightarrow 00:30:47.350$ we still see the splicing change,

 $00:30:47.350 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.954$ and we think that this is attributed

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:49.954 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.175$ to the overexpression of a splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:52.175 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.170$ factor called H&R AMPK that today

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

00:30:54.170 --> 00:30:56.570 I didn't have time to go into,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:56.570 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.628$ but we think that this splicing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:30:58.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.260$ Regulator also promotes the policy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

00:31:03.260 --> 00:31:06.113 The the policy acts on inclusion in M RNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00:31:06.120 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.171$ so we think that there is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

 $00{:}31{:}08.171 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}10.376$ a single pathway to to promote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81168588

00:31:10.376 --> 00:31:13.470 The policy acts on retention in gaps.

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00{:}31{:}15.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}17.653$ This is fascinating and I have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00:31:17.653 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.239$ question in the chat from from

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00:31:20.239 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.975$ Timothy Robinson who says great talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00{:}31{:}22.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}25.528$ I agree with the way you described

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

00:31:25.528 --> 00:31:27.433 using mutually exclusive analysis to

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00:31:27.433 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.659$ find events within the same pathway.

00:31:29.660 --> 00:31:31.568 Did you look at Gap 17?

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00{:}31{:}31.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}34.625$ Aberrant splicing based on mRNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.735722408789474

 $00:31:34.625 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.828$ directly to identify other drivers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.880845552222222

 $00:31:38.870 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.118$ So I'm not sure if I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.880845552222222

00:31:40.118 --> 00:31:40.742 understanding the question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880845552222222

 $00:31:40.750 \longrightarrow 00:31:43.943$ If I if we looked into into

NOTE Confidence: 0.880845552222222

 $00:31:43.943 \longrightarrow 00:31:46.566$ other pathways that are not

NOTE Confidence: 0.880845552222222

 $00{:}31{:}46.566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}49.014$ linked to to the cares pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

 $00:31:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:31:50.340$ I think the question is

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

 $00:31:50.340 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.324$ actually did you look?

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

 $00:31:51.330 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.675$ Did you look at aberrant

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

00:31:52.675 --> 00:31:54.380 splicing based on M RNA to

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

 $00{:}31{:}54.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}55.588$ identify other drivers that

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

 $00:31:55.588 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.330$ might be other than gap 17?

NOTE Confidence: 0.777251266666667

 $00:31:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.939$ I think that's

00:31:58.660 --> 00:32:01.012 yeah. So all the splicing changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:01.012 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.910$ that we identified are based on mRNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:03.910 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.010$ sequencing and based on splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:06.010 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.776$ analysis that we conduct. But if I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:08.776 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.111$ But I can also mention that the gaps are

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:12.111 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.738$ only 5% of the events that mutant be 50,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:14.740 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.169$ three, 5% of the event is splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

00:32:17.169 --> 00:32:19.520 events that mutant P 53 is triggering.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:19.520 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.296$ So there are other M RNA's that affect

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

00:32:22.296 --> 00:32:24.961 other pathways that are being impacted by

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00{:}32{:}24.961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}27.334$ the aberrant splicing by mutant P. 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:27.334 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.800$ So we just went with the gaps to start

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:29.873 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.253$ with because of course of the relevance

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:32.253 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.777$ and the path and the Keras pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:34.780 \longrightarrow 00:32:37.130$ But we are there is a student in the lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

 $00:32:37.192 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.307$ who's actually trying to understand.

 $00:32:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.625$ What?

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

00:32:39.625 --> 00:32:42.145 What is the role of the other splicing

NOTE Confidence: 0.754027668045454

00:32:42.145 --> 00:32:44.640 changes in other M RNA's that are not gaps?

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:32:46.690 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.850$ And presumably, in that context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:32:48.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.368$ I mean, it's kind of interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:32:50.368 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.674$ that the gap 17 effect is so

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:32:52.674 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.990$ kind of singular in a sense,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:32:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.740$ and you presumably in the other cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:32:56.740 \dashrightarrow 00:32:58.551$ it's really going to be a combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00{:}32{:}58.551 \longrightarrow 00{:}33{:}00.075$ that's going to be the constellation

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00:33:00.126 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.488$ of those changes that are key,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

00:33:01.490 --> 00:33:02.882 which is going to be interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.806719478

 $00{:}33{:}02.882 --> 00{:}33{:}04.000$ but tough to tease out

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

00:33:04.110 --> 00:33:06.360 exactly. So, as I mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:06.360 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.909$ we are seeing that 32 gaps encoded

 $00:33:09.909 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.459$ by the genome of of 120 dots that

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:13.459 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.774$ are encoded are being differentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:15.774 \longrightarrow 00:33:17.178$ spliced, we manipulated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

00:33:17.178 --> 00:33:19.992 One, but if you imagine manipulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:19.992 \longrightarrow 00:33:22.265$ several of them and forcing

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:22.265 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.360$ policy axons to be excluded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:24.360 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.352$ the the effect might be synergistic

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:26.352 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.915$ in terms of the the cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.880829711666667

 $00:33:28.915 \dashrightarrow 00:33:30.865$ proliferation and the tumor growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7890346

 $00:33:33.000 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.958$ Sure. Any other questions in the chat?

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}33{:}38.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}39.901$ So we don't seem to have at

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:33:39.901 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.190$ the moment of so that we could,

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:33:41.190 \longrightarrow 00:33:43.990$ and we we should probably move on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:33:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.892$ So thank you very much, Lisa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:33:45.892 --> 00:33:47.584 That was a fascinating stuff with

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:33:47.584 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.370$ the enormous about everyone.

 $00:33:49.370 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.078$ And to think about it. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}33{:}52.078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}57.345$ So, so let's move on for the second

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}33{:}57.345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}01.360$ half to Doctor Rosa Vinod Zikula.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:01.360 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.614$ So Doctor Zickler is an assistant professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:03.614 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.679$ of medicine and digestive diseases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:05.680 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.224$ She received her PhD from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:34:08.224 --> 00:34:10.760 university app Autonomo de Barcelona.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}10.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}12.535$ I apologize for my pronunciation

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}12.535 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}14.310$ and oncology and her postdoctoral

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:14.366 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.364$ training at the Institute of Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}16.364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}18.070$ Research at the University of

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}18.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}19.640$ Illinois and at Yale University.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}19.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}22.056$ Dr Zickler's long term goal is to decipher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:22.060 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.172$ Known genetic alterations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:24.172 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.284$ predispose to colorectal cancer

 $00:34:26.284 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.758$ development and her research focus

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:28.758 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.440$ is on understanding molecular and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:31.440 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.545$ molecular characterization of sporadic

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:33.545 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.657$ and hereditary colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:34:35.657 --> 00:34:38.224 with an interest in understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:38.224 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.172$ the biological differences among

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:34:40.172 --> 00:34:42.230 racial groups to develop her

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}42.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}43.310$ translational research doctors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:43.310 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.339$ Zigler is a key player in several

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:34:47.339 --> 00:34:49.135 repositories and consortia that

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}49.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.931$ recruit cancer patients and

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:34:50.931 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.939$ then collecting biospecimens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00{:}34{:}52.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55.406$ And and clinical data and Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:34:55.406 --> 00:34:58.608 Nikola will will tell us about defining

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

00:34:58.608 --> 00:35:01.078 new pathways in colorectal tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:35:01.078 \longrightarrow 00:35:03.520$ with mismatch repair deficiency.

