WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "01:06:12.080" NOTE Confidence: 0.95674324

 $00:00:00.160 \longrightarrow 00:00:02.159$ Hello. My name is, Michael

NOTE Confidence: 0.95674324

 $00{:}00{:}02.159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}03.840$ Giacchini. I'm an associate professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.95674324

 $00{:}00{:}03.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}05.440$ of medicine at the Yale

NOTE Confidence: 0.95674324

 $00:00:05.440 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.339$ School of Medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9472618

00:00:06.799 --> 00:00:08.080 I'm a medical oncologist in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9472618

 $00:00:08.080 \longrightarrow 00:00:09.380$ the Yale Cancer Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9622189

 $00:00:09.760 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.960$ I'm co director of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9622189

 $00{:}00{:}10.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}12.960$ colorectal cancer program and co

NOTE Confidence: 0.9622189

 $00:00:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.099$ director of the GI

NOTE Confidence: 0.9744723

00:00:14.465 --> 00:00:15.905 clinical research team here at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9744723

 $00:00:15.905 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.405$ Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9617964

 $00{:}00{:}17.905 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}18.945$ I'm here with my colleague,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9617964

 $00:00:18.945 \longrightarrow 00:00:19.765$ doctor Pantel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9987041

00:00:20.065 --> 00:00:21.345 one of our colorectal surgeons.

00:00:21.345 --> 00:00:22.805 I'll let him introduce himself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550895

00:00:23.825 --> 00:00:25.185 Thank you, Mike. My name

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550895

00:00:25.185 --> 00:00:26.704 is Hadden Pantel. I'm a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550895

00:00:26.704 --> 00:00:28.625 colorectal surgeon also here at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550895

 $00:00:28.625 \longrightarrow 00:00:29.125$ Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98650074

 $00:00:29.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.080$ And, I just wanna thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.98650074

 $00:00:31.080 \longrightarrow 00:00:32.520$ everyone for taking time this

NOTE Confidence: 0.98650074

 $00:00:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.320$ evening to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95295626

 $00{:}00{:}33.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.879$ hopefully learn some helpful things

NOTE Confidence: 0.95295626

00:00:35.879 --> 00:00:37.640 about, colon cancer and rectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.95295626

 $00:00:37.640 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.140$ cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903629

 $00:00:39.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.760$ So we'll be doing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903629

 $00:00:40.760 \longrightarrow 00:00:41.260$ Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98922235

 $00:00:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.399$ CME for colorectal cancer for

NOTE Confidence: 0.98922235

00:00:43.399 --> 00:00:44.920 twenty twenty four, twenty twenty

NOTE Confidence: 0.98922235 00:00:44.920 --> 00:00:45.420 five.

 $00:00:46.415 \longrightarrow 00:00:47.375$ Originally, this is gonna be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752822

00:00:47.375 --> 00:00:48.895 a three part session with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752822

00:00:48.895 --> 00:00:50.735 myself, doctor Jacqueline Gaddy, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752822

00:00:50.735 --> 00:00:51.775 doctor Pantel, but this will

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752822

 $00:00:51.775 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.055$ be just doctor just the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752822

 $00:00:53.055 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.795$ two of us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93780893

00:00:54.175 --> 00:00:56.175 doctor Pantel and myself, this

NOTE Confidence: 0.93780893

 $00:00:56.175 \longrightarrow 00:00:56.675$ evening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226224

00:00:57.135 --> 00:00:57.935 We're gonna start with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9490943

00:00:59.695 --> 00:01:00.435 my presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8831415

00:01:01.290 --> 00:01:02.969 Doctor Pantel will moderate some

NOTE Confidence: 0.8831415

 $00:01:02.969 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.469$ questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98745507

 $00:01:03.850 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.290$ and then, the role will

NOTE Confidence: 0.98745507

 $00:01:05.290 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.650$ reverse. He'll present, and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.98745507

 $00:01:06.650 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.930$ I'll moderate some questions for

 $00:01:07.930 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.430$ him.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96690816

 $00:01:09.450 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.050$ We're we'll have, no more

NOTE Confidence: 0.96690816

 $00:01:11.050 \longrightarrow 00:01:12.490$ than a max of, an

NOTE Confidence: 0.96690816

00:01:12.490 --> 00:01:13.310 hour presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9954664

 $00:01:13.610 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.270$ which will

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

00:01:14.615 --> 00:01:15.895 therefore give plenty of time

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

 $00{:}01{:}15.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}17.415$ for questions. This session will

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

00:01:17.415 --> 00:01:18.615 certainly not go any longer

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

 $00:01:18.615 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.655$ than one and a half

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

00:01:19.655 --> 00:01:21.494 hours. We'll we'll, frankly, probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

00:01:21.494 --> 00:01:22.854 be more along the hour

NOTE Confidence: 0.96422625

 $00:01:22.854 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.354$ mark.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97283745

 $00:01:23.975 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.334$ Please put your questions into

NOTE Confidence: 0.97283745

 $00:01:25.334 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.255$ the chat. Some questions may

NOTE Confidence: 0.97283745

 $00:01:27.255 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.530$ be answered directly by, response

NOTE Confidence: 0.97283745

 $00{:}01{:}29.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}30.330$ in the chat, but we'll

 $00:01:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.970$ try and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891103

 $00:01:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.730$ field the questions, to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891103

 $00:01:32.730 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.230$ presenter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:34.010 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.290$ If the question seems pertinent

