WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:59:41" NOTE recognizability:0.788

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.847751033636364

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:02.025$ I'm doctor Mary. I'm lustberg.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847751033636364

00:00:02.025 --> 00:00:04.790 Thank you for joining in person and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847751033636364

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:09.780 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.494$ I'm pleased to introduce Doctor Louis

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:14.494 --> 00:00:19.320 Pushti as today's ground round speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:22.470 --> 00:00:24.770 And Co director of the genomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}24.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.411$ genetics and Epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:26.411 --> 00:00:29.146 Research program here at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}31.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}33.580$ from Semmelweis University of

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}00{:}41.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}44.105$ His research group has made

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:44.105 \longrightarrow 00:00:46.045$ important contributions to establish

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:00:51.278 --> 00:00:53.220 fundamentally different molecular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:00:53.220 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.860$ clinical and epidemiological characteristics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}01.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03.170$ gene expression profiling as

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:03.262 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.320$ a diagnostic technology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}05.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}08.580$ To predict chemotherapy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:08.580 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.025$ endocrine therapy sensitivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00:01:11.030 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.946$ And as shown that different biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:01:13.950 --> 00:01:16.438 processes are involved in determining

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

 $00{:}01{:}18.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}23.090$ in different breast cancer subtype.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:01:29.938 --> 00:01:32.872 data platforms in order to define

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:01:32.947 --> 00:01:35.207 the molecular pathways that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

00:01:35.210 --> 00:01:37.490 disturbed in individual cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.928668915

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00:01:45.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.542$ Doctor Pushki is a trusted colleague

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00:01:47.542 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.446$ here at Yale and is a principal

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

00:01:50.446 --> 00:01:51.990 investigator of several clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

00:01:51.990 --> 00:01:54.770 trials investigating new drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}01{:}54.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}58.245$ including immunotherapies for breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}01{:}58.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01.500$ He's published over 250 scientific

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00:02:01.500 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.283$ manuscripts in high impact medical journals

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.796025125714286

 $00{:}02{:}09.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}12.140$ cited clinical investigators in medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.9487658

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.859605108333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.859605108333333

 $00:02:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.200$ moving ever closer to cure for all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859605108333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}02{:}31.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34.020$ I'm so if you're OK with you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}02{:}35.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}37.392$ having a mask, my accent and my

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:02:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.936$ So I hope it's OK with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

 $00:02:47.334 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.595$ I actually forgot how to get here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}02{:}49.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}52.444$ So I really sympathize with those of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}02{:}58.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}01.210$ with my disclosure slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:01.210 --> 00:03:03.289 And then before I start my slides,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:10.367 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.005$ in a candy store surrounded by a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:12.005 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.517$ lot of really delicious and very

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:14.517 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.846$ interesting scientific questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

00:03:20.550 --> 00:03:21.414 And don't be scared,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}28.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30.390$ past few years and I showed this here

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:32.427 --> 00:03:36.710 why I don't show up to most of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}36.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}37.638$ Administrative meetings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:03:37.638 --> 00:03:39.958 so these studying things like

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:39.958 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.886$ cost effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.460$ what's the best cost effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:03:42.460 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.030$ strategy in the new adjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}03{:}51.723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}53.984$ and other regiments to the opposite

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:00.077 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.646$ cancer 20-30 years before the median age?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:02.650 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.810$ Could we develop some sort of a tool to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.958$ sum up all the genomic abnormalities?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:06.960 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.366$ From germline and somatic regions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:09.366 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.432$ would actually describe the capture

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}13.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.888$ How comes that summer stragen receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:15.888 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.289$ positive cancers recur as they are negative?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}18.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.168$ You know some ER positive cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:04:20.168 --> 00:04:22.050 are not fully ER positive,

 $00:04:22.050 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.656 3040\%$ positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}22.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}25.080$ So what are the rest of those cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:25.142 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.450$ which are ER negative?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.385$ What's their relationship to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:04:28.385 --> 00:04:29.546 ER positive cells?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:29.550 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.968$ What novel therapeutic strategies one could

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:31.968 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.308$ dig out from high dimensional genomic data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:35.310 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.920$ So what is the molecular phylogenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}37.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}39.225$ relationship between different

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:39.225 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.367$ metastatic lesions and the primary tumor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:41.370 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.205$ Is these different for synchronous

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}43.205 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}44.306$ mats against asynchronous?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:44.310 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.515$ That's you know why some Kansas are

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:46.515 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.478$ immune reaction immune poor was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}48.478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.398$ difference between the immune rich ER

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:50.398 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.407$ positive and PR negative terms is there

 $00:04:52.407 \longrightarrow 00:04:54.064$ a difference in the microenvironment

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}04{:}54.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57.448$ that's race influence this so really

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:04:57.448 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.679$ study all of these things and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:00.680 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.400$ You can look at the publications on them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.176$ So I'm only going to focus on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:04.176 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.170$ few which I think have a longer

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:06.170 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.012$ trajectory and contributed to the to

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}05{:}08.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09.477$ this remarkable events that happened

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:09.477 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.991$ in the past 20 years that breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:11.991 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.226$ cancer survival and mortality decline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:14.230 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.840$ mortality decline by about 50%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:16.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.796$ I think this is primarily driven

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00{:}05{:}18.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}20.461$ by new treatment strategies based

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

00:05:20.461 --> 00:05:21.981 on better understanding of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88288054

 $00:05:21.981 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.197$ disease and the new

00:05:23.257 --> 00:05:25.159 classes of drugs that we developed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:05:25.160 --> 00:05:27.338 And I think the journey is

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:29.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.310$ So how new treatment strategies

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:32.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.080$ could influence outcome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:36.480 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.461$ I was in the right place at

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}05{:}40.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}42.045$ we were interested to explore

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:42.045 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.038$ period preoperative chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:43.038 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.821$ for women who actually had operable

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:48.208 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.288$ outcome as smaller disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:49.288 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.600$ And at that time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:05:55.800 --> 00:05:57.360 How do you measure the efficacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:05:58.400 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.176$ Do you measure it by response?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:01.980 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.720$ the extent of residual disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:05.634 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.292$ which eventually become the standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:11.069 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.938$ breast or lymph nodes and that's kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:14.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.212$ So with this definition it pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}20.919 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.035$ this complete pathological response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:06:27.665$ they are positive or negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:27.665 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.694$ or too positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:30.930 --> 00:06:32.841 And this immediately defines you what you

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:32.841 --> 00:06:34.887 actually want to accomplish in the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:35.180 --> 00:06:36.920 You want to put more patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:36.920 --> 00:06:38.322 into these pathologic CR category

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:38.322 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.750$ and you want to hurt harm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

 $00:06:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.930$ So you see the evolution of the chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:06:49.930 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.222$ Regiments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:06:51.974 --> 00:06:53.769 paper on the survival curves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}06{:}58.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}59.466$ response complete response rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:02.650 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.450$ So now we actually accomplish

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}04.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.794$ about a 63% complete response rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}06.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08.824$ by adding an immunotherapy drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:08.830 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.224$ And you also learn that adding other

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:11.224 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.727$ chemotherapy agents like carboplatin

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}14.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.370$ We have regiments that don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:17.602 --> 00:07:19.286 some of my colleagues think that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:19.290 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.936$ Is the chemical incarnation of the devil.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:21.940 --> 00:07:24.894 Also there are even single agent therapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:28.986 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.660$ pathology company eradication of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:30.660 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.104$ the cancer before surgery in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:07:34.460 --> 00:07:36.868 But we also made him really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:38.964 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.624$ those who have residual disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:40.630 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.634$ So those are three randomized clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

00:07:44.321 --> 00:07:45.791 of giving capsidae in chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:45.791 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.778$ for those and the residual disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:53.026 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.571$ response within a similar population

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:54.571 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.329$ if the average germline Broca's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}07{:}56.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}58.106$ And the Catherine study did the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:07:58.106 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.193$ same for the record TDM one or

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:08:02.150 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.860$ But I want to spend a few minutes on

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00:08:03.860 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.158$ how do we get there, in particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

 $00{:}08{:}06.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}10.662$ how we actually came about to establish

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220373

00:08:10.662 --> 00:08:13.877 the value of immunotherapy in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:13.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.036$ In breast cancer. So the roots of

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:08:27.775 --> 00:08:29.980 patients who only receive surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:29.980 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.532$ the amount of immune cells in the tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:08:32.532 --> 00:08:34.200 microenvironment is hugely prognostic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.216$ So this is what the the first half of

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}37.983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}39.897$ for patients who did not receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:08:44.050 --> 00:08:45.566 Little high immune presence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:08:45.566 --> 00:08:47.461 intermediate in presence or low

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:08:47.461 --> 00:08:49.341 immune presence and you see that

 $00:08:49.341 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.502$ that the the immune cells have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:51.502 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.470$ massive prognostic value in all three

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}08{:}53.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}55.646$ categories of of breast cancer subtypes

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:55.646 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.920$ including the ER positive patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:08:57.920 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.656$ And what we used in this particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:08:59.656 --> 00:09:01.452 study was gene signature to define

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:01.452 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.445$ the immune richness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}02.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}04.850$ They're in the same time German

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:04.850 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.450$ investigators showed that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:06.518 --> 00:09:08.840 the presence of immune cells also

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}08.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}10.670$ predicts the probability of complete

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:10.670 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.390$ pathological response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}11.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}14.292$ But this slide shows you 32 important things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:14.292 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.929$ One is that in the red circles you

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:16.929 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.814$ see the pathologic computer response

00:09:18.814 --> 00:09:22.538 rates by tumor infiltrating into side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652 00:09:22.540 --> 00:09:22.893 Presence. NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:22.893 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.011$ So they grouped the cases into

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:25.011 --> 00:09:26.430 no lymphocytes, some lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}29.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}31.504$ these numbers in the in the little

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}37.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}39.940$ so the square or highlighted

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:39.940 --> 00:09:42.700 area and ER positive disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}52.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}53.698$ So of course these observations lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:09:55.440 --> 00:09:57.484 So why some breast cancers are immune,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:09:57.490 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.335$ originalists don't is the immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}09{:}59.335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}00.442$ microenvironment differ between

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:10:00.442 --> 00:10:02.250 the primary system and the maths,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00{:}10{:}05.380 \to 00{:}10{:}07.240$ And ultimately the the most important

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:10:09.324 --> 00:10:11.682 or immune cell presence is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:11.682 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.811$ responsible for the good outcome or

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:17.244 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.500$ So when these papers were published,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

00:10:21.090 --> 00:10:22.550 there were no chemotherapy drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:22.550 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.414$ But now we have and we actually have