 $00:35:03.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.000$ So thanks so much Rosa for doing this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725700857857143

 $00:35:05.000 \longrightarrow 00:35:06.540$ I really look forward to your talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914238268

 $00:35:07.590 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.680$ Thank you, let me share.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:14.750 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.610$ Can you see properly?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

00:35:17.610 --> 00:35:19.890 OK, so thank you so much for giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:19.890 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.491$ me the priority to show you all our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:22.491 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.050$ most recent data on the topic of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

00:35:25.050 --> 00:35:26.556 mismatch repair, deficient tools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:26.556 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.700$ So the outline of the talk is going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:29.700 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.748$ I'm going to explain you give you an

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

00:35:31.748 --> 00:35:34.328 overview of the mismatch repair and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:34.328 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.940$ phenomena of microsatellite instability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00{:}35{:}35.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}38.432$ And then I will explain you the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:38.432 \longrightarrow 00:35:40.318$ clinical phenotypes and challenges in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:40.318 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.943$ the molecular that I diagnosis of the

 $00:35:42.943 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.399$ tumors that have mismatched efficient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:45.400 \dashrightarrow 00:35:48.627$ Then I will explain you the association.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00{:}35{:}48.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}50.870$ That we are describing between

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00{:}35{:}50.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}53.695$ deficiency of RAQUE and DNA helicases

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:53.695 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.205$ in Lynch like syndrome cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:56.210 \longrightarrow 00:35:58.744$ And then I will show our most

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:35:58.750 \longrightarrow 00:36:00.362$ recent publication that describes

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:36:00.362 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.377$ the identification of tumors with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00{:}36{:}02.377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}04.871$ a high likelihood development and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

 $00:36:04.871 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.903$ immune response through mutational

NOTE Confidence: 0.9334385475

00:36:06.903 --> 00:36:07.919 signature profiling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:10.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.476$ So here in the left you can see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:12.476 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.205$ it's a cartoon that shows the the mosque

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:15.205 \longrightarrow 00:36:17.897$ important for the main proteins that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:17.897 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.297$ involved in the mismatch repair system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:20.300 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.037$ The mismatch repair system is the inner

 $00:36:23.037 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.932$ repair system that identifies mismatches like

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:25.932 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.334$ single base base or like larger mismatches.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

00:36:29.340 --> 00:36:31.000 And there's two main complexes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:31.000 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.132$ the mute test that it's formed by message 6

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00{:}36{:}34.132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37.517$ and Message 2 and Message 3 and a message 2.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.990$ So these proteins are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:38.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:40.460$ first ones to recognize them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:40.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.930$ As my tools and then the mute L complexes

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:43.930 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.570$ recruited to help fix the the mismatches

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00{:}36{:}47.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}51.433$ and mutl is formed by PMS two and MLH 1.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:51.440 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.792$ So in the genome there are these

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:53.792 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.775$ sequences that are called microsatellites

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:55.775 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.499$ that are prone to acquire alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:36:58.499 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.344$ when any of the proteins of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:01.344 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.836$ mismatch repair not working.

 $00{:}37{:}02.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}06.520$ So here you can see here you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:06.520 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.838$ see sorry this is on the way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:08.840 \dashrightarrow 00:37:11.054$ Here you can see a microsatellite

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:11.054 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.963$ microsatellites are short and repetitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

00:37:12.963 --> 00:37:14.833 sequences present in coding and

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00{:}37{:}14.833 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}17.040$ non coding regions of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:17.040 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.260$ And when the any of them is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:20.260 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.640$ working this Microsoft.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:21.640 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.260$ That's accumulate deletions or insertions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:24.260 \longrightarrow 00:37:27.074$ So when the size of the microsatellite

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00{:}37{:}27.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}29.208$ cannot be properly kept during

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

00:37:29.208 --> 00:37:32.151 replication of DNA in the cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00:37:32.151 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.379$ the phenomenon of microsatellite

NOTE Confidence: 0.729921572

 $00{:}37{:}34.379 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}36.869$ instability isn't identified in tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:37:39.920 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.732$ So I MSI can be identified

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:37:41.732 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.520$ in a variety of tumors,

 $00:37:43.520 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.734$ but as you can see here on the table

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}37{:}45.734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}48.256$ and in the graph in the material tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}37{:}48.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}50.505$ colorectal and stomach are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:37:50.505 --> 00:37:53.641 tumors that have a higher incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:37:53.641 --> 00:37:56.050 of microsatellite instability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:37:56.050 \longrightarrow 00:37:57.794$ So, in colorectal tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:37:57.794 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.715$ about 10% of a sporadic tumors have

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}38{:}00.715 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}02.760$ mismatch repair deficiency and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:38:02.831 --> 00:38:05.327 deficiencies due to CPG island promoter

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:05.327 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.849$ musculation of the gene mileage one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}38{:}07.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}10.104$ which I show you that it's a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:10.110 \longrightarrow 00:38:12.006$ It's one of the two proteins

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:38:12.006 --> 00:38:13.870 that form the metal complex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:13.870 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.109$ so when there's a promoter methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:17.109 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.104$ there's an addition of transcription

00:38:19.104 --> 00:38:21.970 of the gene and it and resulting in

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:21.970 \dashrightarrow 00:38:24.330$ the loss of expression of the protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:24.330 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.297$ So here you can see the difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:26.300 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.308$ Between normal expression by

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:28.308 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.814$ immunohistochemistry and loss

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:38:29.814 --> 00:38:32.488 of expression and a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:32.488 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.525$ number of these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:34.525 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.715$ they also present this hot spot

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:38:36.715 --> 00:38:38.879 mutation in the Bureau of Gene.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:38.880 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.568$ Here you have the mutation and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}38{:}41.568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}44.168$ two are molecular events are used

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}38{:}44.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}46.940$ to differentiate and tumors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:46.940 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.848$ develop through a sporadic events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:49.848 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.416$ Then the tumors that develop MSI

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:38:52.416 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.444$ but they are developing in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}38{:}55.444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}57.660$ setting of hereditary disease.

 $00:38:57.660 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.259$ So Vince Syndrome is the tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:02.260 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.409$ It's cancer syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:03.409 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.707$ There is due to germline mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:05.707 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.919$ in this mismatch repair genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:07.920 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.540$ It's actually the most common

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:09.540 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.680$ cancer syndrome of all it's present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:39:11.680 --> 00:39:14.188 It's estimated that one in 270 people

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39{:}14.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}16.860$ in the US carry one of the mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:16.934 \longrightarrow 00:39:19.764$ in one of these genes and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:19.764 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.590$ individuals have present this syndrome

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:22.590 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.635$ presents as penetrance about 70 to 80%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:39:26.756$ which means that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}26.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}29.989$ That in in 70 to 80% of the cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:29.989 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.654$ individuals that carry a mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:31.660 \longrightarrow 00:39:32.900$ they end up developing

 $00:39:32.900 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.450$ cancer and when they develop,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:34.450 --> 00:39:36.050 \ {\rm cancer} \ {\rm is} \ {\rm usually} \ {\rm associated}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:36.050 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.450$ with an early age of onset.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}38.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}39.376$ So clinically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}39.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}41.691$ Lynch syndrome patients present with

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}41.691 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}44.336$ fewer polyps than other colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:39:44.336 --> 00:39:46.109 cancer inherited syndromes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:39:46.110 --> 00:39:47.700 and the tumors localized in

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:47.700 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.810$ the right side of the column.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:49.810 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.030$ And this lynch patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}51.030 --> 00{:}39{:}52.860$ They have a high risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:39:52.925 --> 00:39:54.668 developing multiple cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:54.670 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.972$ Colorectal cancers are

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:39:55.972 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.708$ diagnosis or over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}57.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}59.594$ And another clinical feature

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}39{:}59.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}01.949$ that it's important to remember.