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:35.290 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.430$ at the time of presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

00:01:36.490 --> 00:01:37.690 you may see doctor Pantel

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:37.690 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.050$ and myself interrupt each other

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:39.050 \longrightarrow 00:01:40.490$ to answer the relevant question

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:40.490 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.895$ at that time. Otherwise, we'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:41.895 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.935$ probably save some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:42.935 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.815$ questions for the end of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734688

 $00:01:43.815 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.395$ the presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9757858 00:01:45.575 --> 00:01:46.075 So NOTE Confidence: 0.99750495

00:01:46.535 --> 00:01:47.575 thank you so much. Let

NOTE Confidence: 0.99750495

00:01:47.575 --> 00:01:48.935 me get my presentation up

 $00:01:48.935 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.675$ right here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9887797

00:01:53.910 --> 00:01:55.210 Alright. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97566587

00:01:56.230 --> 00:01:58.390 again, this is, our twenty

NOTE Confidence: 0.97566587

 $00:01:58.390 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.750$ twenty four, twenty twenty five

NOTE Confidence: 0.97566587

 $00:01:59.750 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.670$ ELCME for colorectal cancer, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.97566587

 $00:02:01.670 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.550$ thank you so much for

NOTE Confidence: 0.97566587

 $00:02:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.690$ joining us this evening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95767105

 $00:02:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.850$ Here are my disclosures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9271646

 $00:02:07.515 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.635$ and here's an outline for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9271646

 $00{:}02{:}08.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}09.595$ what I'm gonna talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9271646

 $00{:}02{:}09.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}10.875$ today. So We're still we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.9271646

 $00:02:10.875 \dashrightarrow 00:02:12.235$ still really gonna Can you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9271646

 $00:02:12.235 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.195$ guys can I think your

NOTE Confidence: 0.9271646

 $00:02:13.195 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.315$ slides are gonna be pulled

NOTE Confidence: 0.927164600:02:14.315 --> 00:02:14.815 up?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9592783

00:02:15.595 --> 00:02:16.715 Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not

 $00:02:16.715 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.775$ sharing, am I?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9944915

 $00:02:19.769 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.829$ Good call there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92043394 00:02:23.609 --> 00:02:24.109 Ed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.937106

 $00:02:35.425 \longrightarrow 00:02:37.044$ That better? That looks perfect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.56752247

00:02:37.745 --> 00:02:39.264 That's actually a spec up

NOTE Confidence: 0.56752247

 $00:02:39.264 \longrightarrow 00:02:39.764$ there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8648866

00:02:40.544 --> 00:02:41.264 Wouldn't be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9493663

 $00:02:41.825 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.745$ wouldn't be, a presentation without

NOTE Confidence: 0.9493663

 $00:02:43.745 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.510$ a few technical difficulties, and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9803132

00:02:46.150 --> 00:02:47.530 I'm not the chief technology

NOTE Confidence: 0.9803132

 $00:02:47.590 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.730$ officer here or anything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.989860500:02:49.030 --> 00:02:49.510 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88817227

 $00:02:50.389 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.989$ so this is, the twenty

NOTE Confidence: 0.88817227

00:02:51.989 --> 00:02:53.510 twenty four twenty twenty four

NOTE Confidence: 0.88817227

00:02:53.510 --> 00:02:55.030 twenty twenty five Yale CME

 $00:02:55.030 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.129$ for colorectal cancer. My disclosures

NOTE Confidence: 0.88817227

 $00:02:57.349 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.849$ again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99724394

 $00:03:00.125 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.165$ And here's an outline for

NOTE Confidence: 0.99724394

00:03:01.165 --> 00:03:02.364 what I'm gonna discuss this

NOTE Confidence: 0.99724394

 $00:03:02.364 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.864$ evening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98960114

 $00:03:03.565 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.864$ I'm gonna talk about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97839147

 $00{:}03{:}05.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}07.245$ biomarker updates from the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97839147

 $00:03:07.245 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.845$ past year. I'm gonna talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.97839147

 $00:03:08.845 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.345$ about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91507846

00:03:11.004 --> 00:03:12.485 BRAFV six hundred e, obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91507846

00:03:12.485 --> 00:03:14.044 a very important biomarker for

NOTE Confidence: 0.91507846

 $00:03:14.044 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.060$ our disease and some

NOTE Confidence: 0.92273206

00:03:15.540 --> 00:03:18.020 treatment. KRAS and HER2, we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.92273206

 $00:03:18.020 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.139$ got some updates there as

NOTE Confidence: 0.92273206

 $00:03:19.139 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.580$ well, some approvals in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92273206

 $00:03:20.580 \longrightarrow 00:03:21.700$ last year with, you know,

 $00:03:21.700 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.020$ these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99931526

 $00:03:22.660 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.160$ biomarkers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9814875

 $00{:}03{:}23.860 \rightarrow 00{:}03{:}25.700$ We'll talk about mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.9814875

 $00:03:25.700 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.200$ deficient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9527125

 $00:03:26.500 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.739$ microsatellite instability, high disease. It's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9527125

00:03:28.739 --> 00:03:30.514 always a very important topic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9527125

 $00:03:30.514 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.394$ and we have some very

NOTE Confidence: 0.9527125

 $00:03:31.394 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.435$ recent updates that I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.9527125

 $00:03:32.435 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.415$ are important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9619902

 $00{:}03{:}33.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35.334$ We have updates in ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

 $00:03:35.955 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.075$ with the five year follow-up