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:24.414 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.118$ the answer to most of these and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798355488695652

 $00:10:27.631 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.635$ that that address these issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:31.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.283$ So I want to share with you some results

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:34.283 --> 00:10:36.645 which I think really informed a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:36.645 --> 00:10:38.887 my thinking about the the value of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:46.508 --> 00:10:48.594 At that time took on this project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:48.600 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.232$ but downloaded all the CG data or an

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

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

 $00:10:55.990 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.880$ So what drives the immune infiltration

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:10:57.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.825$ and breast cancers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:10:58.830 --> 00:11:00.810 So we looked at Chrono Heterogeneity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:11:00.810 --> 00:11:02.510 mutation load, new antigen load,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:11:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.016$ copy number variations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:11:04.016 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.020$ germline snips,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:11:05.020 --> 00:11:07.068 single gene somatic mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:11:07.068 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.604$ pathway level abnormalities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

 $00:11:08.610 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.740$ which of these is associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:11:10.740 --> 00:11:11.805 high immune presence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870431012333333

00:11:11.810 --> 00:11:13.250 whether you think the results showed?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88883495

00:11:15.410 --> 00:11:17.520 So. Gosh. NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:22.470 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.755$ So the results are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:24.755 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.669$ quite counterintuitive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:25.670 --> 00:11:27.742 So what this shows you is a correlation

00:11:27.742 --> 00:11:29.446 matrix of about 12 immune gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:31.472 \longrightarrow 00:11:33.474$ immune presence or absence or in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:35.626 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.519$ So the darker brown shows a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}11{:}38.519 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}40.784$ correlation value and the darker

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}11{:}45.292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}46.861$ the immune gene signatures are

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:49.375 --> 00:11:50.728 very closely at all. In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:11:53.404 \longrightarrow 00:11:55.798$ So and you see this across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:11:55.798 --> 00:11:57.830 board in all the three subtypes.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}00.504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}02.550$ chromo heterogeneity and higher mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.640$ and neoantigen loads are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:04.640 \longrightarrow 00:12:06.750$ with lower immune infiltration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:06.750 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.486$ So there was such a weird finding

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:12:08.486 --> 00:12:10.090 that we actually teamed up with

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}11.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}14.338$ Thomas Cohn to really confirm this

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:12:14.338 --> 00:12:17.250 in an independent data set data sets

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}17.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.225$ and we find the same same result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:22.790 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.995$ Because even though we found no share

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}24.995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26.679$ genomic alterations that drive the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:26.679 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.384$ immune infiltration in breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:12:32.523 --> 00:12:34.647 immune editing in early stage disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79863867714285700:12:34.650 --> 00:12:34.962 right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:38.995 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.704$ and that's why you have a chromoly

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:12:41.767 --> 00:12:43.975 simple tumor and actually a lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:43.975 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.982$ your antigen load because the cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}45.982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}47.578$ cells with the high neoantigen load

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:47.578 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.128$ are removed by the immune system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}49.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}51.230$ So that's really attractive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}12{:}56.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59.720$ sort of undergo medical transformation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:12:59.720 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.340$ Some of it could be eliminated

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

 $00:13:02.420 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.460$ So if that's really true,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:03.460 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.100$ then then actually immunotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:05.100 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.740$ should work as chemoprevention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:06.740 --> 00:13:08.316 Of course, it's too toxic to do that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.900$ but the concept is important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:09.900 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.867$ So we're going to test this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:11.867 --> 00:13:13.651 an ongoing large event trial that

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:13.651 --> 00:13:15.702 uses symbolism for a year to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:15.763 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.171$ whether it alters contralateral

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}13{:}17.171 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}19.126$ breast cancer events and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:19.126 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.210$ whether it alters breast density.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:21.210 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.862$ Which is sort of a somewhat

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00{:}13{:}23.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}25.188$ validated risk predictor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:25.190 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.961$ But the most important consequence is this

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:26.961 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.239$ that when we actually diagnose these cancers,

00:13:29.240 --> 00:13:31.508 there may be a quasi equilibrium fight

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:37.352 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.367$ immune system is having almost upper

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:39.367 --> 00:13:41.754 hand and that's why it actually is

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:43.450 --> 00:13:45.284 But at that stage you might actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:45.284 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.127$ help tip the balance towards the

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:13:47.127 --> 00:13:49.119 immune system by chemotherapy or by

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:49.119 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.168$ immune checkpoint inhibitors and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:13:51.170 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.874$ Do not have the drugs to test this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

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

00:13:58.820 --> 00:14:01.494 But the third prediction is also interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857 00:14:01.500 --> 00:14:01.850 right? NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

00:14:01.850 --> 00:14:04.300 So if you really follow this logic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:14:04.300 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.940$ then the metastatic disease should

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:14:05.940 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.980$ really arrive through an immune escape.

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:14:07.980 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.835$ So we did a series of studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.798638677142857

 $00:14:09.835 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.630$ to compare primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:10.694 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.612$ exams and maths, and it's among the

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:14:12.612 --> 00:14:14.160 first groups to show that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}14.214 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}16.314$ metastatic lesions in breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:16.314 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.574$ are profoundly immunocompromised.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:17.580 \longrightarrow 00:14:20.562$ And we also looked at whether there

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}20.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}22.610$ is subtle variations by sight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:22.610 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.668$ So now these are all sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:24.670 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.306$ relatively valid accepted principles.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}29.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}30.780$ especially for those of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:14:31.980 --> 00:14:33.932 So there are risks of being coming up

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:40.740 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.372$ I approached Merck to do 2 large

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}45.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}47.676$ What was the neoadjuvant trial to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:14:47.676 --> 00:14:49.477 whether we could actually push the PCR?

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:49.480 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.216$ It's up based on the associations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:14:51.216 \longrightarrow 00:14:53.078$ I showed you to test the causality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

 $00:14:56.474 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.269$ giving people liberalism out and eradicate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}14{:}58.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}00.230$ Micromedex and this is what they said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:15:00.230 --> 00:15:02.218 sorry you're unable to avoid the drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:02.218 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.365$ and the monetary support at this time

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:04.365 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.225$ due to unclear regularly path forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:06.230 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.043$ But it was three years later they

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:08.043 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.563$ actually realized that there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}15{:}09.563 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10.949$ path forward and they actually run

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:10.949 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.554$ both of these studies or or agree to

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:12.554 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.790$ do it and they to their credit they

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:15:14.790 --> 00:15:16.869 actually invited me back to their

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:16.869 \longrightarrow 00:15:18.975$ steering committee of the new adjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}15{:}18.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.598$ trial and I lead the adjuvant trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:21.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.959$ So what do these studies show it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.270$ This is just the selection that is

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:15:35.754 --> 00:15:38.025 cells with pathologic CR or strong

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:38.025 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.637$ strong association with prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:15:39.640 --> 00:15:41.440 And by and large triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:47.380 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.748$ the ice spy all talk to you a

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:48.748 \longrightarrow 00:15:49.739$ little bit more about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

 $00:15:54.610 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.666$ So the largest study keynote 5 to 2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}15{:}56.670 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}15{:}58.580$ the Merck study showed improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:15:58.580 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.819$ about 7 percent, 56 to 63.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:16:00.819 --> 00:16:02.271 Really underwhelming because chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:02.271 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.829$ trials could do double digit improvements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.170$ Yet the chemo studies actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:16:06.170 --> 00:16:07.510 didn't really improve the event

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:07.562 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.950$ free survival that dramatically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:08.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.055$ Oftentimes it didn't deal with

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:10.055 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.490$ it all to a significant extent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:11.490 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.510$ But keynote 522 did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:12.510 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.230$ You see the same in an even smaller study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006314384615400:16:15.230 --> 00:16:15.556 paranormal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:16:15.556 --> 00:16:18.480 They're also showed a 9% even PCR rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:18.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.770$ Not even significant,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154 00:16:22.230 --> 00:16:22.958 The other? NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00:16:27.069 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.959$ is that in metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

00:16:28.960 --> 00:16:30.900 again parallelism have improved the

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

 $00{:}16{:}34.696 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}35.980$ and positive patients whereas in

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.790063143846154

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:16:44.415 --> 00:16:46.032 slide that I showed you previously

00:16:46.032 --> 00:16:47.730 from the fact that the metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:16:47.730 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.253$ lesions are immunocompromised or really

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}16{:}50.253 \to 00{:}16{:}52.857$ immunosuppressed immune attenuated so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:16:55.676 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.474$ you could miss with the biopsy and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:00.710 \longrightarrow 00:17:02.926$ one of our fellows showed and we presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:02.926 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.207$ the San Antonio Breast Cancer meeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:17:05.210 --> 00:17:07.235 So even a few period like in one positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}17{:}07.235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.981$ cells that are intermixed with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}17{:}08.981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}10.778$ micro environment and missed the initial

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:17:10.778 --> 00:17:12.476 biopsy could be enough to actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:12.476 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.794$ ignite an immune response and the same

 $00:17:14.794 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.990$ way chemotherapy ignites sort of like

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:17:17.061 --> 00:17:19.609 one expression in the more massive scale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:26.510 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.042$ This thing observation that why small

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}17{:}29.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31.584$ improvements in Pathologic CR really lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:47.444 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.196$ power to show improvement in PCR,

 $00:17:49.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.970$ but was woefully underpowered and

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:50.970 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.224$ included all subtypes to to really

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}17{:}53.224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}54.896$ show improvement in survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:54.900 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.937$ So this matter analysis by the FDA

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:17:56.937 --> 00:17:58.939 and showed very little in fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:17:58.939 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.714$ no relationships at all between

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:00.714 --> 00:18:02.479 improvement in PCR and survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.118$ They confused a lot of people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:04.120 --> 00:18:05.751 but it would have to fly against

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:05.751 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.770$ the totally common sense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}06.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}09.042$ Observations, Taxol improved pathologic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}09.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}11.314$ sciarid improved survival receptive

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:11.314 --> 00:18:12.690 improved Pathologic CR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:12.690 \longrightarrow 00:18:13.740$ it improves survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}13.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15.140$ Platinum improved Pathologic CR

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:17.355 \longrightarrow 00:18:18.467$ improves survival as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}18.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20.624$ And of course the immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}22.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}24.740$ But nevertheless it's really true

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:24.740 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.991$ that at the individual trial level

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:26.991 --> 00:18:28.886 the relationship between the PCR

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}32.690 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}18{:}34.028$ So that's the next question to

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:34.028 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.823$ study why and I actually have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:35.823 --> 00:18:36.959 good explanation for you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}36.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}39.024$ And I think it's very elegant and simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:39.030 --> 00:18:41.598 But to understand that you need

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}41.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.754$ to familiarize yourself with this

00:18:43.754 --> 00:18:46.351 concept of a continuous metric of

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}18{:}46.351 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}48.948$ of outcome or pathological response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:48.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.939$ So again in 2007 we developed this

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:51.939 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.250$ metric called residual cancer burden

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:54.250 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.615$ to capture the pathological residual

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:18:56.615 --> 00:18:59.609 disease as a continuous variable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:18:59.610 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.370$ We did that because continuous

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:19:01.370 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.130$ variables are more powerful to

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:19:03.188 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.360$ identify genes that would be associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:19:05.360 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.070$ with outcome or not but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:19:07.070 --> 00:19:08.876 So eventually it took sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:19:08.876 --> 00:19:10.990 traction in the form of categories,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}19{:}10.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}13.678$ so you can use this continuous score to

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:19:13.678 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.258$ create bins of 0 being complete response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86675393866666700:19:17.260 --> 00:19:17.898 Another bin.