00:40:01.950 --> 00:40:02.372 Sorry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:02.372 \longrightarrow 00:40:04.482$ remember from these patients is

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:04.482 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.119$ that the Lynch syndrome is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:40:07.119 --> 00:40:09.309 a multi cancer syndrome affecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:09.310 \longrightarrow 00:40:10.948$ different organs and here you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:40:10.948 --> 00:40:12.924 see the list and it's significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:12.924 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.974$ important to remember that because

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:14.974 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.961$ actually female lynch patients they

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:16.961 \longrightarrow 00:40:19.390$ developed for example like in the material,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00:40:19.390 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.045$ they have a higher incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

 $00{:}40{:}21.045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}22.369$ of developing endometrial than

NOTE Confidence: 0.807376979090909

00:40:22.369 --> 00:40:23.080 colorectal cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00{:}40{:}25.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}27.178$ So because I explained you that

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00{:}40{:}27.178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}29.449$ Link syndrome is the most common

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

00:40:29.449 --> 00:40:31.459 cancer syndrome and because of

 $00:40:31.459 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.621$ all this clinical features that

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:33.621 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.365$ these patients have nowadays,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:35.365 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.855$ all in the midfield and Jay

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:37.855 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.439$ cancers are supposed to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:40.439 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.947$ tested for the for Lynn syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:42.950 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.333$ So how this works is all these cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:46.333 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.638$ They are tested with immunohistochemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:48.638 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.629$ for the expression of the four main

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00{:}40{:}51.629 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}54.067$ proteins of the mismatch repair if.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

00:40:54.067 --> 00:40:56.689 Because of the expression in MSH

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00{:}40{:}56.689 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}59.581$ 2 MSH 6 or PS2 is identified,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:40:59.581 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.143$ then the patient should be referred

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

00:41:02.143 --> 00:41:04.974 to cancer genetics for testing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:04.974 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.798$ contrary if the loss of emulate

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:06.798 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.716$ one or PMS or the conduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

00:41:08.716 --> 00:41:10.893 of emulate one and PMS two is

00:41:10.962 --> 00:41:13.278 identified by immunohistochemistry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:13.280 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.400$ then there is the one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:15.400 \longrightarrow 00:41:17.120$ Methylation should be tested and

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:17.120 \longrightarrow 00:41:19.239$ if there is no methylation then

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:19.239 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.929$ the patient should be referred

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:20.929 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.912$ to cancer genetics and in any

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:22.912 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.616$ way if anyone in the identifies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:24.620 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.046$ MSI case, but there was no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

00:41:28.050 --> 00:41:29.958 I'm even Histochemistry tested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00{:}41{:}29.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}33.470$ but the physicians have a clinical concern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:33.470 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.195$ Then these patients should be

NOTE Confidence: 0.77898428696

 $00:41:35.195 \longrightarrow 00:41:36.575$ preferred to cancer genetics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00{:}41{:}38.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}41.054$ So in general, in the cancer genetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:41:41.054 --> 00:41:42.850 clinic was we've been facing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:41:42.850 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.066$ is that about 50% of the suspected link

 $00:41:46.066 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.210$ syndrome patients that are referred.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:41:48.210 --> 00:41:51.633 They actually test negative for Jim for

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:41:51.633 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.943$ having germline mutations in the genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:41:53.943 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.447$ And this case is where name as Lynch

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:41:56.447 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.752$ like syndrome because they are similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:41:58.752 --> 00:42:01.590 to lynch like but there's no mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:01.590 \longrightarrow 00:42:04.229$ So as as a definition these lines

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:42:04.229 --> 00:42:06.050 like syndrome patient patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:06.050 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.606$ they develop tumors at the MSI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:08.610 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.647$ They don't have resolution of image one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:10.650 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.870$ They don't have the hotspot be

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:12.870 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.863$ 600 imitations and they don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:14.863 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.088$ have a germline mutations either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:17.090 \longrightarrow 00:42:20.346$ So what are these things like cases they

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:42:20.346 --> 00:42:23.010 actually could be Lynch syndrome cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:23.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.050$ but that due to difficulty on

00:42:25.050 --> 00:42:26.882 identifying mutations or because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00{:}42{:}26.882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}28.546$ have like encrypting mitigations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:28.550 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.468$ Maybe we have not been able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:30.468 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.290$ then defy them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:42:33.900$ or they could actually be heritary

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:33.900 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.790$ cases that they might be due to general

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.740$ mutations in other genes and that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00{:}42{:}38.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}43.556$ They end up developing MSI as a driver

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:42:43.556 --> 00:42:48.738 effect, not as a cancer driver effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333 00:42:48.740 --> 00:42:51.090 sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:42:51.090 --> 00:42:53.800 Sorry that they developed because

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:42:53.800 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.510$ other germline mutations but they

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00{:}42{:}56.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}59.535$ actually the MSI was an effect of

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:42:59.535 --> 00:43:02.310 the development of cancer but they

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:02.310 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.685$ could just be sporadic cancers.

 $00:43:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.930$ So to address these challenges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:07.930 \longrightarrow 00:43:10.888$ we have developed 2 main projects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:10.890 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.882$ one and the general level and

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:12.882 \longrightarrow 00:43:15.320$ another one at the semantic level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:15.320 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.413$ The general level with our aim was

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:43:17.413 --> 00:43:19.200 to identify the current deficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00{:}43{:}19.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}21.678$ DNA repair genes and the cellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:21.678 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.716$ consequences that contribute to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:23.716 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.631$ development of colorectal cancer in

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

00:43:25.631 --> 00:43:28.860 lines like patients and at the somatic level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:28.860 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.356$ we aim to define molecular factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:31.356 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.050$ in the three types of mismatch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.402$ Deficient tumors the lynch lynch like

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:36.402 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.321$ and the viral methylated ones which will

NOTE Confidence: 0.682636668333333

 $00:43:39.321 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.456$ contribute to diagnosis and treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:43:43.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.646$ So so our collaborations with the

 $00{:}43{:}46.646 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}49.610$ correct with the current concerns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:43:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:43:52.298$ we were able to describe the patients have

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

00:43:52.298 --> 00:43:55.314 a higher frequency of family history of

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:43:55.314 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.589$ colorectal cancer than sporadic cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:43:57.590 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.894$ and you can see here how the standardized

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:00.894 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.930$ incidence ratio was 2.2 for the links in

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

00:44:03.930 --> 00:44:07.664 comparison to 0.48 for sporadic individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00{:}44{:}07.664 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}11.072$ and and these incidents

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:11.072 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.840$ of family history was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:44:14.308$ Actually lower than lead,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:14.308 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.143$ so this kind of foods.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

00:44:16.150 --> 00:44:19.080 The Linge like phenotype and

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:19.080 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.838$ in between between.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:20.840 \longrightarrow 00:44:22.622$ Lynch and Sprite.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:22.622 \longrightarrow 00:44:27.216$ We're also able to to show that the

 $00:44:27.216 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.704$ average age of diagnosis for Lynch like is

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:30.704 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.250$ significantly younger than sporadic cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:33.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.746$ So these two features are suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:35.746 \longrightarrow 00:44:37.889$ that a potential unidentified genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

00:44:37.889 --> 00:44:40.773 predisposition induced in this in a group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

00:44:40.780 --> 00:44:43.828 at least in Group of Lynch

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:43.828 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.352$ like syndrome patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:45.360 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.504$ So to address this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:46.504 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.939$ and because we believe that that is the case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:48.940 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.886$ we develop a a study including 654

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:54.886 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.516$ individuals from our Chicago Colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

00:44:57.516 --> 00:44:59.620 Cancer Center consortium cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:44:59.620 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.698$ and we performed that link screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:45:02.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.680$ testing that I mentioned before

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:45:05.680 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.620$ we identified 23 suspected links.

NOTE Confidence: 0.523577779909091

 $00:45:08.620 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.730$ Lynn syndrome.

 $00:45:11.770 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.567$ So from those we were able to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:45:15.567 --> 00:45:17.926 germline DNA from 15 of them and

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:45:17.926 --> 00:45:20.194 we perform XM sequencing and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:20.194 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.468$ identified that four of them were

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:22.548 \longrightarrow 00:45:25.164$ actually engaged and eleven were links

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:25.164 \longrightarrow 00:45:27.912$ like were classified as Lynch like

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:27.912 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.417$ because we didn't find limitations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:30.420 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.156$ So then we take it one step further

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:33.156 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.212$ and we wanted to identify if if

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:45:36.212 --> 00:45:38.730 any of these links, like patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:38.730 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.775$ had mutations in other DNA repair genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:45:41.780 --> 00:45:45.630 So we analyze 162 DNA repair genes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00{:}45{:}45.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}48.668$ we were able to see that this links,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:48.668 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.620$ like patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:49.620 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.996$ They had the higher mutational burden

00:45:52.000 --> 00:45:54.576 and comparison to lynch to the TCG,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00{:}45{:}54.580 --> 00{:}45{:}56.868 \text{ a colorectal cancer cohort},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:56.868 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.728$ and to control without cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:45:59.730 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.514$ So specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:00.514 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.258$ we identified four loss of function variants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:46:03.260 --> 00:46:06.004 one in body, one one in Werner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:06.010 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.717$ one in MCPH one and one in Rev 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.754$ So then after this first study

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:12.754 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.507$ that we identified that links

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:14.507 \longrightarrow 00:46:16.499$ like were in bridge with mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:16.499 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.320$ in the inner river jeans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:18.320 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.756$ we include decided to include two

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:46:20.756 --> 00:46:22.820 different independent series of lines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:46:22.820 --> 00:46:25.448 like patients to try to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

00:46:25.448 --> 00:46:28.243 genes that maybe would be recurrently

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:28.243 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.787$ mutated in this in this phenotype.