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

00:03:37.075 --> 00:03:38.515 from the DYNAMIC study. We

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

 $00{:}03{:}38.515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39.955$ have the Altair results that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

 $00:03:39.955 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.834$ tell us a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

 $00:03:40.834 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.795$ about what we can and

00:03:41.795 --> 00:03:43.790 can't do, perhaps with persistently

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

 $00{:}03{:}43.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}45.770$ positive circulating tumor DNA. We

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

00:03:45.770 --> 00:03:46.890 have a recent approval for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9363827

 $00:03:46.890 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.350$ anal cancer with retinphemimab

NOTE Confidence: 0.98246926

 $00:03:49.050 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.350$ that that we'll be discussing

NOTE Confidence: 0.98246926

 $00:03:50.410 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.990$ as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8499315

 $00{:}03{:}51.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}52.970$ Excuse me, not approval. We

NOTE Confidence: 0.8499315

 $00:03:52.970 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.250$ have a recent guideline change

NOTE Confidence: 0.8499315

 $00:03:54.250 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.990$ with retinphemimab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9953017

 $00:03:56.925 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.965$ So how do we apply

NOTE Confidence: 0.9953017

 $00{:}03{:}57.965 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}59.644$ the biomarkers in twenty twenty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9953017

 $00:03:59.644 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.765$ five for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9699589

 $00:04:01.325 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.545$ colorectal cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9427709

 $00:04:03.084 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.605$ These are the biomarkers really

NOTE Confidence: 0.9427709

 $00:04:04.605 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.965$ that as as I see

NOTE Confidence: 0.9427709

 $00:04:05.965 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.845$ them at this point in

 $00:04:06.845 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.224$ time. We have KRAS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94703734

 $00:04:09.790 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.590$ which is a sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94703734

 $00:04:10.590 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.110$ a negative biomarker for most

NOTE Confidence: 0.94703734

 $00:04:12.110 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.150$ patients in the first line

NOTE Confidence: 0.94703734

 $00:04:13.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:14.830$ setting. What we can't use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94703734

 $00:04:14.830 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.950$ we can't use drugs like

NOTE Confidence: 0.94703734

 $00:04:15.950 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.450$ panetumumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.8065982

 $00:04:16.750 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.330$ and stuximab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97089493

 $00:04:17.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.070$ We have KRAS g twelve

NOTE Confidence: 0.97089493

 $00{:}04{:}19.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.450$ c, our one actionable

NOTE Confidence: 0.997968

 $00:04:20.830 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.430$ KRAS mutation that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.997968

 $00:04:22.430 \longrightarrow 00:04:23.325$ target with drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:24.125 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.325$ I'll come back to BRAF

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:25.325 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.685$ in a second. We have

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:26.685 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.205$ some rare fusions. Of course,

00:04:28.205 --> 00:04:29.165 we have TMB high, which

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:29.165 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.845$ is relatively rare, but microsatellite

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:30.845 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.205$ instability high, and we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:32.205 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.965$ HER2 amplified, maybe four percent

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

00:04:33.965 --> 00:04:35.325 of these patients, four percent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95737785

 $00:04:35.325 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.865$ five percent each of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9808517

 $00{:}04{:}38.125 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}39.900$ So, again, we've we've done

NOTE Confidence: 0.9808517

00:04:39.900 --> 00:04:40.779 a good job, I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9808517

00:04:40.779 --> 00:04:42.140 over the last several decades

NOTE Confidence: 0.9808517

 $00:04:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.420$ of carving up this type

NOTE Confidence: 0.9808517

 $00:04:43.420 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.940$ of cancer into different molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.9808517

 $00:04:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.440$ subtypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96786857

 $00:04:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.700$ but there's a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.96786857

 $00:04:46.700 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.580$ work to do in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.96786857

 $00:04:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.100$ maroon color, which has no

NOTE Confidence: 0.96786857

 $00{:}04{:}49.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.779$ biomarker, and the blue color,

 $00:04:50.779 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.520$ we're still,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

 $00:04:52.444 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.805$ not able to really target

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

 $00:04:53.805 \longrightarrow 00:04:54.764$ most of these variants of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

00:04:54.764 --> 00:04:56.205 KRAS. Although, that really may

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

 $00:04:56.205 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.164$ be changing with some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

 $00:04:57.164 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.525$ the new PANRAS inhibitors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

 $00:04:58.525 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.565$ we have in the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9434228

 $00:04:59.565 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.865$ which I could really think

NOTE Confidence: 0.93503505

 $00:05:01.245 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.604$ that could change dramatically how

NOTE Confidence: 0.93503505

 $00:05:02.604 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.904$ we think about this disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90875584

00:05:04.610 --> 00:05:05.910 But what about this subtype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90875584

 $00:05:05.970 \longrightarrow 00:05:07.190$ the BRAF v600E,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550677

 $00:05:07.730 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.430$ nine percent of metastatic colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550677

 $00:05:09.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.930$ cancer, one of the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550677

 $00:05:10.930 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.610$ aggressive molecular subtypes of the

 $00:05:12.610 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.690$ drug of the disease. We've

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550677

 $00:05:14.690 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.850$ used encorafinib, BRAF inhibitor with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9550677

 $00:05:16.850 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.350$ cetuximab

NOTE Confidence: 0.99324685

 $00:05:18.145 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.504$ as second line therapy for

NOTE Confidence: 0.99324685

 $00:05:19.504 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.324$ several years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.974877