00:19:17.898 --> 00:19:19.493 That's the minimal residual disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00{:}19{:}19.493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}21.578$ or RCB 1 moderate amount or CB2

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:19:21.578 --> 00:19:23.360 and a large amount of RCB 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:19:25.720 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.161$ a continuous scroll and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

 $00:19:27.161 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.476$ why we did it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

00:19:28.480 --> 00:19:31.168 Be teamed up the deal I spoke

NOTE Confidence: 0.866753938666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:19:32.395 --> 00:19:34.530 this continuous sort of score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:19:34.530 --> 00:19:36.175 I thought actually could reveal

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:37.491 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.078$ about how different drugs work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

00:19:49.750 --> 00:19:51.955 the control arm is always staxel ACC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}19{:}51.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}55.434$ and but you see here is the RCB values

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}19{:}55.434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}57.664$ from zero to 50 is complete response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:57.664 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.507$ Five is expensive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:19:58.510 --> 00:19:59.050 Single disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:19:59.050 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.210$ This kind of shows you the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:01.272 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.120$ prevalence of the density or the

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:20:03.120 --> 00:20:05.012 frequency with which you encounter a

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}05.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07.112$ particular RCB value in the trial arm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}07.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.552$ So the black is the control and the dotted

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}10.552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}11.992$ lines are various experimental drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}12.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}15.168$ I just want to look at you the two

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}15.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.370$ panels which are labeled so I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:18.370 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.819$ think I can use a A.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:20:20.820 --> 00:20:21.676 Sort of a pointer,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:20:22.746 --> 00:20:23.739 that the bottom panel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:20:25.068 --> 00:20:27.780 you have a large improvement in PCR rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:31.100 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.820$ That's where the curves start.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:32.820 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.060$ But you also see a massive shift towards

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:35.060 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.979$ the smaller values across the board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}39.338 \to 00{:}20{:}41.579$ top instead of right hand corner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}43.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}44.380$ also improves PCR rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}20{:}44.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47.035$ But it does it by moving the RCB 1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:47.040 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.460$ the little residual disease group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:20:58.680 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.116$ So we thought that actually measuring

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:03.689 --> 00:21:06.323 in residual cancer burden scores could

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:08.740 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.406$ And we developed a new statistical tool

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:10.406 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.196$ that you can find in this paper and

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:14.056 --> 00:21:15.601 a breast cancer on this open website,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:15.601 --> 00:21:17.406 we call it treatment efficacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:17.406 \longrightarrow 00:21:19.305$ score and it basically compares

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:19.305 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.275$ the distribution of RCB scores.

00:21:21.280 --> 00:21:23.440 Cross through trial arms in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:24.940 --> 00:21:26.575 correlates quite well with event

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:28.710 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.650$ There's a significant difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:33.220 --> 00:21:35.763 in this test score then you don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:38.530 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.468$ So we're going to validate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:21:45.781 --> 00:21:48.967 So pembrolizumab is expensive and 15%

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

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

 $00:21:51.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.442$ so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:51.442 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.326$ He entered into this race to find

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:54.326 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.527$ predictive markers that define the

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:56.527 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.697$ patients who need pembrolizumab and

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:21:58.697 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.579$ this is a slide from from us from

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:22:01.579 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.392$ a group in Germany civil libel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:22:03.392 --> 00:22:05.740 And one of my former lab members Thomas Kuhn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}22{:}05.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}08.080$ who leads their translational research arm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}22{:}08.080 \longrightarrow 00{:}22{:}11.083$ And what they show in this randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:22:11.083 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.746$ immunotherapy versus chemotherapy alone

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00:22:12.746 \longrightarrow 00:22:14.944$ ARM study that there are a number

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}22{:}14.944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16.632$ of molecular variables that predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

00:22:16.632 --> 00:22:19.375 response to any if you have them like

NOTE Confidence: 0.683619764

 $00{:}22{:}19.375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}21.865$ high commutation burden or a high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:22:21.870 --> 00:22:24.294 Energy and expression or high P like in

00:22:24.294 --> 00:22:26.303 one expression or high till comes you

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:22:26.303 --> 00:22:28.440 have higher PCR rate with chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:22:33.965 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.873$ happens in both groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:22:37.580 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.876$ the PD low and high or the field

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}22{:}39.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}41.619$ count low and high groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:22:41.620 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.042$ So these are these one of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}22{:}44.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}45.936$ metrics are selective to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}22{:}49.734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}50.880$ might benefit from Pedro.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

 $00:22:55.170 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.653$ that MH subclass 2 expression in tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:22:57.653 --> 00:22:59.897 cells might actually identify a group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:22:59.900 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.340$ the group of patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.492$ really need it Pembroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:02.500 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.966$ So I need to see class to is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:04.966 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.000$ mostly expressed in immune cells and

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:08.000 --> 00:23:10.148 participates in antigen presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}23{:}10.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}12.294$ but it can be induced to be expressed

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:12.294 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.426$ in cancer cells and epithelial cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}23{:}14.426 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}17.089$ by interferon gamma, for example, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:17.089 --> 00:23:20.107 Have you run this immunity chemistry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:20.110 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.990$ a simple immunity chemistry for

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:21.990 --> 00:23:23.494 emission classical expression on

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:23.494 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.565$ cancer as opposed to the immune cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:25.570 --> 00:23:29.254 And we actually confirmed that what

 $00:23:29.254 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.710$ Justin Balko originally reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}23{:}31.807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}33.994$ that the cancers which were positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:23:33.994 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.190$ for MHC Class 2 expression actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:40.730 --> 00:23:41.962 But the pathologic CR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:41.962 --> 00:23:44.124 it was the same whether they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}23{:}49.646 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}50.978$ marker treatment interaction

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}23{:}53.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}55.130$ this completely independent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:23:55.130 --> 00:23:57.298 Another set of former lab member of mine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

 $00:24:00.901 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.417$ trial without the salesman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667 00:24:02.420 --> 00:24:03.036 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:03.036 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.576$ I highlighted for you the

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:04.576 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.500$ interaction between Italy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:05.500 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.500$ the expression on epithelial cells that

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:08.500 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.578$ actually predicted higher odds ratio for PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:24:11.580 --> 00:24:13.561 Vidot is always the map but didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:24:13.561 --> 00:24:15.758 have any sort of significant other

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:15.758 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.474$ ratio with chemotherapy alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:17.480 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.419$ but the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:24:18.419 --> 00:24:20.610 Study our immune cells didn't carry this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:20.610 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.633$ So it's a really cool project there

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}24{:}22.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}24.954$ and we just got funding from the NCI

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:24.954 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.328$ to kind of test this and validate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:27.328 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.710$ in a larger trial them S 1418 that I,

 $00:24:30.710 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.010$ I mentioned to you earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667 00:24:33.010 --> 00:24:33.506 But again, NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:36.962 \longrightarrow 00:24:38.382$ actually throws up new questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}24{:}38.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}40.574$ even more interesting questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00{:}24{:}45.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}47.213$ A lot of people are struggling

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:47.990 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.710$ how you make a cold against the heart.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:24:50.710 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.243$ But we thought we ask something a

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:25:04.628 --> 00:25:06.651 that Kim actually came women led

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:25:06.651 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.757$ and we compared the immune reach

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

 $00:25:10.647 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.220$ the PCR versus those that did not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.626329596666667

00:25:17.496 --> 00:25:19.308 us to some leads about what

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}19.382 --> 00{:}25{:}20.830 \ combination \ therapies,$

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}20.830 \to 00{:}25{:}22.898$ immunotherapies could really be

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}22.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.483$ make embolism and more effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}25.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}27.128$ So just to summarize this let's we

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:25:27.128 --> 00:25:28.842 found that the teacher have better if

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}32.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}34.772$ You don't accomplish PCI and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:36.463 \longrightarrow 00:25:38.258$ are also associated with it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:25:38.260 --> 00:25:40.740 The innate immunity markers actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:40.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.130$ are macrophage and K markers and when

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:45.597 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.871$ you really see this very strikingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:47.871 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.319$ so cancers it raises your disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}50.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}52.295$ The dominant cytokines are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:52.295 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.875$ cytokines which are involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}53.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}56.249$ in chemotaxis and activation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}56.249 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}57.689$ neutrophils and macrophages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:25:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:25:59.210$ So we hypothesized they're blocking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}25{:}59.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}01.190$ Some of those would actually improve

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}05.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06.784$ You actually went pembrolizum ab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:06.784 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.280$ So interestingly I just put that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:26:11.140 --> 00:26:13.078 It's so beautiful because it congruent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

00:26:15.393 --> 00:26:17.491 same cytokines that we see highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:19.726 \longrightarrow 00:26:22.120$ TNBC at the very same chemokines

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:24.704 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.742$ microenvironment metastatic disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:25.742 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.334$ right in that paper that showed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00{:}26{:}28.334 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29.453$ the metastatic microenvironment

NOTE Confidence: 0.853674237272727

 $00:26:29.453 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.230$ is more immuno attenuated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:33.930 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.142$ Just instead of finish these sort of

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}38.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}40.154$ So if immunotherapy works

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:26:40.154 --> 00:26:41.477 beautifully entrepreneur disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:26:42.950 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.390$ subset of ER positive cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}44.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47.142$ And we think that it will work because

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}49.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52.073$ that in three arms that included

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:26:52.073 --> 00:26:55.079 immunotherapy including the door volume up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}26{:}56.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}59.238$ the Penrose Metaxa arm and the pembrolizumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:06.707 --> 00:27:08.968 ER positive here we call them HR

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}09.041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.377$ hormone receptor positive cancers.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:27:33.970 --> 00:27:35.949 high high and some Withrow high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}27{:}35.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}37.546$ So the small print we throw higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:37.546 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.689$ MP two group is the subset among the