 $00:46:30.787 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.904$ So when we did that in the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:33.904 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.487$ series with unified 6 genes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:36.487 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.449$ were mutated and had lots of

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:38.449 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.330$ function variants and interestingly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:40.330 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.988$ We found the same splicing variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:42.988 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.458$ in two different patients in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:45.458 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.665$ regular 5 gene and we actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00{:}46{:}47.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}50.215$ perform a kinship analysis to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00{:}46{:}50.215 \longrightarrow 00{:}46{:}53.406$ that and to prove that these two

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:53.406 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.198$ patients were not genetically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865651094285714

 $00:46:55.200 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.860$ And they were not genetically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.520$ There were no this related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:04.520 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.640$ Sorry, because these patients were

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:06.640 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.774$ both coming from from Spain and we just

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:09.774 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.254$ wanted to make sure that there was no

 $00:47:12.254 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.976$ any family relation that we don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:15.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.059$ And then when we developed the analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:18.059 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.099$ of the other series of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:20.100 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.945$ we again identified another loss

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:22.945 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.070$ of function variant in regular 5.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:26.070 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.303$ So with that, if you've been able

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:28.303 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.138$ to follow my my talk and the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:31.138 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.582$ the notification of mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:47:32.582 --> 00:47:34.470 in our original serious,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:34.470 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.155$ we have identified 4 different

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}47{:}37.155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}40.442$ mutations in genes that belong to

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:40.442 \longrightarrow 00:47:43.007$ the Dracula DNA helicase family.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:43.010 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.645$ So here you can see the five the

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:46.645 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.135$ five proteins that are in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:47:49.135 --> 00:47:51.243 family regular one bloom Werner

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:51.243 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.980$ regular four and regular 5 and all

 $00:47:53.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.790$ of them share the same helicase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:56.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:57.800 I \text{ mean}$.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:57.800 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.295$ So these are the individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:47:59.295 \longrightarrow 00:48:01.200$ that we have identified the two

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:01.200 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.940$ individuals with the same splicing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:02.940 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.875$ one with the insertion and

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:04.875 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.423$ from the original cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:06.430 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.970$ We also identified this individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:08.970 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.494$ with a mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}48{:}10.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}13.230$ So after that we were interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}48{:}13.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}15.600$ knowing if maybe the mutations in

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:15.600 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.600$ this in this family of genes were also

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}48{:}18.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}21.280$ recurring in other cancer friendships.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:48:21.280 --> 00:48:22.788 So to do that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:22.788 \longrightarrow 00:48:24.673$ First took individuals that were

00:48:24.673 --> 00:48:26.769 referred to the Smilo Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}48{:}26.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}28.413$ Genetics and Prevention program

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:28.413 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.589$ that when they were referred,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:30.590 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.450$ they and they were tested

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:48:34.310$ and we in the clinic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:48:34.310 --> 00:48:35.780 They didn't find any mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:35.780 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.446$ say many known cancer predisposition genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:48:39.450 --> 00:48:43.018 So we perform XM sequencing in 156

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}48{:}43.018 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}48{:}46.184$ breast cancer patients in 75 individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:46.184 \longrightarrow 00:48:49.346$ that had different types of tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:49.346 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.342$ that were not breast tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:52.342 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.770$ We'll sync clouded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:53.770 \longrightarrow 00:48:55.015$ MSH and PC.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:48:55.015 --> 00:48:58.873 These are very rare type of familial

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:48:58.873 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.172$ colorectal cancer that affects individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:02.172 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.032$ in different generations and that

 $00:49:04.032 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.339$ they develop cancer at the young age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:06.340 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.658$ But these individuals don't have MSI RMS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:49:09.660 --> 00:49:10.536 And lastly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:10.536 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.040$ we also identify mutations in the DC G.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:49:15.930$ So with this analysis we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:15.930 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.880$ able to see that actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:17.880 \longrightarrow 00:49:20.456$ like the higher a little frequency variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:20.456 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.110$ in DNA repair genes that are not the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}49{:}23.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}26.225$ Compare and then they are not know

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:26.225 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.286$ well established cancer predisposing

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:28.286 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.784$ genes and we all the identified

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}49{:}31.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}35.067$ mutations in the REQ DNA helicases

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:49:35.067 --> 00:49:37.597 in the lynch like phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:37.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:41.580$ So then we went back to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:41.580 \longrightarrow 00:49:44.379$ families that we were able to.

00:49:44.380 --> 00:49:46.588 Contact again to in the defy

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:46.588 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.650$ if the mutations were shared.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:48.650 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.375$ If these mutations with shared

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:50.375 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.755$ with other family members,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:51.760 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.928$ so here these are the three families that

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:53.928 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.167$ will have with mutations in the right QL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:56.170 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.058$ So family A&B are the the ones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:49:59.058 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.858$ share the same splicing variant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}50{:}00.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}03.196$ so here this is the program that

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:03.196 \longrightarrow 00:50:05.121$ developed for family aid that

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:50:05.121 --> 00:50:06.267 developed colorectal cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:06.270 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.928$ At 63.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:06.928 \longrightarrow 00:50:08.902$ We were also able to sequence

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:08.902 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.215$ the tumor of this individual and

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

00:50:11.215 --> 00:50:13.579 we also found a missense variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:13.653 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.655$ in the in the tumor of this.

 $00:50:15.660 \longrightarrow 00:50:16.809$ Of this patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}50{:}16.809 \to 00{:}50{:}19.490$ and then the brother of this program

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00{:}50{:}19.569 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}22.001$ had a small bowel cancer and he was

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:22.001 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.418$ also a carrier of the mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.636$ The family we we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:25.636 \longrightarrow 00:50:27.460$ This was the program that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.651248294

 $00:50:27.530 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.180$ are of collector cancer at

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:29.180 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.755$ 64 very strong family history

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:31.755 \longrightarrow 00:50:35.319$ and then we tested the two sons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:35.320 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.259$ That one was a carrier and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:37.259 \longrightarrow 00:50:39.696$ other one was not a carrier and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

00:50:39.696 --> 00:50:41.560 rate of diagnosis was under 40s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00{:}50{:}41.560 --> 00{:}50{:}44.176$ And lastly this last one we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:44.180 \longrightarrow 00:50:46.790$ This was the program developed

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:46.790 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.913$ colorectal cancer at 66 and we

00:50:49.913 --> 00:50:52.451 tested this son that also had

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:52.451 \longrightarrow 00:50:54.792$ sorry also had the mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

00:50:54.792 --> 00:50:56.936 But however, these individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:56.936 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.080$ in the second generation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:50:59.080 \longrightarrow 00:51:00.736$ because they are in their 40s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:51:00.740 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.570$ they might have not been able

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:51:02.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:03.974$ to develop cancer yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

 $00:51:03.974 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.959$ So this this course aggregation

NOTE Confidence: 0.815990964416667

00:51:05.959 --> 00:51:07.990 study was not definitive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:10.030 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.811$ So then we wanted to to test what was

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}51{:}12.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}15.417$ the effect of having a heterozygous

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:15.417 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.550$ loss of function barrier in intestines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}51{:}18.550 \longrightarrow 00{:}51{:}21.820$ So to do that we went back to to our

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:51:21.918 --> 00:51:25.649 contacts in Spain and we extracted cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:25.650 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.884$ extracted blood samples from the two of

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:28.884 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.086$ these songs that I show you in family.