 $00:05:21.025 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.985$ since that was published in

NOTE Confidence: 0.974877

 $00{:}05{:}21.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}22.944$ the New England Journal of

NOTE Confidence: 0.974877

 $00:05:22.944 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.444$ Medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.88397723

 $00{:}05{:}23.745 --> 00{:}05{:}25.264$ as second line the rapy. But

NOTE Confidence: 0.88397723

 $00:05:25.264 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.784$ first line key first line

NOTE Confidence: 0.88397723

 $00:05:26.784 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.324$ therapy has largely been chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.638078

00:05:28.705 --> 00:05:29.764 Olflox, Fulfirinox,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9228256

 $00:05:30.625 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.384$ plus appropriate biologic, which would

NOTE Confidence: 0.9228256

 $00:05:32.384 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.444$ generally be bevacizumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245518

 $00:05:34.680 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.279$ What about moving things up

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245518

 $00:05:36.279 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.400$ to an earlier alliance? So

 $00:05:37.400 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.460$ that is what the breakwater

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245518

 $00:05:38.759 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.139$ study tried to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91782486

 $00:05:40.600 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.539$ This was just presented two

NOTE Confidence: 0.91782486

 $00:05:42.599 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.720$ two months ago at our,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91782486

00:05:44.039 --> 00:05:45.740 on our meeting ASCO GI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91782486

 $00:05:45.960 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.145$ And this is this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.91782486

 $00:05:47.145 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.845$ a practice change in study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99111205

 $00:05:49.464 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.145$ So this took patients that

NOTE Confidence: 0.99111205 00:05:51.145 --> 00:05:51.645 were.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9359169

 $00:05:54.105 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.285$ of appropriate age, had measurable

NOTE Confidence: 0.9359169

 $00:05:56.345 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.845$ disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93256706

 $00{:}05{:}57.385 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}58.825$ had and had never received

NOTE Confidence: 0.93256706

 $00{:}05{:}58.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}59.945$ any prior treatment for their

NOTE Confidence: 0.93256706

00:05:59.945 --> 00:06:01.305 metastatic disease, and, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93256706

00:06:01.305 --> 00:06:03.139 had BRAF v six hundred

 $00:06:03.139 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.800$ e mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96196586

 $00:06:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.699$ a class one mutation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.96196586

 $00:06:05.699 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.880$ BRAF. The BRAF protein functioning

NOTE Confidence: 0.96196586

 $00:06:07.940 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.720$ as a monomer to stimulate

NOTE Confidence: 0.96196586

 $00:06:09.860 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.779$ tumor growth as as an,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96196586

 $00:06:12.100 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.600$ oncogene.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84480643

00:06:13.540 --> 00:06:14.040 And,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89573187

 $00:06:16.175 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.295$ randomized patients in a one

NOTE Confidence: 0.89573187

 $00:06:17.295 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.275$ to one to one fashion

NOTE Confidence: 0.89573187

00:06:18.575 --> 00:06:20.195 are encorafenib and cetuximab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95936936

 $00{:}06{:}21.055 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}22.515$ BRAF inhibitor and cetuximab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9994986

 $00:06:23.135 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.035$ BRAF inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.9314545

 $00:06:24.335 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.415$ plus cetuximab plus chemo plus

NOTE Confidence: 0.9314545

 $00{:}06{:}26.415 --> 00{:}06{:}27.475 \ \mathrm{FOLFOX} \ \mathrm{six},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.98902833

00:06:28.575 --> 00:06:30.595 versus standard of care options,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83431596

00:06:31.310 --> 00:06:32.930 FOLFOX, FOLFIREX, etcetera.

00:06:33.550 --> 00:06:34.830 This arm and craftsmanship of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7790138

 $00:06:34.830 \longrightarrow 00:06:35.330$ cetuximab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8384533

 $00:06:36.349 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.569$ you can see that numerically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8384533

 $00:06:37.630 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.509$ smaller and that's because it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8384533

 $00:06:38.509 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.410$ closed earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

 $00:06:39.949 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.069$ and these are really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

 $00:06:41.069 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.430$ the arms that move forward

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

 $00:06:42.430 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.205$ for comparison here. The study

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

00:06:44.205 --> 00:06:45.725 was looking at progression free

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

 $00{:}06{:}45.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}47.325$ survival and overall response rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

00:06:47.325 --> 00:06:48.685 as a dual primary endpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.943248

00:06:48.685 --> 00:06:50.385 by Bicker by blinded review.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9586218

 $00:06:50.845 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.525$ And, of course, overall survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.9586218

 $00:06:52.525 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.645$ is a key secondary endpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9586218

00:06:53.645 --> 00:06:54.945 which would kick in automatically

00:06:55.325 --> 00:06:56.640 depending on the response rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.943172

 $00:06:57.120 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.160$ seen. So this is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.943172

 $00:06:58.160 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.840$ way they built their study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943172

00:06:59.840 --> 00:07:01.380 Again, dual primary endpoints.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92466486

 $00:07:01.760 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.980$ If, overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.9763347

 $00:07:03.280 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.180$ response rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96452636

 $00:07:04.960 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.760$ was significant, then, then OS

NOTE Confidence: 0.96452636

 $00:07:07.760 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.040$ would be triggered for an

NOTE Confidence: 0.96452636

 $00{:}07{:}09.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10.635$ interim analysis. And as we'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.96452636

 $00:07:10.635 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.794$ get to, this is exactly