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:39.689 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.094$ ER positive patients who benefited

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:42.386 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.526$ You can't see that right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:43.530 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.870$ So the HR positive MP1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:45.870 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.098$ there's no difference whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:47.098 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.633$ you get chemo plus durva,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:48.640 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.341$ but if you are MP two then

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:52.770 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.570$ with the other two arms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.130$ And what's even nicer when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:56.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.528$ look at the molecular features

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:27:59.070 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.810$ the area are positive but

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:00.810 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.202$ their ER signaling and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769 00:28:02.210 --> 00:28:02.540 Yeah, NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769 00:28:06.700 --> 00:28:07.321 this is low. NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:10.376 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.620$ benefit from endocrine treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:13.650 --> 00:28:15.139 signature which also makes sense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}18.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}20.690$ the chemotherapy arms and but

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}20.690 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}28{:}22.958$ we didn't really see a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:22.958 --> 00:28:24.988 difference in the immune micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}24.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}27.100$ in in immune signature genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}27.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}30.594$ So again we hope to launch the prospective

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

 $00:28:32.440 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.816$ With the routinely available essay we

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}34.816 \to 00{:}28{:}37.113$ could actually identify a group that

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:37.113 --> 00:28:39.360 will benefit from the same way as

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:41.887 --> 00:28:44.027 including immune checkpoint therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.902$ So just to summarize these clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:45.902 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.424$ partially the paradigm shift that

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}48.957 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}50.766$ years is that the best way to treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:50.766 --> 00:28:52.326 most stage two and stage three

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}52.326 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.016$ triple negative patients is new

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:54.016 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.609$ adjuvant chemotherapy and the best

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}28{:}55.609 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}56.929$ PCR rates are accomplished about

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:28:56.929 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.016$ two third of the patients having a

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:28:59.016 --> 00:29:00.566 competent navigation of the cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:00.570 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.998$ the same happened in her two

 $00:29:01.998 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.474$ positive disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:29:02.480 --> 00:29:04.178 Don't talk about this because it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:04.178 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.030$ really predated at least by 1015 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:29:06.030 --> 00:29:07.077 the immunotherapy revolution

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:07.077 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.520$ and there are a lot of really

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:29:09.581 --> 00:29:11.566 interesting studies that will push

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:11.566 \longrightarrow 00:29:13.551$ the survival even further among

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

00:29:13.614 --> 00:29:15.539 those who have residual disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:15.540 \longrightarrow 00:29:17.328$ So there are new studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00{:}29{:}17.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}19.201$ are launched in that space that

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:19.201 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.037$ I kind of highlighted for you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:21.040 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.595$ So what's next,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769 00:29:21.595 --> 00:29:21.780 right. NOTE Confidence: 0.701418739230769

 $00:29:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.890$ So what's going to be the

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

00:29:22.935 --> 00:29:24.519 next paradigm shift in the next 10 years?

00:29:24.520 --> 00:29:27.656 And I think the this is really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00{:}29{:}27.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}30.215$ I I see two really potentially very

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00:29:30.215 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.358$ high impact fields which we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.804587020555556

 $00:29:36.120 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.460$ So wait a second.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:43.622 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.905$ concept that could we detect molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:29:45.905 --> 00:29:49.101 relapse in solid tumors the same way as

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:29:51.470 \longrightarrow 00:29:53.374$ So if you see that with PCR that

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:29:53.374 --> 00:29:55.119 your genomic abnormalities returned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}29{:}55.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}56.428$ then a second round of treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:29:56.428 --> 00:29:57.622 at that point would actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:29:57.622 --> 00:29:59.017 cure some people from leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

00:30:01.127 --> 00:30:02.961 to sometimes it didn't really have

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:30:02.961 --> 00:30:05.438 good ways to catch this and we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:05.438 \longrightarrow 00:30:07.378$ really have good effective drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:07.378 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.168$ either 5610 years ago to test this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:09.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.154$ but now we have we have most molecular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:30:11.160 --> 00:30:13.265 Essays that can pretty reliably

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:13.265 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.917$ identify and the SEC DNA is

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:15.917 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.237$ particularly tumor informed C DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:18.240 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.256$ So if you have a high C DNA level

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:30:20.256 --> 00:30:22.023 that's starting to rise while you

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:22.023 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.866$ are in the surveillance of follow

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:23.866 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.678$ up stage of the initial curative

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}30{:}25.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}27.604$ therapy as the city then rises,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:27.604 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.970$ unfortunately it's almost sure bad that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:30.035 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.201$ will have a recurrence clinical recurrence

00:30:32.201 --> 00:30:34.609 within the next seven or eight months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}30{:}34.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}36.640$ So could we intervene at that point

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:30:43.600 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.340$ I look in therapy and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}30{:}50.827 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52.497$ patients who are receiving endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:30:52.558 --> 00:30:54.630 therapy but start to have a rising CDN,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:30:57.680 --> 00:31:00.312 And we'll just continue with their standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:06.585 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.458$ shifting idea is really that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:10.070 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.070$ So you have metastatic disease kind of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:12.070 --> 00:31:13.910 current dogma is that you will die from it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:15.270 --> 00:31:16.522 but ultimately people die.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:19.750 --> 00:31:21.850 So what happened in the past five,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}31{:}24.022 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}25.790$ understood much more clearly that

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:25.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.830$ only that there are multiple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

 $00:31:28.978 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.126$ not just some medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:30.130 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.303$ Disease doesn't exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:31:32.870 --> 00:31:34.160 just like the breast cancer doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:35.593 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.637$ It's a useful concept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:36.640 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.680$ But practically really these

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:44.050 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.250$ different types of breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:45.250 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.308$ And the same way like metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00{:}31{:}53.640 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}> 00{:}31{:}55.032$ That's obviously very different

00:31:55.032 --> 00:31:56.424 from somebody relapsing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:56.424 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.150$ having a metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:58.150 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.404$ After they went through all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:31:59.404 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.482$ treatments that I showed you

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:00.482 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.477$ in the new adjuvant setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.396$ the chemotherapies was embolism and whatnot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:04.400 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.965$ So curing those folks with

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:05.965 \dashrightarrow 00:32:07.880$ existing the rapies is a long shot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:07.880 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.518$ but curing those folks who never had

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:09.518 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.961$ any therapy with the combination of

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:32:10.961 --> 00:32:12.840 drugs is probably not such a long shot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:32:15.038$ And there are many case reports and

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:15.038 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.877$ oncologists who practice for a long time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

 $00:32:16.880 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.835$ All have an ecdotal cases of

NOTE Confidence: 0.803463255714286

00:32:18.835 --> 00:32:19.617 metastatic patients,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:21.125 \dashrightarrow 00:32:22.630$ disease because her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:28.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.178$ And also for your poster disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}32.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}34.758$ kind of put into the mind of many

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}36.353 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}38.100$ two positive cancer can be cured.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}32{:}38.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}40.206$ I think it's kind of increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:45.348 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.312$ actually focus on covad especial

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:47.312 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.706$ group of her of metastatic patients,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:32:52.646 --> 00:32:54.399 with oligo metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:32:58.890 --> 00:32:59.444 Is micromass,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:32:59.444 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.383$ but we can deal with micro Mets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:03.090 --> 00:33:04.780 That's how adjuvant therapy improves

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:06.818 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.564$ breast cancer in the lymph nodes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.752$ the systemic therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}09.752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}12.116$ Washes and and kills them

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:12.116 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.540$ at the Micromax.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:13.540 --> 00:33:15.129 So I think this better than probably

00:33:15.129 --> 00:33:16.828 will hold up in stage four disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:16.828 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.274$ and the vision is very simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}20.305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22.507$ call these patients the oligo metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:28.150 --> 00:33:30.880 Because then they will be curable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}33{:}35.149 \to 00{:}33{:}37.237$ just wanna share you some of the results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:41.218 --> 00:33:43.206 average or median age even in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:43.264 --> 00:33:45.139 absence of any germline mutation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:45.140 --> 00:33:46.810 Actually that's the majority of

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:33:53.380 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.940$ One was that each is the strongest non

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:33:58.220 --> 00:34:00.314 So could you actually sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:34:00.314 --> 00:34:01.710 hypothesize that young women?

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:01.710 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.015$ Could be breast cancer actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}04.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}05.859$ experience an accelerated epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:07.420 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.396$ So this was an idea that Erin Hofstatter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}09.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}10.846$ our former colleague picked up and

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:12.531 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.196$ that actually suggests that this

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}15.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}17.468$ So it shows you this insert from

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:21.659 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.340$ of simply and clearly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:23.340 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.461$ So what you should what you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:25.461 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.594$ there is each acceleration in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}27.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}29.898$ normal breast tissue of women who

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:29.898 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.237$ had breast cancer later and the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:34:32.240 --> 00:34:33.605 Epigenetic age acceleration of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}33.605 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}34.970$ who never develop breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:34.970 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.282$ So we did this with the Susan Comment

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:37.282 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.805$ Tissue Bank and with some tissues from here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.330$ So you see that there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.050$ significant acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:43.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.942$ So epigenetically speaking based

 $00:34:44.942 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.834$ on the methylation signature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}34{:}46.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49.162$ the breast normal breast tissues of

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:49.162 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.139$ woman who subsequently developed breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:51.139 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.729$ cancer is older than their chronological age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:53.730 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.641$ And we don't see this to such

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

00:34:55.641 --> 00:34:57.609 extent in the control patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:57.610 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.370$ And then and then we had some follow

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00:34:59.370 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.958$ up patients which really kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.774022176190476

 $00{:}35{:}00.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}02.608$ papers that explained that it's mostly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:35:02.610 --> 00:35:04.438 Polycom related genes whose

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:04.438 \longrightarrow 00:35:06.266$ methylation pattern is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:06.266 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.340$ with this age acceleration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}35{:}08.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}10.940$ and this last paper on the review in

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:10.940 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.183$ science advances shows that actually every

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:13.183 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.845$ cell proliferation adds a little bit of

 $00:35:15.845 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.050$ epigenetic aging to to to the tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}35{:}18.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}20.808$ And there is a share of epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:20.808 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.001$ signature between cancers and and normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:23.001 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.710$ cells and it relates to aging and it

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:25.710 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.895$ relates to ultimately cell divisions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:35:27.900 --> 00:35:30.516 But it's probably not the full story though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:30.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.340$ So what's the rest of the story?