 $00:51:32.090 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.458$ That one was a carrier and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:33.458 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.630$ the other one was not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:34.630 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.700$ And we extracted that RNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:36.700 \longrightarrow 00:51:39.794$ We did the red transcription and qPCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:39.800 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.458$ To show that actually the the level of gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:43.458 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.160$ expression was significantly lower in the in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:46.160 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.059$ in the brother that had the mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:51:50.060 --> 00:51:53.100 And to test the effect in the Warner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:53.100 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.755$ we had to use a different approach because we

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:55.755 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.097$ didn't have access to that family anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:51:58.100 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.118$ But we were likely to acquire

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:01.120 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.192$ Lymphoblastoid cell line from family that

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}52{:}04.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}07.875$ had there were these one mutation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:07.875 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.706$ heterozygosity and from a control also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:10.706 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.182$ And this mutation is the one

 $00:52:12.182 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.539$ that the cell lines have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:13.540 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.988$ And it's just like a loss of function

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:15.988 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.841$ mutation just for an amino acids

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:17.841 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.605$ down the line from the actual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:52:19.610 --> 00:52:20.810 Colorectal cancer mutation that

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:20.810 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.170$ we found in one of the patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:23.170 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.986$ So we extracted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:23.986 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.074$ We grow the cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:25.080 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.455$ We extracted proteins and we show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:28.455 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.407$ again that there is an effect on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}52{:}31.407 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}33.607$ heterozygous and the protein expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:33.610 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.549$ So with these we show that when

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:35.549 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.661$ there is a when these individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:37.661 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.079$ have a heterozygous well as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:40.079 \longrightarrow 00:52:41.539$ function in these genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:41.540 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.075$ they actually have a downregulation

 $00:52:44.075 \longrightarrow 00:52:46.610$ of the gene and protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:46.610 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.787$ So then we were interested in knowing

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:48.787 \longrightarrow 00:52:51.009$ well if there is a downregulation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:52:51.010 --> 00:52:53.030 what's happening with the activity

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:52:53.030 \longrightarrow 00:52:55.550$ on the activity of the genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00.52.55.550 \longrightarrow 00.52.56.966$ and how is that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:52:56.966 --> 00:52:59.670 How are these sales managing DNA damage?

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:52:59.670 --> 00:53:00.460 Because again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}53{:}00.460 --> 00{:}53{:}03.225$ remember that these are DNA repair genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:03.230 \longrightarrow 00:53:05.552$ So to do that we grow the cells and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}53{:}05.552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}08.129$ we perform a flow cytometry analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:08.130 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.695$ that was actually testing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}53{:}10.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}13.756$ quantity of forceful relation of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:13.756 \longrightarrow 00:53:15.990$ serene 139 residue of the history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:15.990 \longrightarrow 00:53:19.270$ Age to ax as an indicator of the

 $00:53:19.270 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.580$ damage and DNA double strand breaks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:22.580 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.180$ So when we did that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:24.180 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.884$ we determined the phosphorylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:25.884 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.440$ at different time points and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:53:28.512 --> 00:53:30.542 black are the wild type cells and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:30.542 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.905$ the and the and Gray are the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:53:32.905 --> 00:53:34.783 ones with the headers I use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:34.783 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.306$ so it's true that that the first time

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:38.306 \longrightarrow 00:53:41.074$ the first time point might be a delay

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:41.074 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.089$ on the on on the phosphorylation we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:44.089 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.822$ that on the other time points there

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:46.822 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.780$ is a higher dose of the frustration and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:49.780 \longrightarrow 00:53:52.289$ therefore an indicator that these cells have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:52.290 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.074$ The higher DNA damage

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:55.074 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.080$ and here as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:53:57.080 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.788$ this is the difference

 $00:53:58.788 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.069$ between the heterozygote,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:00.070 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.080$ the the heterozygous that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:02.080 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.010$ like a higher phosphorylation so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:07.010 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.770$ So right now we are also doing more

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.758$ analysis and we are testing for for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.124$ for the effect of these variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:15.124 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.065$ in cell cycle because some of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:18.065 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.215$ preliminary data showing that maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

00:54:20.215 --> 00:54:23.196 these cells are actually arrested in G1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00{:}54{:}23.200 \longrightarrow 00{:}54{:}27.136$ but we have not had this data yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:27.140 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.084$ So in conclusion from this aim

NOTE Confidence: 0.759642116333333

 $00:54:29.084 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.380$ I we believe that

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}54{:}30.451 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}32.151$ heterozygous loss of function

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:32.151 \longrightarrow 00:54:34.276$ variants in DNA repair genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:54:34.276 --> 00:54:36.596 such as Warner and regular five,

 $00:54:36.600 \longrightarrow 00:54:38.840$ could predispose to tumor development

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00.54.38.840 \longrightarrow 00.54.41.080$ because they are enriched among

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:41.150 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.230$ the lines like cancer phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:43.230 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.302$ They lead to gene down regulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:46.302 \longrightarrow 00:54:49.100$ and they increase DNA damage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:49.100 \longrightarrow 00:54:51.102$ So now turning it to the end

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:51.102 \longrightarrow 00:54:53.069$ two at the somatic level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:53.070 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.068$ Had to do develop these aim.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:55.070 \longrightarrow 00:54:56.920$ We also included two different

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:54:56.920 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.770$ independent series of tumors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}54{:}58.829 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}55{:}00.473$ mismatch repair deficient tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:55:00.473 -> 00:55:02.528 from the three different types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:02.530 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.450$ and we develop exam sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:05.450 \longrightarrow 00:55:07.786$ to identify somatic variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:07.786 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.779$ and loss of hydrazoic events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.260$ And with with this data,

 $00:55:12.260 \longrightarrow 00:55:14.096$ with this excellent data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:14.096 \longrightarrow 00:55:16.850$ we also were interested in defying

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:16.935 \longrightarrow 00:55:19.155$ the contribution of mutational

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:19.155 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.375$ signatures to these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:21.380 \longrightarrow 00:55:23.715$ So mutational signatures are like

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:55:23.715 --> 00:55:26.617 a fingerprint of of the portrait

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:55:26.617 --> 00:55:29.949 of the mutations that the tumor has

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:55:29.949 --> 00:55:32.715 acquired over the development of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}55{:}32.715 \longrightarrow 00{:}55{:}35.625$ tumor and they some of them are well

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:35.625 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.460$ established and they are associated to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:37.460 \longrightarrow 00:55:38.246$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:38.246 \longrightarrow 00:55:40.604$ exposure to carcinogens and other ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}55{:}40.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}43.306$ Associated like in the case of the mismatch,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:43.310 \longrightarrow 00:55:46.684$ repair to deficiency on DNA repair pathways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:46.690 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.547$ So they the these are the six

 $00:55:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.806$ current well established signatures

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}55{:}51.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}53.376$ that are associated with deficiency

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:53.376 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.588$ of the mismatch repair.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:54.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:56.570$ So when these tumors have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:55:56.570 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.572$ when the tumors have deficiency and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}55{:}58.572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}00.629$ analyze the the mutational signatures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:56:02.990$ you can see this one so so we

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:02.990 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.819$ were interested in knowing what

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:04.819 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.759$ was the contribution of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:06.759 \longrightarrow 00:56:08.849$ signatures to each of the tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:08.850 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.634$ So let me explain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:10.634 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.864$ So this colorful graph here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}56{:}12.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}15.042$ So we first read identified what

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:15.042 \longrightarrow 00:56:16.850$ were the mutational signatures that

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:16.850 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.644$ were contributing the most to each

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:18.644 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.887$ of the tumor and then we perform

 $00:56:20.887 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.819$ clustering to see whether the groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:22.820 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.270$ of whether the tumors that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:26.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.280$ a similar contribution of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:29.280 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.016$ So here each each row is 1 tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:33.016 \longrightarrow 00:56:35.174$ and each column is rotational.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:35.174 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.214$ It's a contribution of to

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:37.214 \longrightarrow 00:56:38.820$ the mutational signatures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:38.820 \longrightarrow 00:56:42.036$ and here we are also having the phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:56:44.936$ So in here you can see the tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:44.936 \longrightarrow 00:56:47.790$ is linch light lynch or the MSI?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6929773745200:56:47.790 --> 00:56:48.131 Isolated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}56{:}48.131 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}50.859$ And then in the last column here we

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}56{:}50.859 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}53.445$ are showing that which is the protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:53.445 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.800$ that each of these tumors have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:56:55.800 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.436$ Most of the expression.