NOTE Confidence: 0.96452636

 $00{:}07{:}11.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}12.995$ what happened given the higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.96452636

 $00:07:12.995 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.975$ response rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9838813

 $00:07:14.435 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.735$ This was a balanced,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476855

 $00{:}07{:}16.195 --> 00{:}07{:}17.175$ study. Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96603614

 $00:07:17.555 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.354$ chemotherapy plus engraftment, cetuximab versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.96603614

 $00:07:20.354 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.955$ standard of care. Most of

 $00:07:21.955 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.580$ these patients had right sided

NOTE Confidence: 0.96603614

 $00:07:23.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.460$ tumors, which is what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.96603614

 $00:07:24.460 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.920$ would expect for this disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96603614

 $00:07:26.060 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.660$ certainly a worse prognosis for

NOTE Confidence: 0.96603614 00:07:27.660 --> 00:07:28.160 this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8905935

 $00{:}07{:}29.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.540$ this subtype of colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.8905935

 $00:07:30.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.920$ and frankly the worst molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8905935

 $00:07:31.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.520$ subtype in terms of prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9226684

 $00:07:34.794 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.835$ Two thirds of patients are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9226684

 $00:07:35.835 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.875$ more or less had liver

NOTE Confidence: 0.9226684

 $00:07:36.875 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.254$ metastases in this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89145285

00:07:38.715 --> 00:07:39.455 And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95494497

 $00{:}07{:}39.995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}41.775$ we're we're quite advanced overall.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9720726

 $00:07:42.315 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.514$ This is the response rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.9720726

 $00:07:43.514 \longrightarrow 00:07:44.794$ that we saw, so sixty

00:07:44.794 --> 00:07:46.235 point nine percent, so sixty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9720726

00:07:46.235 --> 00:07:47.215 one percent essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.7890635

 $00{:}07{:}47.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}49.629$ with this FOLFOX and graphona mocetuximab

NOTE Confidence: 0.9230508

 $00:07:50.250 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.530$ versus forty percent with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9230508

00:07:51.530 --> 00:07:53.069 standard pair of of chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9230508

 $00:07:53.289 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.789$ alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571065

00:07:54.409 --> 00:07:55.150 So certainly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:07:56.169 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.810$ a substantial improvement in response

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:07:58.810 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.689$ rate. When we look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

00:07:59.689 --> 00:08:01.449 duration of response, also very

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00{:}08{:}01.449 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}03.324$ impressive. More than six month

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:03.324 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.085$ duration of response, forty six

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:05.085 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.845$ percent with with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:06.845 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.324$ investigational arm versus only fifteen

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:09.324 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.085$ percent of the chemotherapy arm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00{:}08{:}11.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}12.764$ so improving durability of these

 $00{:}08{:}12.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}14.205$ responses. Still have a ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00{:}08{:}14.205 \to 00{:}08{:}14.925$ to go, though. As you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:14.925 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.884$ can see that that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:15.884 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.085$ year mark, this does drop

NOTE Confidence: 0.9181344

 $00:08:17.085 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.590$ back down to fifteen percent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99037457

00:08:19.370 --> 00:08:20.969 So that's great. It's important

NOTE Confidence: 0.99037457

 $00:08:20.969 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.250$ to get responses, but this

NOTE Confidence: 0.99037457

 $00:08:22.250 \longrightarrow 00:08:23.289$ is really what matters. Are

NOTE Confidence: 0.99037457

 $00:08:23.289 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.909$ we making our when we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9130586

 $00:08:25.689 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.750$ intensify chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9491764

 $00{:}08{:}27.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}28.590$ are we just seeing responses

NOTE Confidence: 0.9491764

00:08:28.650 --> 00:08:30.255 but survival is ending up

NOTE Confidence: 0.9491764

 $00:08:30.335 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.995$ the same?

NOTE Confidence: 0.97244877

00:08:31.455 --> 00:08:32.975 This was the overall survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.97244877

 $00:08:32.975 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.795$ that we saw.

 $00:08:34.575 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.095$ This is an interim analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.92235

 $00:08:36.095 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.975$ and even though you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.92235

00:08:36.975 --> 00:08:38.655 a very impressive hazard ratio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92235

 $00:08:38.655 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.015$ point four seven and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.92235

 $00:08:40.015 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.615$ low p value at this

NOTE Confidence: 0.92235

 $00:08:41.615 \longrightarrow 00:08:42.115$ interim

NOTE Confidence: 0.94394845

00:08:42.655 --> 00:08:44.200 analysis, it was you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94394845

 $00:08:44.200 \longrightarrow 00:08:45.480$ very strict in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94394845

 $00:08:45.480 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.640$ statistical design. This actually technically

NOTE Confidence: 0.94394845

 $00:08:47.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.339$ does not achieve statistical significance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98931694

 $00:08:49.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.760$ but it is an interim

NOTE Confidence: 0.98931694

 $00:08:50.760 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.260$ analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9761118

 $00:08:51.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.679$ Obviously, this is a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.9761118

00:08:52.679 --> 00:08:53.959 promising first step,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9290506

 $00:08:54.679 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.179$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9008594

 $00:08:56.120 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.980$ the response rate and,

 $00:08:59.184 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.184$ it speaks for itself as

NOTE Confidence: 0.95303285

 $00:09:00.184 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.204$ well. And based on this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95303285

 $00:09:02.425 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.545$ there was there was an