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:32.340 \longrightarrow 00:35:34.293$ So family history is a predictive risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}35{:}34.293 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}36.614$ factor even in the absence of any

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:36.614 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.399$ detectable hyper reference gene mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}35{:}38.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}40.125$ right? So something you inherited

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:40.125 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.160$ increases your risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:35:41.160 --> 00:35:44.200 even if it's you can't see it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:35:44.200 --> 00:35:46.960 Polygenic risk scores that use individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:46.960 \longrightarrow 00:35:49.233$ snips that are individually associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:49.233 \longrightarrow 00:35:51.795$ with risk to a very small extent,

 $00:35:51.800 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.284$ sum them up and you've made them

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:53.284 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.799$ by the risk that they confer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:54.800 \longrightarrow 00:35:55.960$ That's a polygenic risk score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667 00:35:55.960 --> 00:35:56.342 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:35:56.342 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.016$ even the best ones today using several

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:35:59.016 --> 00:36:00.932 100 risks polygenic risk and have

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:00.932 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.000$ a lot of missing heredity in them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:03.000 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.296$ So they don't explain this complete story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:05.300 \longrightarrow 00:36:07.524$ So we have this other idea that could

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}36{:}07.524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09.504$ the combination of non recurrent rare

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}36{:}09.504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}11.209$ germline variants and cancer relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:11.209 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.029$ genes determined individual risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}36{:}13.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}14.326$ So because they are not recurrent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:36:14.330 --> 00:36:16.286 Missed them in in indigenous studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666666700:36:16.290 --> 00:36:16.621 right,

 $00:36:16.621 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.607$ because they start out finding individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}36{:}18.607 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}36{:}20.292$ snips that are associated because

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:20.292 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.188$ they are recurrent in the mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:22.188 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.810$ state of India's cancer population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:23.810 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.460$ But if it's not recurrent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:25.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.760$ you won't see it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:27.760 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.767$ So this is an idea that really kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:29.767 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.637$ wanted me for quite a while since this

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}36{:}31.637 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}33.807$ paper came out from the 1000 Genome Project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.316$ which showed that all of us

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:35.316 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.320$ here have different faces.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:36.320 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.714$ And the reason we have different faces

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:38.714 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.185$ is this amazing set of variation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:36:41.185 --> 00:36:43.870 Snips and Jermaine Snips and other

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:43.870 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.720$ genomic variations that we are born with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:47.720 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.456$ So an average person carries about

 $00:36:50.456 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.648$ 20 and 50 to 350 genes that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:53.648 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.016$ a loss of function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.490$ That's probably the reason why I have

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:56.490 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.879$ this poor voice and small stature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:57.880 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.582$ But anyway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:36:58.582 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.039$ so the point is that this low

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:01.039 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.707$ frequency events that occur in unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}37{:}03.707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}05.947$ combination individuals might set the

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:06.020 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.400$ stage that what additional events

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:08.400 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.780$ matter or cause the transformation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:37:10.780 --> 00:37:14.285 So it's a combinatorial effect, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:14.285 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.890$ So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}37{:}15.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}17.995$ We put these hypothesis forward

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:17.995 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.100$ that really that functional germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:20.169 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.339$ variants as potential Co oncogenes.

 $00:37:22.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.632$ And this actually I think there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:24.632 \dashrightarrow 00:37:26.960$ something that covers on the screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:26.960 \longrightarrow 00:37:28.675$ Yeah, so you can't see this well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:28.680 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.505$ but this model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:29.505 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.430$ the the nice thing about models is

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:31.485 \dashrightarrow 00:37:33.649$ they predict testable hypothesis, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:33.649 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.743$ So this particular idea that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:37:35.743 --> 00:37:37.432 Germans polymorphisms all of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}37{:}37.432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}39.172$ together said this theme stage for

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:37:39.172 --> 00:37:41.342 what counts as an oncogenic event and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:41.342 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.296$ eventually this is the totality of

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:43.296 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.376$ abnormalities that lead to cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00{:}37{:}45.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}48.173$ So it's this sort of testable leads

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:48.173 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.300$ to this testable hypothesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:50.300 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.448$ right that cancers in younger patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:52.450 \longrightarrow 00:37:53.440$ This is correct.

 $00:37:53.440 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.420$ They should have more germline variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:55.420 \longrightarrow 00:37:57.003$ because they need fewer somatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

00:37:57.003 --> 00:37:58.951 events to reach a threshold, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:37:58.951 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.755$ The sexual disturbance that

NOTE Confidence: 0.663768066666667

 $00:38:00.755 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.010$ pushed them over to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:03.094 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.440$ become malignant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:04.440 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.150$ And theoretically you could also

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}06.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}08.635$ use this idea to develop a cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}08.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}10.405$ gene systems integrity score that

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}10.405 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.369$ captures how far a cell or tissue is

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:13.369 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.837$ from this malignant transformation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:14.840 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.210$ So we started to study that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:17.210 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.352$ And this is a paper that

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:19.352 --> 00:38:21.469 touching postdoc in my lab did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:21.470 --> 00:38:23.534 So we asked this really fundamental

 $00:38:23.534 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.568$ simple thing that amazingly not a

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:25.568 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.368$ lot of people actually studied before

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:27.368 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.175$ that what's the relationship between

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:29.175 --> 00:38:32.276 the person's age of that each of your

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:32.276 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.862$ diagnosis of cancer and the germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:34.862 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.550$ variant load in cancer relevant genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:37.550 \longrightarrow 00:38:39.050$ So what are cancer relevant genes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:39.050 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.143$ So we just put from the literature

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:41.143 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.410$ and from from review articles about

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:43.410 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.685$ 1500 genes which are experimentally

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}45.685 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}47.505$ validated that they alter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:47.510 --> 00:38:48.854 They've played an important

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:48.854 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.198$ biological role in cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:50.200 \longrightarrow 00:38:51.320$ And when you see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:38:51.320 --> 00:38:52.930 it's actually pretty obvious and

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:38:52.930 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.305$ it's really beautiful, right.

 $00:38:54.305 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.735$ So people who develop cancer at

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}56.735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}59.540$ an older age have fewer germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}38{:}59.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}01.898$ alterations in these cancer relevant genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:01.900 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.110$ People who develop cancer at

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:03.110 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.700$ younger age have a much higher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:04.700 --> 00:39:07.902 these are age bins by years of 10 and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:07.902 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.079$ opposite is seen in the somatic space.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:10.080 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.760$ So people will develop cancer at their ages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:11.760 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.675$ Prostate cancer folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:12.675 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.200$ have a lot of mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:14.200 --> 00:39:15.495 whereas people who develop cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:15.495 \dashrightarrow 00:39:17.520$ at an early age have fewer somatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667 00:39:17.520 --> 00:39:17.809 Positions, NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:17.809 \longrightarrow 00:39:19.543$ and we knew this from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:19.543 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.410$ pediatric literature actually.

00:39:20.410 --> 00:39:21.502 Pediatric cancers don't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:21.502 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.790$ a heck of a lot of mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:23.790 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.589$ So that's actually a really nice story

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:25.589 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.257$ that that supports this idea that

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:27.257 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.667$ somehow that's the combined effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:28.670 --> 00:39:30.254 And if you have a lot of germline hits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}30.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}33.098$ you need need a fewer random

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:33.098 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.959$ somatic hits to push you over.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:35.960 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.908$ In this paper view,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:36.908 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.643$ it kind of did you think a

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00{:}39{:}38.643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}40.167$ little bit deeper and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:40.170 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.750$ so cancers which actually are highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:42.750 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.690$ linked to environmental factors for

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:44.690 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.850$ lung cancer for example that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:46.850 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.765$ actually tend to have a lot more

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:48.765 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.190$ somatic events and some somatic

00:39:50.190 --> 00:39:51.462 mutations from somatic origin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:51.462 --> 00:39:53.052 from germline in other cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:53.052 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.909$ kind of coffee.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.958$ So in between and some of them are

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

00:39:55.958 --> 00:39:57.429 actually like testicular germs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:57.430 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.755$ atoms are dominated by germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.720834559166667

 $00:39:59.755 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.080$ hits rather than somatic hits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:04.550 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.189$ But then this location OK so

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:07.189 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.345$ why 1500 genes so probably are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:09.345 \dashrightarrow 00:40:11.650$ there more genes related to cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:40:11.650 --> 00:40:14.219 So we we asked this question whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:14.219 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.157$ what's the what's the totality

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}16.157 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}18.062$ of cancer relevant human genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}18.062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}20.976$ and the name we came up with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:20.976 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.676$ really simple concept that if.

00:40:22.680 --> 00:40:24.235 Core cancer genes are important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}24.235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.185$ and we define core cancer genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:40:26.185 --> 00:40:27.865 actually from a clinical panel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:27.870 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.192$ the MSKCC impact panel that's clinically

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:30.192 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.620$ used to define actual permutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:32.620 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.052$ So these hypothesized the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:35.052 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.092$ genes that interact in a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:40:38.100 --> 00:40:39.785 Putting putting interaction network or

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}40{:}39.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}42.392$ the string network that there's a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:42.392 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.837$ different ways to measure interactions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:43.840 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.422$ So genes that interact with the core

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:40:45.422 --> 00:40:46.977 genes will be somewhat important and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:46.977 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.909$ genes that interact with this one step

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:48.955 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.419$ remove genes will also be important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:50.419 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.996$ to some extent but probably less.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:51.996 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.082$ And then those which are three four

 $00{:}40{:}54.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}56.136$ steps removed are even less important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:56.140 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.079$ So we wanted to test this hypothesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:40:58.080 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.168$ but as you get closer to the close genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:00.168 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.476$ then you would have increasing connectivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.892$ That's one mathematical way to measure

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:04.892 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.760$ the importance of gene as you get closer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:07.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.513$ So one step.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}08.513 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}10.019$ Both from from core cancer genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:10.019 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.245$ then it's going to be more important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:12.245 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.885$ than survivability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:12.890 --> 00:41:14.996 We can check this in genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}14.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}17.030$ wide CRISPR and ASARONE screens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}17.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}18.465$ Also predicted genes which are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:18.465 --> 00:41:19.326 one step removed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.451$ 2 steps removed are more important than

00:41:21.451 --> 00:41:23.306 those which are three steps removed

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}23.306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}25.385$ in terms of having large number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:25.445 --> 00:41:27.161 somatic mutations in in Kansas and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:27.161 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.420$ that they will be under a stronger

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:29.420 --> 00:41:31.270 negative selection in the germline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925 00:41:31.270 --> 00:41:31.590 right, NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:31.590 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.870$ because they are important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.186$ And in many of these genes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:34.186 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.562$ are important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:34.570 --> 00:41:36.579 cancer are important in many other things