00:56:57.436 --> 00:56:59.890 So when we perform this analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}56{:}59.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}02.634$ you can see with identified 2 of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:02.640 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.390$ that mutational signatures based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:05.390 \longrightarrow 00:57:09.684$ the the contribution of SBS 26 and 15,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:09.684 \longrightarrow 00:57:11.539$ which are very well established.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:11.540 \longrightarrow 00:57:13.284$ Mutational signatures associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:13.284 \longrightarrow 00:57:15.464$ deficiency of the mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}57{:}15.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}17.100$ identified first the two clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:17.100 \longrightarrow 00:57:19.370$ that are in breach with the Lynch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:19.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.381$ And the lynch,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:20.381 \longrightarrow 00:57:22.740$ like and then we then defied this

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}57{:}22.812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}25.212$ cluster that has a higher contribution

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:25.212 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.729$ of the tumors that are missing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452 00:57:27.730 --> 00:57:29.240 MSI, NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:29.240 \longrightarrow 00:57:32.260$ MSI dated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:57:32.260 --> 00:57:35.270 So here I'm I'm showing you the

 $00:57:35.270 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.500$ different features associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:36.500 \longrightarrow 00:57:38.900$ with each of the the clusters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:38.900 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.276$ and as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

00:57:40.276 --> 00:57:42.873 cluster two is enriched with MSI dated

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}57{:}42.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}46.031$ and also this cluster has specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:46.031 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.486$ clinical features that are well

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:48.486 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.259$ established with this type of tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:51.260 \longrightarrow 00:57:53.672$ which are that they develop preliminarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}57{:}53.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}55.973$ and female patients at an older

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00{:}57{:}55.973 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}57.857$ age and that they are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.69297737452

 $00:57:57.857 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.870$ with the bright side location.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:01.910 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.198$ So as a molecularly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

00:58:03.198 --> 00:58:05.130 as I as I explained you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

00:58:05.130 --> 00:58:07.435 this cluster is associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:07.435 \longrightarrow 00:58:10.212$ thousand expression of mutl and mainly

 $00:58:10.212 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.570$ due to the manipulation of image

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00{:}58{:}12.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}15.790$ one and and then there's tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:15.790 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.560$ They also have the higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

00:58:17.560 --> 00:58:19.330 number of frames if mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:58:22.095$ even though there is no difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:22.095 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.230$ tumor purity that could be affecting this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:24.230 \longrightarrow 00:58:25.658$ But we didn't see that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:25.658 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.610$ was a significant difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00{:}58{:}26.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}28.164$ and they don't have a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:28.164 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.430$ difference in their own TMB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:58:31.350$ So to like two more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:31.350 \longrightarrow 00:58:32.100$ Additional burden,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:32.100 \longrightarrow 00:58:34.350$ so it's specifically to the friendships

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00{:}58{:}34.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}36.498$ and what this suggests is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:36.498 \longrightarrow 00:58:38.350$ the the tumors in this cluster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764589175

 $00:58:38.350 \longrightarrow 00:58:40.140$ They actually have the higher

 $00:58:40.140 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.930$ level of Microsoft the instability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:58:43.970 \longrightarrow 00:58:46.007$ So one of the results of having

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00{:}58{:}46.007 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}47.745$ a higher level of microsatellite

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:58:47.745 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.139$ instability could be that these tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

00:58:50.139 --> 00:58:52.708 have a different new antigen load,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:58:52.710 \longrightarrow 00:58:55.560$ so new antigens are these peptides

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:58:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.846$ that are generated after somatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:58:57.846 \longrightarrow 00:58:59.986$ mutations arise in the tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:58:59.990 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.190$ And as you can see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:01.190 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.966$ you can see that the normal protein and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

00:59:02.966 --> 00:59:05.020 this is a missense mutation in the tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:59:07.236$ so this is going to be 1 amino

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:07.236 \longrightarrow 00:59:08.718$ acid different from the self.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:08.720 \longrightarrow 00:59:10.616$ The regular normal protein,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

00:59:10.616 --> 00:59:14.564 but no antigens that are that are there.

 $00:59:14.564 \longrightarrow 00:59:16.220$ Develop from frame.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:16.220 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.540$ Frameshift mutations are significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:18.540 \longrightarrow 00:59:21.440$ different from the normal because

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:21.440 \longrightarrow 00:59:25.340$ they introduce a lot of well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:25.340 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.990$ Insertions and deletions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:26.990 \longrightarrow 00:59:28.640$ So these proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:28.640 \longrightarrow 00:59:30.580$ These peptides are significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00.59:30.580 \longrightarrow 00:59:32.035$ different from cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:59:34.830$ and these new antigens which represented

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:34.830 \longrightarrow 00:59:38.460$ here by this dot are presented from

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.420$ through the HLA 1 receptor to the TCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:43.420 \longrightarrow 00:59:45.100$ To the T cell receptors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:45.100 \longrightarrow 00:59:47.340$ and this is obviously a very simplified

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00{:}59{:}47.340 \to 00{:}59{:}48.920$ version of what's happening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:48.920 \longrightarrow 00:59:52.359$ but then when this is when when this

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:52.359 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.740$ is happening then the T cells identify

 $00:59:55.740 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.577$ the tumor cells as as non self,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $00:59:59.577 \longrightarrow 01:00:02.372$ and then they're going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:02.372 \longrightarrow 01:00:05.480$ start the immune response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:05.480 \longrightarrow 01:00:08.664$ So we wanted to see how these new

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:08.664 \longrightarrow 01:00:11.707$ antigens and the direction of the HLA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:11.710 \longrightarrow 01:00:13.380$ Image of the patient were

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:13.380 \longrightarrow 01:00:15.050$ occurring based on the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:15.109 \longrightarrow 01:00:16.779$ clusters that we are defined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:16.780 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.924$ So to do that we use several

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01{:}00{:}20.924 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}21.978$ bioinformatics pipelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:00:21.978 --> 01:00:24.726 We use Poly solver to predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:24.726 \longrightarrow 01:00:28.061$ the HLA one alleles that we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01\text{:}00\text{:}28.061 \dashrightarrow 01\text{:}00\text{:}30.863$ that there's three of them using

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01{:}00{:}30.955 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}33.600$ the germline XM sequence data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:33.600 \longrightarrow 01:00:36.301$ Then we use unaware tool to

 $01:00:36.301 \longrightarrow 01:00:38.706$ annotate all the mutations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:38.706 \longrightarrow 01:00:41.678$ we had identified in the in the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:00:41.680 --> 01:00:43.300 More excellent sequencing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:43.300 \longrightarrow 01:00:44.920$ then we use net,

$$\begin{split} & \text{NOTE Confidence: } 0.84446865875 \\ & 01:00:44.920 --> 01:00:45.621 \text{ MCA}, \end{split}$$

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:00:45.621 --> 01:00:49.126 MHC pan that actually identifies

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:49.130 \longrightarrow 01:00:50.609$ what are what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:00:50.609 --> 01:00:53.074 What are the interactions between

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:00:53.074 --> 01:00:56.610 the HLA's and the new antigens?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:56.610 \longrightarrow 01:00:57.982$ And then we took it one step

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01{:}00{:}57.982 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}59.348$ further and we use narrow pred.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:00:59.350 \longrightarrow 01:01:02.890$ 5 that actually this algorithm

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:02.890 \longrightarrow 01:01:04.610$ computes the recognition potential.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:04.610 \longrightarrow 01:01:08.678$ So what it does is it provides a likelihood

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:08.678 \longrightarrow 01:01:11.954$ that this interaction is going to occur.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:11.960 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.976$ And it's based on on the immune epitope.