NOTE Confidence: 0.95303285

 $00:09:03.545 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.985$ approval granted for this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.95303285

 $00:09:04.985 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.125$ the frontline setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97606295

 $00:09:06.745 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.464$ When we look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97606295

00:09:07.464 --> 00:09:09.304 subgroup analysis, this is what

NOTE Confidence: 0.97606295

 $00:09:09.304 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.425$ we saw. So you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.97606295

 $00:09:10.425 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.625$ see this to the right

NOTE Confidence: 0.97606295

 $00:09:11.625 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.764$ of this line favors

NOTE Confidence: 0.93931204

 $00{:}09{:}13.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}15.100$ the encorafenib, stuximab with FOLFOX.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93931204

 $00:09:15.400 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.600$ So another way of putting

NOTE Confidence: 0.93931204

 $00:09:16.600 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.960$ it is base basically, all

NOTE Confidence: 0.93931204

 $00:09:17.960 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.640$ subgroups seem to benefit from

NOTE Confidence: 0.93931204

 $00:09:19.640 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.760$ this. And where does this

 $00:09:20.760 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.260$ land?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9979042

00:09:21.720 --> 00:09:22.760 Even though this was just

NOTE Confidence: 0.9979042

 $00:09:22.760 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.680$ presented in January, we've already

NOTE Confidence: 0.9979042

 $00:09:24.680 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.640$ got it now into our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9979042

 $00:09:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.540$ national guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91525376

 $00:09:27.000 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.065$ So So for BRAFV600E

NOTE Confidence: 0.78944963

 $00:09:28.605 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.065$ mutation positive, encorafenib

NOTE Confidence: 0.91136944

 $00:09:30.605 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.524$ with appropriate biologic, which would

NOTE Confidence: 0.91136944

 $00{:}09{:}32.524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}33.964$ be an EGFR inhibitor plus

NOTE Confidence: 0.91136944

 $00:09:33.964 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.884$ FOLFOX, has become the standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.91136944

 $00:09:35.884 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.245$ of care. Of course, there

NOTE Confidence: 0.91136944

 $00:09:37.245 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.365$ may be patients you think

NOTE Confidence: 0.91136944

 $00:09:38.365 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.584$ can tolerate this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224987

 $00:09:40.204 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.980$ and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91021085

00:09:41.459 --> 00:09:43.059 those patients could still get

NOTE Confidence: 0.91021085

 $00:09:43.059 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.940$ full thoughts if they had

 $00:09:43.940 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.519$ some contraindication to nacorafenib, vesitux-

imab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91021085

 $00:09:46.740 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.399$ or pematumumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9848198

00:09:47.860 --> 00:09:48.980 or something like that. But

NOTE Confidence: 0.9848198

 $00:09:48.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.100$ I do think the majority

NOTE Confidence: 0.9848198

 $00:09:50.100 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.059$ of patients will be getting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9848198

 $00:09:51.059 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.679$ this regimen going forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9993112 00:09:55.475 --> 00:09:55.975 So NOTE Confidence: 0.94262314

 $00:09:56.355 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.795$ that was BRAFV six hundred

NOTE Confidence: 0.94262314

 $00:09:57.795 \longrightarrow 00:09:58.675$ d, this slice of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94262314 00:09:58.675 --> 00:09:59.175 pie. NOTE Confidence: 0.9982664

 $00:09:59.554 \longrightarrow 00:10:00.834$ What other slices of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982664

 $00:10:00.834 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.954$ pie have we made an

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982664

 $00:10:01.954 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.995$ impact on in the last

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982664

 $00:10:02.995 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.495$ year?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

00:10:04.035 --> 00:10:05.475 So KRAS g twelve c

00:10:05.475 --> 00:10:06.855 has certainly been an evolving

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

 $00:10:06.915 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.875$ story over the last few

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

 $00:10:07.875 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.000$ years, but there was there

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

 $00:10:09.000 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.600$ were two approvals with KRAS

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

 $00:10:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.880$ g twelve c in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

 $00:10:11.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.080$ last year that I wanna

NOTE Confidence: 0.9718827

 $00:10:13.080 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.580$ highlight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8577976

00:10:14.200 --> 00:10:14.700 Adagracin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9814819

00:10:15.400 --> 00:10:16.860 KRAS g twelve c inhibitor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9582172

 $00:10:17.240 \longrightarrow 00:10:18.059$ and sotorasib

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

 $00:10:18.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.040$ were both granted FDA approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

 $00:10:20.040 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.640$ for advanced CRC this this

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

 $00:10:21.640 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.964$ past year. You know, these

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

00:10:22.964 --> 00:10:24.165 have been in guidelines for

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

 $00:10:24.165 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.045$ a little bit. Many of

 $00:10:25.045 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.165$ us may have been familiar

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

00:10:26.165 --> 00:10:27.785 with their use from managing

NOTE Confidence: 0.947673

 $00:10:27.845 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.545$ lung cancer, but now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9853334

 $00:10:30.005 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.524$ a full FDA approval for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9853334

 $00:10:31.524 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.024$ sotorasib

NOTE Confidence: 0.8838487

 $00{:}10{:}32.325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}34.404$ and, again, accelerated approval for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8838487

 $00:10:34.404 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.904$ adagracib.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98238945

 $00:10:35.684 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.144$ Both of those agents available.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98238945

 $00:10:37.285 \longrightarrow 00:10:38.425$ I think this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.87649995