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:36.579 \longrightarrow 00:41:38.547$ and that's exactly defined in this paper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:38.550 --> 00:41:40.166 And this just shows you the numbers though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:40.170 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.658$ So one or two step remove genes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:41:42.658 --> 00:41:44.869 our genome is about 10,000 genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:44.870 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.910$ So actually probably the cancer 11

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}46.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}49.090$ genes space is much much bigger,

00:41:49.090 --> 00:41:50.978 just don't know about a lot of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:50.978 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.725$ and of course they're importance is

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:52.725 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.810$ not as important as a P53 mutation but

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:41:55.810 \longrightarrow 00:41:57.890$ nevertheless they contributes very

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}41{:}57.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}01.189$ likely contribute to the biological disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:01.190 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.667$ So where are you going with this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:02.670 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.015$ So what you actually want to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:05.015 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.710$ really is so address cancer as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:07.710 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.128$ cellular transformation as as a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:10.211 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.028$ defect in a in a in a complex system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:13.030 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.598$ So complex systems fail through unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:15.598 \longrightarrow 00:42:18.250$ combinations of individual non lethal events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:18.250 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.587$ I mean just think about this if

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}42{:}19.587 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.064$ you would run the statistics on

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:42:21.064 --> 00:42:22.204 what's causing plane crashes,

 $00:42:22.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.254$ even find anything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00{:}42{:}23.254 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}24.994$ Because even though flying through

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:24.994 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.309$ a storm is a risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:42:26.310 --> 00:42:27.984 but many many planes fly through

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:42:27.984 --> 00:42:29.782 storms have any problem, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:29.782 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.146$ pilot sleeping or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:42:31.150 --> 00:42:31.800 Been trained,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:31.800 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.075$ it's a lot of happens that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:34.075 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.238$ despite of this sort of human errors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:36.240 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.071$ the plane survives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:42:37.071 --> 00:42:38.733 you don't even know about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

00:42:38.740 --> 00:42:40.516 So it's really a unique combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:40.516 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.700$ that brings down points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.359$ And so that's the thing that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:43.359 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.177$ actually try to see whether we could.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7001029925

 $00:42:45.180 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.836$ So some of these unique combination

 $00:42:46.836 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.940$ of Germany and some

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:47.994 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.961$ of the events into a score and

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:49.961 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.010$ they ultimately visualize it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:51.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.953$ They did a little bit of a sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

00:42:53.960 --> 00:42:55.760 preliminary kind of effort in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

00:42:55.760 --> 00:42:57.851 few years ago with wavey she trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:42:57.851 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.790$ to kind of map all the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}42{:}59.853 \to 00{:}43{:}01.949$ abnormalities that particular cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

00:43:01.950 --> 00:43:04.118 As and visualize it in a standardized way

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}04.118 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}06.763$ in in these papers we try to resurrect

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:43:06.763 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.963$ this really delighted that Susan Coleman

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00:43:08.963 \longrightarrow 00:43:10.898$ actually accepted this challenge for

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}10.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}13.158$ their hecaton in March next year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}13.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.189$ So we're going to lead A-Team to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.759412185238095

 $00{:}43{:}16.189 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18.990$ try to develop this Kansas score. Umm.

 $00:43:21.920 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.941$ So the new classes of drugs, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:23.941 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.908$ So that's the last piece that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:25.908 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.807$ actually going to talk to you a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}43{:}27.807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}29.588$ bit because I'm so excited about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:29.590 --> 00:43:30.970 So metabolically, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:30.970 --> 00:43:34.190 rewiring is a major hallmark of cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:34.190 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.588$ yes. Yeah, we don't have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:35.588 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.520$ drugs that exploit it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:36.520 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.104$ So remember, a lot of chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:38.104 --> 00:43:39.472 drugs interfere with DNA synthesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:39.472 --> 00:43:41.278 because you need to double your DNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:41.280 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.968$ but you need to also double your lipids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:42.970 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.860$ You also need to double your proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:44.860 --> 00:43:47.578 So why don't we have drugs in that space?

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.205$ So we started off with the computational

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:50.205 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.969$ biology project to look for.

00:43:51.970 --> 00:43:54.790 Most of isoenzyme diversity in cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:43:54.790 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.210$ compared to corresponding normal tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:43:57.210 --> 00:44:00.333 So isoenzymes kind of more or less sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:00.333 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.672$ could catalyze the same chemical reaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:02.672 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.059$ But they are different genes and sometimes

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:05.059 \longrightarrow 00:44:07.426$ they are located in different compartments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.290$ So what you want to look at is is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:09.346 \longrightarrow 00:44:11.736$ particular isoenzyme becomes cancer dominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:11.740 \longrightarrow 00:44:14.064$ So this isoenzyme diversity gets lost because

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:14.064 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.660$ out of the three or four isoforms that

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:44:16.660 --> 00:44:19.329 produce the same sort of chemical reaction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.341$ one becomes dominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}44{:}20.341 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}22.026$ That may be actually important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667 00:44:22.030 --> 00:44:22.274 Analogy. NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:44:22.274 --> 00:44:24.470 So if you're looking for is this sort of

00:44:24.525 --> 00:44:26.712 change that the normal cell has kind of fun,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:26.720 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.388$ actually both sides of enzyme one

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:28.388 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.310$ and two and the cancer actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:30.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.175$ one of these becomes dominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:32.180 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.958$ So we asked how many are these

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:33.958 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.200$ in the human genome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:35.200 \longrightarrow 00:44:37.624$ So we again went to the TTC share

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:37.624 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.145$ data and called all the human enzymes

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:40.145 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.421$ which have less than 5 isoforms

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:42.421 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.309$ to find to look for a pattern that

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:45.309 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.666$ showed this cancer dominance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:44:46.666 --> 00:44:47.994 Once we find this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}44{:}48.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}50.052$ then we looked whether we can see the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:50.052 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.459$ in the CLA the cancer cell line encyclopedia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:44:52.460 \longrightarrow 00:44:53.908$ Just to make sure that this is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:44:53.908 --> 00:44:54.930 happening at a cellular level,

 $00:44:54.930 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.030$ not at the tissue level because the

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}44{:}57.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}00.026$ TCG's tissue level and it also then

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:00.026 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.098$ once we confirm those that they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:02.098 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.032$ also dominant in a cancer cell line

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:04.032 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.755$ that enabled us to really check

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:05.755 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.625$ whether this particular isoform is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:07.630 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.438$ is survival critical in the depth

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:10.438 --> 00:45:13.050 map data which is CRISPR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:13.050 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.580$ You have no card database.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:14.580 --> 00:45:16.695 And then the final hit you wanted to confirm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:16.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.176$ so this is what we found.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:18.180 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.085$ So there are about 136 cancer breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:22.085 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.960$ dominant isoenzymes that we find in the CG.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:45:27.102$ About 81 of these are also cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:27.102 --> 00:45:29.139 dominant in breast cancer cell lines,

 $00:45:29.140 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.568$ but 53 are important for survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:32.568 --> 00:45:34.053 When you knock it out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:34.060 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.610$ you can sell lines, survival improves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:36.610 --> 00:45:38.270 And about 44 of these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:38.270 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.184$ the locking out the the particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:40.184 --> 00:45:42.080 isoform is more important than knocking

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:42.080 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.336$ out the other one and then you actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}45{:}44.389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}45.985$ meet all these three criteria then

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

00:45:45.985 --> 00:45:48.751 you end up with about 17 potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:48.751 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.586$ targetable isoenzymes in breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}45{:}51.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53.662$ But we did this for a whole bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:53.662 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.719$ of cancer types and the the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00{:}45{:}55.719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57.713$ shared sort of cancel them in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:57.713 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.958$ nicer form turned out to be a C1

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:45:59.958 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.550$ or acetyl coenzyme carboxylase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:46:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:46:05.446$ And this little uncertainty,

 $00:46:05.446 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.795$ the things the right side for

NOTE Confidence: 0.903624126666667

 $00:46:08.795 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.370$ you shows the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:10.370 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.274$ the actual pattern expression pattern, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:12.274 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.859$ So the red one is a potential target and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:46:14.859 --> 00:46:17.001 first column or the first sort of set by

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:17.060 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.499$ the line start is the normal tissue and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:19.499 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.560$ second column is the corresponding cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:21.560 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.995$ So you see that the blue goes

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:46:22.995 --> 00:46:24.309 down because it's lost in cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:24.310 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.630$ but then the red stays up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}25.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}27.390$ So we actually looked at why this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}27.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}29.908$ happening. It's maturation driven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:29.910 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.248$ And but what is a C?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:31.250 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.229$ So C1 and C2 are actually the first literally

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:34.229 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.788$ the enzymes in fatty acid synthesis.

 $00:46:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.795$ They pre they are immediately

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:38.795 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.530$ before fast or fatty acid synthase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:46:41.530 --> 00:46:43.430 They convert acetyl coenzyme to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:43.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.774$ Malaya coenzyme and this C1 is

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:46:45.774 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.270$ actually in the cytoplasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}47.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}49.070$ C2 is the mitochondrial membrane

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}49.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}50.870$ also regulates fatty acid breakdown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:46:50.870 --> 00:46:52.550 So if you block ACC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}52.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56.084$ you block fatty acid synthesis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:46:56.084 --> 00:46:58.440 accelerate fatty acid burning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}46{:}58.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00.421$ So it turns out that actually this

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:00.421 --> 00:47:02.013 wasn't real skin of pharmaceutical

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:02.013 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.077$ companies for a long time because

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:04.077 --> 00:47:05.817 because as a target for Nash,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}05.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}09.438$ which is non Alcoholics started

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}09.438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}11.804$ hepatitis or fatty liver and it's also

 $00:47:11.804 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.979$ actually one of the major targets for

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}13.979 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}16.160$ herbicides that we use in agriculture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:16.160 --> 00:47:18.200 Turns out that Pfizer actually had a drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:18.200 --> 00:47:19.968 that worked amazingly well in people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}19.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}22.322$ They put it through several clinical trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:22.322 --> 00:47:24.598 and they established that it actually works,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:24.600 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.511$ it blocks the novel fatty acid synthesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:26.511 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.729$ as you see on that curve that ports.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:28.730 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.172$ The percent of the noble lipogenesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:31.172 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.998$ in people, it was also safe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:32.998 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.006$ except for one thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:34.010 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.020$ It caused a little bit of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}36.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}37.360$ hypertrigly ceridemia and made and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}37.416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}39.288$ caused a drop in platelet counts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.262$ You know, we play the games on 400,000,

 $00:47:41.262 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.378$ so the politicians,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:42.378 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.402$ not the 200,200 thousand is actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:44.402 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.464$ it's a 50% drop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:45.464 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.576$ But we don't even count this as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:47.576 --> 00:47:48.869 toxicity in chemotherapy because

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:48.869 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.484$ it's a very safe level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:50.490 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.894$ Nevertheless,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:50.894 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.914$ Pfizer felt that that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}52.914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}54.530$ warrants discontinuing the drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:47:54.530 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.834$ So we reached out to them and we actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}47{:}56.834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}58.737$ got the right to test this drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626 00:47:58.740 --> 00:47:59.067 In. NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:47:59.067 --> 00:48:00.702 In preclinical models and hope

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}00.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}03.539$ to bring it back to the clinic if

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:03.539 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.637$ these little promising,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:04.640 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.399$ but did the preclinical model look promising?