 $01:01:14.980 \longrightarrow 01:01:16.460$ It's it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:16.460 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.880$ It's this prediction is based

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:01:18.880 --> 01:01:20.980 on the TCR receptor rapporteur,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:20.980 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.828$ that it's that it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:24.830 \longrightarrow 01:01:27.305$ That he's present in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:27.305 \longrightarrow 01:01:28.790$ immune epitope database.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:01:28.790 --> 01:01:33.870 So with that we took this likelihood

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:33.870 \longrightarrow 01:01:36.470$ and this recognition potential,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:36.470 \longrightarrow 01:01:37.858$ and we score them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:37.858 \longrightarrow 01:01:39.940$ and we identified the ones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:40.012 \longrightarrow 01:01:42.250$ were at the highest 10% tile and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:42.250 \longrightarrow 01:01:44.810$ the ones that were at the lower 10%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:44.810 \longrightarrow 01:01:48.743$ So we assume that if there is no selection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:48.750 \longrightarrow 01:01:51.070$ then the these interactions in

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:51.070 \longrightarrow 01:01:54.470$ the temple in the top percentile.

01:01:54.470 --> 01:01:57.116 Between the new antigens and the HLA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:57.120 \longrightarrow 01:01:59.490$ one should be the distribution of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:01:59.490 \longrightarrow 01:02:01.998$ these alleles should be similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:01.998 \longrightarrow 01:02:04.128$ the distribution of the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:04.130 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.488$ and the little frequency in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:02:06.488 --> 01:02:07.274 patient population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:07.280 \longrightarrow 01:02:11.102$ So to test this hypothesis we we

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:11.102 \longrightarrow 01:02:13.886$ compare the actual frequency of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:13.886 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.178$ alleles in the patient population for

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:16.178 \longrightarrow 01:02:18.708$ each of the different clusters and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01{:}02{:}18.708 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}20.783$ the frequency and the distribution

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:20.850 \longrightarrow 01:02:22.985$ of the alleles in the ones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:22.985 \longrightarrow 01:02:25.199$ are selected as having the higher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

01:02:25.199 --> 01:02:27.364 Likely for the recognition and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84446865875

 $01:02:27.364 \longrightarrow 01:02:28.230$ what we NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:28.313 \longrightarrow 01:02:31.199$ identified is that actually there was

 $01:02:31.199 \longrightarrow 01:02:33.931$ one specific allele B702 that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}02{:}33.931 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}36.806$ significantly in breach in this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:36.806 \longrightarrow 01:02:40.486$ the top 10\% recognition potential,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:40.490 \longrightarrow 01:02:43.058$ which that was not happening in

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}02{:}43.058 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}46.290$ the lower set of of interactions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:46.290 \longrightarrow 01:02:49.594$ So we think that the specific actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:49.594 \longrightarrow 01:02:52.961$ wanna leaves like the B702 could promote

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}02{:}52.961 \longrightarrow 01{:}02{:}55.109$ stronger immune immune response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:55.110 \longrightarrow 01:02:57.646$ And these tumors that are the ones with

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:02:57.646 \longrightarrow 01:03:00.059$ the higher microsatellite instability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:03:00.060 --> 01:03:02.348 And we believe that these down the line

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:02.348 \longrightarrow 01:03:05.808$ could be affecting the immune response

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}03{:}05.808 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}10.790$ of these tumors to and and how to

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:10.790 \longrightarrow 01:03:13.038$ immune immune checkpoint inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:13.040 \longrightarrow 01:03:16.407$ So obviously this is the the beginning

 $01:03:16.407 \longrightarrow 01:03:19.146$ of like expanding this work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:19.146 \longrightarrow 01:03:21.967$ the area of immune response by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:22.061 \longrightarrow 01:03:25.237$ immune checkpoint inhibitor response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:03:25.240 --> 01:03:26.317 So in conclusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:26.317 \longrightarrow 01:03:28.471$ for him two molecular differences between

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:28.471 \longrightarrow 01:03:31.225$ the three different types of mismatch repair,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:31.230 \longrightarrow 01:03:34.482$ deficient tumors could have a direct

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:34.482 \longrightarrow 01:03:37.450$ implication and immune response specific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:37.450 \longrightarrow 01:03:39.956$ One else could be driving the presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:03:39.956 --> 01:03:41.919 of neoantigens among mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:41.919 \longrightarrow 01:03:43.994$ deficient tumors with the highest

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:43.994 \longrightarrow 01:03:45.980$ level of microsatellite instability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:45.980 \longrightarrow 01:03:48.320$ We probably specially this work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:48.320 \longrightarrow 01:03:50.816$ so overall the take home message is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:50.816 \longrightarrow 01:03:53.313$ our studies show that there's novel

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:53.313 \longrightarrow 01:03:55.117$ molecular heterogeneity among these.

01:03:55.120 --> 01:03:57.410 Under the efficient tumors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:57.410 \longrightarrow 01:03:59.242$ that understanding the clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:03:59.242 \longrightarrow 01:04:01.268$ pathological features associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:01.268 \longrightarrow 01:04:03.272$ this heterogeneous heterogeneity is

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:03.272 \longrightarrow 01:04:05.620$ essential to accurate diagnosis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:05.620 \longrightarrow 01:04:07.575$ prediction of treatment response in

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:07.575 \longrightarrow 01:04:10.050$ the setting of personalized medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:10.050 \longrightarrow 01:04:12.650$ And our future directions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:12.650 \longrightarrow 01:04:14.785$ It's to understand the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}04{:}14.785 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}16.920$ mechanism that associate trequel 5

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:04:16.987 --> 01:04:19.357 and Warner deficiency with this type

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:19.357 \longrightarrow 01:04:21.419$ of tumors identify immune regulators

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}04{:}21.419 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}23.903$ that determine response based on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:23.903 \longrightarrow 01:04:26.602$ type the specific type of mismatch

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:04:26.602 --> 01:04:27.570 repair deficiency,

 $01:04:27.570 \longrightarrow 01:04:29.975$ and investigate also the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01{:}04{:}29.975 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}31.899$ response to immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:31.899 \longrightarrow 01:04:34.411$ inhibitors based on this type of

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:34.411 \longrightarrow 01:04:35.590$ mismatch repair deficiency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:04:35.590 --> 01:04:37.015 So with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:04:37.015 --> 01:04:39.390 just acknowledge our funding sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:39.390 \longrightarrow 01:04:41.856$ Martinek Albuch that is the the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:41.856 \longrightarrow 01:04:44.809$ dog in my lab that has one done most

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:44.809 \longrightarrow 01:04:46.969$ of the work and my collaborators

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

 $01:04:46.970 \longrightarrow 01:04:49.287$ in the US and also in Spain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796941060842105

01:04:49.290 --> 01:04:51.874 And I'll be happy to take any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01{:}04{:}52.850 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}55.170$ Thank you very much Rosa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

01:04:55.170 --> 01:04:57.242 A terrific work that's very interesting and

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01{:}04{:}57.242 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}00.048$ we do have a couple of questions in the chat,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01:05:00.050 \longrightarrow 01:05:05.056$ so which hopefully I can read properly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01:05:05.056 \longrightarrow 01:05:08.014$ So the first is from Jeffrey

01:05:08.014 --> 01:05:09.969 Townsend and Jeff asks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01\text{:}05\text{:}09.970 \dashrightarrow 01\text{:}05\text{:}13.590$ is the association of BRAF V600E

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

01:05:13.590 --> 01:05:16.990 with MSH mutation purely mutational?