 $00:10:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.400$ a very important

NOTE Confidence: 0.96802324

00:10:41.260 --> 00:10:42.780 breakthrough in the management of

NOTE Confidence: 0.96802324

 $00:10:42.780 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.860$ colorectal cancer is is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.96802324

 $00:10:44.860 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.760$ targeting these, molecular subtypes. Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96802324

 $00{:}10{:}47.980 --> 00{:}10{:}48.480 \ \mathrm{personalized}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.9661074

00:10:48.940 --> 00:10:50.220 medicine, getting the right drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.9661074

 $00:10:50.220 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.860$ to the right patient at

 $00{:}10{:}50.860 --> 00{:}10{:}51.600$ the right time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9958086

 $00:10:52.220 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.200$ So this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.95464

00:10:53.705 --> 00:10:55.005 some data from the sotorasib

NOTE Confidence: 0.95464

 $00{:}10{:}55.145 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}56.765$ study. You can see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.95464

00:10:56.905 --> 00:10:59.085 that, sotorasib and pantetumumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9935629

 $00:10:59.945 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.065$ was better than standard of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9935629

00:11:01.065 --> 00:11:02.905 care for advanced patients. Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9935629

 $00:11:02.905 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.205$ this is advanced patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99119747

00:11:04.905 --> 00:11:06.105 There are studies going on

NOTE Confidence: 0.99119747

 $00:11:06.105 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.705$ to move this this therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.99119747

 $00:11:07.705 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.825$ up into an earlier line

NOTE Confidence: 0.99119747

 $00:11:08.825 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.330$ of therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921791

00:11:09.730 --> 00:11:11.010 When, we look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921791

 $00:11:11.010 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.530$ median progression free survival for

NOTE Confidence: 0.921791

 $00:11:12.530 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.070$ advanced patients that have progressed

00:11:14.130 --> 00:11:14.950 on biflopyrimidine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

00:11:15.730 --> 00:11:16.850 oxaplatin or in a T

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:16.850 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.450$ can, etcetera, then the median

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:18.450 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.730$ progression free survival with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:19.730 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.610$ standard of care arm was

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:20.610 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.730$ two months. That's the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:21.730 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.690$ of the scan, right? That's

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:22.690 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.655$ the time of scan. We

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:23.655 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.098$ We scan every eight weeks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

00:11:25.098 --> 00:11:26.542 So basically, standard of care

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:26.542 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.986$ doing very little for these

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:27.986 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.429$ patients, whereas the investigational arm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

00:11:29.718 --> 00:11:31.162 had a PFS of five

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:31.162 \longrightarrow 00:11:32.606$ point six two months. I

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

 $00:11:32.606 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.050$ think we still have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.91519606

00:11:34.050 --> 00:11:35.493 ways to go to to

 $00:11:35.493 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.360$ to prolong that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98445624

00:11:36.920 --> 00:11:38.200 Moreover, I think moving these

NOTE Confidence: 0.98445624

 $00:11:38.200 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.480$ drugs up earlier on in

NOTE Confidence: 0.98445624

 $00:11:39.480 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.440$ the line of treatment, which

NOTE Confidence: 0.98445624

 $00:11:40.440 \longrightarrow 00:11:41.899$ is under active investigation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9832003 00:11:42.360 --> 00:11:42.860 will,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9527192

00:11:44.279 --> 00:11:44.779 will,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00:11:45.160 \longrightarrow 00:11:46.360$ make an a a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

00:11:46.360 --> 00:11:47.720 impact. Make giving these drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00:11:47.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.240$ earlier in somebody's treatment course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00:11:49.240 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.415$ I think we'll we'll get

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

00:11:50.415 --> 00:11:52.175 more effectiveness from them. But,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

00:11:52.175 --> 00:11:53.775 certainly, this now is a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00{:}11{:}54.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}55.535$ a reasonable option for our

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00:11:55.535 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.215$ patients essentially in the third

00:11:57.215 --> 00:11:58.495 line setting that are about

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

00:11:58.495 --> 00:11:59.615 there or I prefer the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00:11:59.615 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.975$ term five floor pyramid in

NOTE Confidence: 0.86481076

 $00:12:00.975 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.115$ refractory setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93288404

 $00:12:02.809 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.610$ So some of the data

NOTE Confidence: 0.93288404

 $00{:}12{:}03.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}05.130$ from AdaGradsson, the other g

NOTE Confidence: 0.93288404

00:12:05.130 --> 00:12:06.809 twelve c inhibitor, you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.93288404

 $00:12:06.809 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.690$ see this is from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93288404

 $00{:}12{:}07.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09.370$ New England Journal paper that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498936

 $00:12:10.330 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.770$ that supported its approval. You

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498936

 $00:12:11.770 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.550$ can see, in this waterfall

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498936

 $00:12:13.610 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.730$ plot, the majority of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498936

 $00:12:14.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.895$ bars going down indicating cytoreduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.916935

 $00:12:17.434 \longrightarrow 00:12:19.035$ and about, half of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.916935

 $00:12:19.035 \longrightarrow 00:12:19.535$ crossing

NOTE Confidence: 0.97676885

 $00:12:19.995 \longrightarrow 00:12:21.455$ the the thirty percent threshold

00:12:21.835 --> 00:12:23.434 of partial response. You can

NOTE Confidence: 0.925318

00:12:23.434 --> 00:12:25.675 see, again, similar PFS, similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.925318

 $00:12:25.675 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.195$ OS for a very advanced