 $00:48:08.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.626$ So I don't really invitro data

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:10.626 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.739$ because the invitro,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:11.740 --> 00:48:14.414 you know metabolism is highly sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:14.420 --> 00:48:15.704 Dependent on how much fatty acid

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:15.704 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.399$ and one that you have in the media.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:17.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.938$ So this is the in vivo data in mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:19.940 \longrightarrow 00:48:22.060$ So this is PBX to macros that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:22.060 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.802$ contracted out for Jackson lab and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}23.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.530$ you see that this ACC inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:25.586 \longrightarrow 00:48:27.841$ actually inhibits the growth although

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}27.841 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}29.194$ doesn't strike completely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}29.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}31.960$ The MDA MB 468 Genographic did here

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00{:}48{:}31.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}34.170$ at Yale shows the same thing but the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:34.170 --> 00:48:35.615 most striking thing was synergy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:35.620 --> 00:48:38.244 the doxorubicin and Vina Robin and

 $00:48:38.244 \longrightarrow 00:48:40.464$ also with the collaborator is

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:40.464 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.240$ interested endocrine sensitive CVD

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:42.305 \longrightarrow 00:48:44.585$ and resistance to develop the food.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:44.590 --> 00:48:47.830 Strand resistant MCF 7 cell line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:47.830 \longrightarrow 00:48:49.720$ she also showing you know xenograft

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:49.720 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.462$ model that there are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:51.462 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.728$ inhibited the growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

00:48:52.730 --> 00:48:54.488 So this looks pretty promising to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:54.488 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.854$ us and we do some additional studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.78179626

 $00:48:56.854 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.486$ to really figure out more about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:48:59.550 \longrightarrow 00:49:01.430$ synergy between chemotherapy agents and

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:01.430 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.510$ we hope to get this back from Pfizer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:04.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.510$ But how does this work?

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:06.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.946$ So the most interesting thing was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:08.946 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.360$ when we looked at what transcriptional

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:11.360 --> 00:49:14.391 changes occur after exposure to this drug,

 $00:49:14.400 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.200$ what really was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:16.200 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.710$ Striking is the that there was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:19.710 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.930$ dramatic increase in genes that are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:21.930 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.865$ Mediating and involved in unfolded

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:24.865 \longrightarrow 00:49:27.213$ protein response and upregulate

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:27.213 --> 00:49:29.160 endoplasmic reticulum stress.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:29.160 --> 00:49:31.550 So our working hypothesis thereby

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:31.550 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.940$ inhibiting the Novo fattiest synthesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00{:}49{:}33.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}36.005$ you actually alter the membrane

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:36.005 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.070$ composition of the endoplasmic reticulum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:38.070 --> 00:49:41.177 You know proteins have to find a threat

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:41.177 --> 00:49:43.956 through the membrane to get into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00{:}49{:}43.956 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}45.609$ endoplasmic reticulum for secondary

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:45.610 --> 00:49:48.070 modifications and we think that by

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:48.070 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.178$ changing the endoplasmic reticulum lipid

 $00:49:50.178 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.208$ composition we change this process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:52.210 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.569$ Of of protein synthesis and in user

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

00:49:54.569 --> 00:49:56.044 unfolded protein response which

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:56.044 \longrightarrow 00:49:57.676$ eventually overwhelms the cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:57.680 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.660$ So that's the project that we do in the lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:49:59.660 \longrightarrow 00:50:01.598$ Look at the lipid membrane composition

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00{:}50{:}01.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}03.884$ of of the endoplasmic reticulum as as

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:50:03.884 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.156$ far as we can and the lipid alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:50:06.156 \longrightarrow 00:50:08.854$ in the cells exposed to this and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00:50:08.854 \longrightarrow 00:50:10.935$ some some reporter systems to nail

NOTE Confidence: 0.882094448666667

 $00{:}50{:}10.935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}12.957$ this as the mechanism of action.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:50:15.010 --> 00:50:17.929 So I'm going to summarize this really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:17.930 \longrightarrow 00:50:19.685$ So for those of you who are clinical fellows,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:19.690 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.965$ you know every clinical dilemma

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:20.965 \longrightarrow 00:50:22.910$ that we discussed in a tumor boards,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:22.910 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.046$ it's a research question asking for a study,

00:50:25.050 --> 00:50:26.290 some movies disheartened then

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:26.290 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.150$ people come about saying that OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:28.150 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.186$ what should I research?

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:29.186 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.481$ I mean what you should

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:30.481 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.589$ research is all around us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:31.590 \longrightarrow 00:50:33.347$ You just need to open your eye.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:33.350 \longrightarrow 00:50:35.135$ And so recognizing the prognostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}50{:}35.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}36.920$ importance of Pathologic CR residual

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:50:36.976 --> 00:50:38.661 disease has left new treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:38.661 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.346$ strategies and improved survival in

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:40.398 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.174$ triple negative disease and her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:42.174 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.652$ positive disease and I showed you how so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}50{:}44.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}46.267$ Molecular offices of these issues

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}50{:}46.267 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}47.947$ also gives some idea that how

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:47.947 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.160$ we could make it even better by

 $00:50:50.160 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.860$ studying the difference between

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:51.860 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.560$ the nonresponders and responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:53.560 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.020$ So immunotherapy established its

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:50:57.210$ value in breast cancer and Robinson

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:50:57.273 --> 00:50:59.463 is now approved as as neoadjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:50:59.463 \longrightarrow 00:51:00.923$ therapy together with chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:00.986 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.596$ for all three primary disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}02.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}04.586$ It's also approved as first line

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}04.586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}06.900$ therapy for PD like 1 positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:06.900 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.277$ metastatic breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:08.280 \longrightarrow 00:51:10.450$ And I think we have a reasonably

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:10.450 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.636$ decent explanation why you need the PD

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:12.636 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.430$ ligand one in the metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:14.430 \longrightarrow 00:51:16.425$ So we are about to launch studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:16.425 \longrightarrow 00:51:17.919$ to demonstrate that similar benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:17.919 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.949$ could be seen in a subset of

00:51:19.949 --> 00:51:21.110 molecular defined subset,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:21.110 \longrightarrow 00:51:23.826$ small subset of ER positive breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:23.830 \longrightarrow 00:51:25.672$ And we also have some promising

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:51:25.672 --> 00:51:27.548 markers that could actually make this

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:27.548 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.324$ whole strategy safer and more cost

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:29.324 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.913$ effective by tailoring the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:30.913 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.785$ to those who really needed it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:32.790 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.716$ But these you need validations and

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:51:34.716 --> 00:51:37.121 I think the most exciting sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:37.121 \longrightarrow 00:51:39.233$ things on the horizon clinically is

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:39.233 \longrightarrow 00:51:41.277$ CDN surveillance and interventional

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:41.277 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.982$ homophone macular relapse that might

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}51{:}43.982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}46.108$ ultimately reduce further metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:46.108 \longrightarrow 00:51:48.184$ recurrences and this understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:48.184 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.779$ the molecular phylogeny of metastatic

00:51:50.779 --> 00:51:53.014 disease really prompted this idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:53.014 \longrightarrow 00:51:54.355$ that because the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:54.360 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.342$ Synchronous mats are very similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:51:57.342 --> 00:51:59.876 the primary tumors might be they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:51:59.876 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.809$ responding to the same way and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:01.809 \dashrightarrow 00:52:03.723$ micro mats that remain after eradicating

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:03.723 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.976$ those are also similar to the to them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}05.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}08.010$ So that the microbes that remain after

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:52:08.010 --> 00:52:09.804 the primary tumor is being resected

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:09.804 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.834$ that may be approaching the same these

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}11.888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}13.784$ disease with the same strategy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:13.784 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.926$ we very successfully used in stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:15.926 \longrightarrow 00:52:18.554$ three disease might actually cure a

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:18.554 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.036$ small subset maybe 10% maybe 30% of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:22.036 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.790$ the Novo metastatic stage four disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714 00:52:24.790 --> 00:52:25.243 And.

00:52:25.243 --> 00:52:27.508 There's a really deep portfolio

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:27.508 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.910$ of new classes of drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:29.910 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.510$ And that's my last slide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:31.510 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.862$ I apologize ahead of time for people who

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:33.862 \dashrightarrow 00:52:35.606$ actually didn't make it to the slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

00:52:35.610 --> 00:52:37.146 but I ran out of space.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:37.150 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.536$ But these are the various people

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}38.536 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}40.224$ who worked in my lab and contributed

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:40.224 \longrightarrow 00:52:41.876$ the work that I showed you and

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00{:}52{:}41.929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}43.417$ students and other collaborators

NOTE Confidence: 0.907215034285714

 $00:52:43.417 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.905$ and collaborators within Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8774344 00:52:50.630 --> 00:52:50.980 So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876696786363636

 $00:53:02.110 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.714$ Yeah, so. If you have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.876696786363636

 $00:53:04.714 \longrightarrow 00:53:06.800$ questions then feel free to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876696786363636

 $00:53:06.800 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.170$ Ask yes, silly. I have.

 $00:53:13.600 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.860$ Saying that, we were going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

00:53:17.980 --> 00:53:21.016 And you mentioned, right and when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

 $00:53:21.016 \longrightarrow 00:53:23.890$ talked about the model especially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

00:53:23.890 --> 00:53:27.672 Negative. I want to know if you will

NOTE Confidence: 0.697274038

 $00:53:27.672 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.478$ consider rate in that model and it's so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:33.020 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.414$ So actually Kim and and some other

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:53:35.414 --> 00:53:37.575 previous lab members did they really

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:37.575 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.705$ nice analysis trying to see whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}39.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}42.084$ there is a immune difference between

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:42.084 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.625$ triple negative breast cancer by race.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:44.625 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.500$ The hypothesis was that that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}47.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}50.517$ Stress and this sort of this weathering

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:50.517 \longrightarrow 00:53:52.680$ that that unfortunately many people

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}53{:}52.680 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}53{:}55.062$ with African American or Hispanic race

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:53:55.062 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.492$ have to suffer would have an impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:53:57.492 --> 00:53:59.173 on your immune immune system, right.