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01:05:16.990 \longrightarrow 01:05:19.517$ Or is there some more complex biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01:05:19.517 \longrightarrow 01:05:22.322$ to the association and he asks because

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01:05:22.322 \longrightarrow 01:05:23.970$ the trinucleotide signature in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01:05:23.970 \longrightarrow 01:05:26.658$ Used by MSH is especially likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.869126174

 $01{:}05{:}26.658 \mathrel{--}{>} 01{:}05{:}30.050$ make the B Rav 600 to E mutation. Yeah

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:30.060 \longrightarrow 01:05:33.300$ so so. The BRAF mutation in colon cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:33.300 \longrightarrow 01:05:36.140$ is associated with the serrated pathway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:36.140 \longrightarrow 01:05:38.216$ so that's like the more biological.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

01:05:38.220 --> 01:05:39.948 It's not this type of tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:39.950 \longrightarrow 01:05:42.056$ but for the for the Ms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:42.060 \longrightarrow 01:05:44.280$ I believe it's more like a

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

01:05:44.280 --> 01:05:45.314 motivational association,

 $01:05:45.314 \longrightarrow 01:05:48.933$ but the one that has been more

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:48.933 \longrightarrow 01:05:51.349$ described biologically is the one

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:51.349 \longrightarrow 01:05:54.073$ that the the serrated pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:54.080 \longrightarrow 01:05:56.211$ Had tumors that they were writing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

01:05:56.211 --> 01:05:57.864 Passwords are developing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:05:57.864 \longrightarrow 01:06:01.170$ but this is like more like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:06:01.170 \longrightarrow 01:06:03.475$ Mutational that we used to

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:06:03.475 \longrightarrow 01:06:05.319$ mainly separate the sporadic

NOTE Confidence: 0.64577244225

 $01:06:05.319 \longrightarrow 01:06:07.398$ from the hereditary ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:09.130 \longrightarrow 01:06:10.444$ OK great thanks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:10.444 \longrightarrow 01:06:13.072$ And then the next question is

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:13.072 \dashrightarrow 01:06:15.827$ from Ryan Jensen and Ryan asks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

01:06:15.830 --> 01:06:18.623 And one of the potential roles of

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01{:}06{:}18.623 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}21.918$ of REC QL 5 is to prevent aberrant

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:21.918 \longrightarrow 01:06:24.350$ homologous recombination by displacing

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:24.350 \longrightarrow 01:06:26.726$ RAD 51 off single stranded DNA.

 $01:06:26.726 \longrightarrow 01:06:28.858$ And he wonders if in tumors from

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

01:06:28.858 --> 01:06:30.528 patients with loss of function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

01:06:30.530 --> 01:06:33.750 mutations in REC queue do you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:33.750 \longrightarrow 01:06:35.514$ increased chromosomal aberrations?

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

01:06:35.514 --> 01:06:37.470 Sister chromatid exchanges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:37.470 \longrightarrow 01:06:40.480$ or perhaps increases in microsatellite

NOTE Confidence: 0.831493464

 $01:06:40.480 \longrightarrow 01:06:42.286$ contraction or expansion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:06:43.010 \longrightarrow 01:06:45.702$ So all of these we have, we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:06:45.702 \longrightarrow 01:06:50.420$ There's so the the work done in Q L5

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:06:50.420 \longrightarrow 01:06:53.280$ and colorectal cancer is not very vast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01{:}06{:}53.280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}56.508$ So so right now what I can say is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

01:06:56.508 --> 01:06:59.721 we we just engineer a cell line that is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:06:59.730 \longrightarrow 01:07:00.838$ that has these mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:00.838 \longrightarrow 01:07:03.058$ which rupees per so we are going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:03.058 \longrightarrow 01:07:05.058$ have the cell lines that have like the

 $01:07:05.119 \longrightarrow 01:07:07.357$ heterozygous and homozygous and Val types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01{:}07{:}07.360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}10.024$ So we are going to be testing these

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:10.024 \longrightarrow 01:07:13.256$ kind of events that Brian is suggesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

01:07:13.260 --> 01:07:14.886 So I don't have that information

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

01:07:14.886 --> 01:07:16.920 yet where I know that, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01{:}07{:}16.920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}19.660$ for Frank L5 is that there there's been one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:19.660 \longrightarrow 01:07:22.292$ There was one old paper that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:22.292 \longrightarrow 01:07:25.798$ showing that interestingly regular 5

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:25.798 \longrightarrow 01:07:29.230$ downregulation was identified in MSI tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:29.230 \longrightarrow 01:07:32.438$ and so I think that there is more

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01{:}07{:}32.438 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}34.965$ than we can be learning about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

01:07:34.965 --> 01:07:36.458 and and I think that that's going

NOTE Confidence: 0.865207728333333

 $01:07:36.458 \longrightarrow 01:07:38.147$ to be one of our like next steps.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:39.670 \longrightarrow 01:07:43.189$ Great thank you and I had one quick question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:43.190 \longrightarrow 01:07:44.594$ When you were going

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:44.594 \longrightarrow 01:07:46.349$ through and looking at the.

 $01:07:46.350 \longrightarrow 01:07:48.546$ The the red queue and other

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:48.546 \longrightarrow 01:07:51.109$ mutations in the Lynch like syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:51.110 \longrightarrow 01:07:53.789$ I didn't have a sense for for whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

01:07:53.789 --> 01:07:55.103 it was clear whether that they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

01:07:55.103 --> 01:07:56.590 all loss of function mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:56.590 \longrightarrow 01:07:59.518$ like for example the T31K in that one

NOTE Confidence: 0.729372912222222

 $01:07:59.518 \longrightarrow 01:08:02.668$ family is that is that some is that a is

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:02.680 \longrightarrow 01:08:05.200$ that one so that one was mutation that

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:05.200 \longrightarrow 01:08:07.847$ we found in the tumor of that patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:07.850 \longrightarrow 01:08:09.782$ We have not been able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:09.782 \longrightarrow 01:08:11.070$ test the other individual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01{:}08{:}11.070 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}12.775$ So the germline variants that

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:12.775 \longrightarrow 01:08:14.900$ we are even defining in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01{:}08{:}14.900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}16.994$ germline are all loss of function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:17.000 \longrightarrow 01:08:19.920$ But we only have been able to test

 $01:08:19.920 \longrightarrow 01:08:22.738$ 1 tumor from these individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

01:08:22.740 --> 01:08:24.525 I can tell you, not for AQL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:24.530 \longrightarrow 01:08:26.922$ I know a lot of the data for

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:26.922 \longrightarrow 01:08:30.107$ one not a lot few data from

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

01:08:30.107 --> 01:08:31.604 Warner mutation somatically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:31.610 \longrightarrow 01:08:34.646$ There is the there identifying loss

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

01:08:34.646 --> 01:08:37.266 of function mutations and actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:37.266 \longrightarrow 01:08:40.302$ these tumors that have loss of

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01{:}08{:}40.302 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}42.990$ function mutations in Werner they

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

01:08:42.990 --> 01:08:45.453 have a significantly higher number

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:45.453 \longrightarrow 01:08:47.574$ of them in comparison to the ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:47.574 \longrightarrow 01:08:49.490$ that don't have mutations there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:49.490 \longrightarrow 01:08:52.808$ MSI. So again another kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:52.810 \longrightarrow 01:08:55.342$ Another clue that there have there

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:08:55.342 \longrightarrow 01:08:58.191$ might be some association between

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

01:08:58.191 --> 01:09:01.419 deficiency in these genes and MSI.

01:09:01.420 --> 01:09:03.940 However, association doesn't mean causality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:09:03.940 \longrightarrow 01:09:05.536$ so this is what I think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:09:05.536 \longrightarrow 01:09:07.459$ is what we actually need to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

01:09:07.460 --> 01:09:08.970 More research to figure out

NOTE Confidence: 0.790083059375

 $01:09:08.970 \longrightarrow 01:09:10.910$ these needs one or the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

01:09:12.290 --> 01:09:17.726 Good, well I think it's been a great session.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

01:09:17.730 --> 01:09:19.155 And lots of good questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

 $01:09:19.155 \longrightarrow 01:09:20.580$ and and two fantastic talks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

 $01:09:20.580 \longrightarrow 01:09:22.645$ So I'd like to just to finish

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

01:09:22.645 --> 01:09:24.608 by by thanking Luisa and Rosa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

01:09:24.610 --> 01:09:26.500 Very much for really giving very

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

 $01:09:26.500 \longrightarrow 01:09:27.760$ stimulating and exciting talks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

 $01{:}09{:}27.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}30.250$ great grand rounds and thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

01:09:30.250 --> 01:09:32.242 you very much everybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804723313333333

 $01:09:32.250 \longrightarrow 01:09:34.828$ Thank you. Bye bye bye.