 $00:53:59.173 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.037$ So the truth is that if there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:01.037 --> 00:54:02.803 such a thing, it's really subtle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:02.803 --> 00:54:04.909 We find some some really intriguing

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:04.909 --> 00:54:06.788 things around macrophages things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:06.790 --> 00:54:08.956 but whether this really holds up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:08.960 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.140$ I'm not quite sure yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:10.140 \longrightarrow 00:54:11.771$ So I can send you the slides

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:11.771 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.230$ and we have some things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:13.230 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.358$ some references there and we we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}54{:}15.358 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}17.699$ some things but I'm not sure that it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}54{:}17.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}18.495$ It's really detectable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:18.495 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.350$ There are other things that we haven't

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}54{:}20.397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}21.972$ looked at but we plan to do which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:21.972 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.650$ like inflammatory markers in the blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:23.650 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.560$ But that's also kind of

 $00:54:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:54:26.706$ biased by comorbidities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00{:}54{:}26.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}28.510$ So if you have a lot of other diseases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:28.510 --> 00:54:30.390 then it's just going to be high anyway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.148$ And in terms of the models,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667 00:54:32.150 --> 00:54:32.892 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:32.892 --> 00:54:35.118 so Pathologic CI is equally good

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:35.118 \longrightarrow 00:54:37.544$ in terms of metastatic recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:37.544 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.146$ regardless of race.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667 00:54:39.150 --> 00:54:39.766 In fact, NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:39.766 --> 00:54:41.614 I personally have a really serious

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:41.614 --> 00:54:43.397 doubt that there is any major

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

00:54:43.397 --> 00:54:44.912 genetic sort of explanation

NOTE Confidence: 0.800806662666667

 $00:54:44.912 \longrightarrow 00:54:47.640$ behind disparities and outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:54:50.390 \longrightarrow 00:54:52.694$ So models that include in survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

00:54:52.694 --> 00:54:54.325 rates are problematic, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:54:54.325 \longrightarrow 00:54:56.700$ because it perpetuated a risk

 $00:54:56.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.925$ factor that that maybe not true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

00:54:58.925 --> 00:54:59.985 So if your social,

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:54:59.990 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.290$ social circumstances change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:55:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.690$ Is there a question from online?

NOTE Confidence: 0.793267928888889

 $00:55:05.690 \longrightarrow 00:55:06.760$ I should call you back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:11.020 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.708$ So there's this question online that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:13.710 --> 00:55:16.924 Umm. Somebody's relevant regretting

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}16.924 \to 00{:}55{:}18.472$ their choice that they're not breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}18.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}19.588$ on cologist and they agree with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:19.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.738$ That's the do patients with inflammatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:21.738 \longrightarrow 00:55:24.015$ breast cancer have higher response rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:24.015 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.361$ to checkpoint inhibition and the agent

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}26.361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}28.289$ setting regardless to applying results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:28.290 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.350$ Yeah, that's a good one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:29.350 --> 00:55:30.434 So you know inflammatory

 $00:55:30.434 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.789$ breast cancer is a misnomer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:31.790 \longrightarrow 00:55:33.698$ It's really, it's a clinical description

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:33.698 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.649$ that people came up and whatever

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:35.649 --> 00:55:37.486 maybe the 19th century and because

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:37.486 --> 00:55:38.976 the breast looks like inflamed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:38.980 --> 00:55:42.164 it's red and hot and and swollen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:42.170 --> 00:55:44.172 it looks like a skin infection and

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:44.172 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.950$ very often primary care physicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:45.950 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.030$ Give it antibiotics and it just gets worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:48.030 --> 00:55:49.494 So inflammatory breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}49.494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}51.324$ actually is not particularly rich.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:55:51.330 --> 00:55:54.378 In fact it's pretty poor in immune cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667 00:55:54.380 --> 00:55:55.361 But we did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}55{:}55.361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}56.996$ Actually the first whole genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:56.996 \longrightarrow 00:55:59.268$ sequencing of inflammatory breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:55:59.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:01.170$ hoping to find something and

 $00:56:01.170 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.290$ disappointed we didn't find

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.940$ anything that actually defined this

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}56{:}05.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}08.330$ autonomically at the DNA sequence space,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:08.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.986$ but we find some interesting things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:56:09.990 --> 00:56:12.534 Again, TGF beta macrophage

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:12.534 \longrightarrow 00:56:15.718$ related markers show up there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

00:56:15.720 --> 00:56:17.202 As potentially contributing

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:17.202 \longrightarrow 00:56:19.178$ to the poor outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667 00:56:19.180 --> 00:56:19.760 But yeah, NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:19.760 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.920$ so inflammatory breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:20.920 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.810$ is all the four subtypes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00:56:22.810 \longrightarrow 00:56:24.560$ as far as we can tell today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}56{:}24.560 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}56{:}26.485$ there is really no proton

NOTE Confidence: 0.701762791666667

 $00{:}56{:}26.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}27.640$ nomical genomic alteration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:31.010 \longrightarrow 00:56:32.765$ So what type of preventive

 $00:56:32.765 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.520$ interventions do you foresee for

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:34.584 \longrightarrow 00:56:36.489$ patients with high cancer score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:36.490 \longrightarrow 00:56:40.134$ So if you already have validated and

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

00:56:40.134 --> 00:56:42.310 really effective prevention drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:42.310 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.088$ right, the moxen aromatase inhibitors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

00:56:45.088 --> 00:56:48.260 food and other drugs, the I type drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:48.260 \longrightarrow 00:56:50.932$ but they have side effects and and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:50.932 \longrightarrow 00:56:53.404$ think one way to use these cancer score

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

00:56:53.481 --> 00:56:55.897 would be to if you're high risk that

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

00:56:55.897 --> 00:56:57.970 you are close to this tipping point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00{:}56{:}57.970 --> 00{:}56{:}59.050$ I should say you that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:59.050 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.770$ don't have that score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:56:59.770 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.598$ It's working on it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:00.598 \longrightarrow 00:57:02.129$ But it's the idea that if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:02.129 \longrightarrow 00:57:03.319$ can tell that these biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00{:}57{:}03.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05.078$ tissue biopsy shows that you are

 $00:57:05.078 \longrightarrow 00:57:06.812$ close to this tipping point and

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:06.812 \longrightarrow 00:57:08.312$ maybe you are willing to put

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:08.312 \longrightarrow 00:57:09.739$ up with some additional.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667 00:57:09.740 --> 00:57:10.280 Umm. NOTE Confidence: 0.839109910666667

 $00:57:10.280 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.980$ Discomfort from a prevention drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:17.620 --> 00:57:20.024 All right. Let's go ahead, Andrew.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:20.024 \longrightarrow 00:57:22.688$ A lot of times with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:22.688 --> 00:57:24.969 people who have even PCR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:24.970 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.268$ they can relapse in the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:57:29.130$ And people sort of say that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:29.130 \longrightarrow 00:57:30.950$ due the blood brain barrier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:30.950 \longrightarrow 00:57:33.915$ but are there molecular alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}33.915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}37.750$ that predict frame labs or can you?

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:37.750 --> 00:57:39.436 No, I can't. But you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:39.440 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.483$ I mean, that's the reason why I

 $00:57:40.483 \longrightarrow 00:57:41.698$ don't go to many of the meetings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:57:43.270$ because there are so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:43.270 \longrightarrow 00:57:44.526$ interesting things to study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:44.530 --> 00:57:47.306 I just enjoy them more but yeah so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:47.310 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.443$ so people tried that but they didn't find it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:49.450 --> 00:57:51.106 But what you bring up is illegal one right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:51.110 \longrightarrow 00:57:53.049$ So the pathologic CR is really good

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:57:53.049 --> 00:57:55.183 but it's not a perfect predictor and

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}55.183 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}57.476$ for for there are many reasons why

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}57{:}57.476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}59.654$ there should be a disconnect with

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:57:59.654 \longrightarrow 00:58:01.384$ Pathologic CR improvement in survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:01.384 --> 00:58:03.286 So you can't cure people twice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}03.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}04.730$ So if you enroll a lot of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:04.730 \longrightarrow 00:58:06.070$ that are on stage one breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:06.070 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.468$ cancer and the surgeon cure them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:07.470 --> 00:58:09.000 it doesn't really matter whether

 $00.58:09.000 \longrightarrow 00.58:10.530$ they are chemosensitive or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}10.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}12.778$ But in terms of recurrences look to Silver

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:12.778 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.130$ Point out something that many oncologists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:15.130 --> 00:58:16.258 Even breast oncologists may

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:16.258 --> 00:58:17.668 not be totally familiar with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:17.670 \longrightarrow 00:58:19.896$ So there are a number of studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:19.896 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.984$ that show now that the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:21.984 --> 00:58:24.102 sight of recurrence of the PCR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:24.110 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.196$ half of the time it's the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:26.200 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.916$ When you have no PCR residual disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:58:31.013$ then the brain is the first site

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:31.013 --> 00:58:32.978 in about 10% and it goes along

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:32.978 --> 00:58:34.580 with this idea that the brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00{:}58{:}34.638 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}36.228$ is somehow a protected site.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:36.230 \longrightarrow 00:58:38.407$ And the question is then how they

 $00:58:38.407 \longrightarrow 00:58:40.654$ actually can break this protection and

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:40.654 \longrightarrow 00:58:42.744$ really help avoid brain recurrences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:42.750 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.580$ There are some some really good

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:44.580 \longrightarrow 00:58:46.656$ initiatives in the in the her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:46.656 \longrightarrow 00:58:48.511$ positive space and some of the ADC

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:48.568 --> 00:58:50.810 may get in there triple 90 disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:58:50.810 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.010$ but what actually would define

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:53.010 --> 00:58:55.391 high risk for brain recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:55.391 --> 00:58:57.766 in terms of molecular markers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

00:58:57.770 --> 00:59:00.426 But they could find that in a reproducible

NOTE Confidence: 0.764090394

 $00:59:00.426 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.847$ and accepted sort of widely accepted way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172

 $00:59:06.360 \longrightarrow 00:59:09.036$ Thank you. Thank you for all

NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172

 $00:59:09.036 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.618$ of you who have joined both

NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172

 $00{:}59{:}11.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}12.956$ in person and virtually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172

 $00:59:12.956 \longrightarrow 00:59:15.402$ This concludes our breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9430172

 $00{:}59{:}15.402 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}16.906$ awareness month grand rounds.

 $00{:}59{:}16.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}17.590$ Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53831303

00:59:38.790 --> 00:59:41.000 Yeah.