NOTE Confidence: 0.925318

 $00:12:27.195 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.175$ patient population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9822099

 $00:12:28.554 \longrightarrow 00:12:29.755$ So I think these numbers

NOTE Confidence: 0.9822099

 $00:12:29.755 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.135$ can only improve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95479745

 $00:12:31.740 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.780$ as we make these options

NOTE Confidence: 0.95479745

 $00:12:32.780 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.140$ available earlier in the course

NOTE Confidence: 0.95479745

00:12:34.140 --> 00:12:35.520 of treatment for our patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95479745

 $00:12:35.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.660$ which hopefully future studies will

NOTE Confidence: 0.95479745

 $00:12:37.660 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.160$ show.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9032569

 $00:12:38.940 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.980$ So what do we also

NOTE Confidence: 0.9032569

 $00{:}12{:}39.980 --> 00{:}12{:}40.940$ see? We also saw on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9032569

 $00{:}12{:}40.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}42.880$ our NCCN guidelines that KRAS

NOTE Confidence: 0.9032569

00:12:43.020 --> 00:12:44.380 g twelve c mutation positive

00:12:44.380 --> 00:12:44.880 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91244835

 $00{:}12{:}45.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}47.455$ should be receiving sororac in or

NOTE Confidence: 0.91244835

 $00:12:47.455 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.955$ adagracin

NOTE Confidence: 0.935753

00:12:48.334 --> 00:12:49.475 with, appropriate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7949442

00:12:51.135 --> 00:12:52.815 biologic therapy, eGFR, and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9840932

 $00{:}12{:}54.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}56.035$ either could be appropriate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

00:12:56.975 --> 00:12:58.575 What about HER2NU? We saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:12:58.575 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.095$ some updates at ASCO in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:13:00.095 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.230$ June of this past year

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:13:01.230 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.550$ from the MOUNTAINER study. This

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00{:}13{:}02.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}03.670$ is actually the final update

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:13:03.670 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.950$ from this study. I'll just

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:13:04.950 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.990$ highlight it in a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

00:13:05.990 --> 00:13:07.670 of slides because, again, it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:13:07.670 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.350$ is, speaking to this theme

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664962

 $00:13:09.350 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.650$ of of biomarker,

 $00:13:12.150 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.270$ by of of these rare

NOTE Confidence: 0.90611905

 $00:13:13.270 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.029$ biomarkers for colorectal cancer that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90611905

 $00:13:15.029 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.690$ are highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.9559798

 $00:13:16.304 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.125$ highly actionable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98784953

00:13:17.825 --> 00:13:18.565 So this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9921014

 $00:13:18.945 \longrightarrow 00:13:19.765$ was a study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9143182

 $00:13:21.184 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.865$ that evaluated patients that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9143182

 $00:13:23.025 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.765$ were essentially,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95245034

 $00:13:24.625 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.745$ on their third line of

NOTE Confidence: 0.95245034

00:13:25.745 --> 00:13:28.065 treatment for colorectal cancer. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95245034

00:13:28.065 --> 00:13:29.045 again, prior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7984634

 $00:13:29.510 \longrightarrow 00:13:30.170$ five flirapyrmidine

NOTE Confidence: 0.902506

 $00{:}13{:}30.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}32.470$ refractory essentially here. Then we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.902506

 $00{:}13{:}32.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}34.330$ getting a small molecule tucatinib

NOTE Confidence: 0.902506

 $00:13:34.550 \longrightarrow 00:13:35.850$ with antibody trastuzumab,

 $00:13:36.390 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.370$ HERD and HER2.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97212726

 $00:13:38.150 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.370$ And this was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98366886

 $00:13:40.070 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.429$ really the arm that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.98366886

00:13:41.429 --> 00:13:42.790 investigated. You can see forty

NOTE Confidence: 0.98366886

 $00:13:42.790 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.145$ one plus forty five in

NOTE Confidence: 0.98366886

00:13:44.145 --> 00:13:44.805 over eighty patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94730496

 $00:13:45.825 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.425$ Per FDA requirements, they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.94730496

 $00:13:47.425 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.545$ required to look at TUKAT

NOTE Confidence: 0.94730496

 $00:13:48.545 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.325$ and monotherapy to really determine

NOTE Confidence: 0.7931972

 $00:13:50.945 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.405$ determine separation of components.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9826691

 $00:13:53.185 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.305$ But these were the arms

NOTE Confidence: 0.9826691

 $00:13:54.305 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.905$ that biologically really made the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9826691

 $00:13:55.905 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.965$ most sense, frankly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8573665

 $00:13:57.345 \longrightarrow 00:13:57.845$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9166091

 $00:13:59.309 \longrightarrow 00:14:00.589$ were were reused as the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9166091

00:14:00.589 --> 00:14:02.509 main efficacy analysis to to

 $00:14:02.509 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.550$ look at the effectiveness of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9166091

 $00:14:03.550 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.209$ the drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

 $00:14:04.750 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.190$ So what were the final

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

 $00:14:06.190 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.389$ outcomes from the study? We

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

 $00:14:07.389 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.009$ can we can see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

 $00:14:09.069 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.750$ that Doctor. Strickler presented this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

 $00:14:10.750 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.345$ at ASCO in June a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

 $00:14:12.345 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.785$ response rate of thirty nine

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

00:14:13.785 --> 00:14:15.065 percent, so close to forty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9476628

00:14:15.065 --> 00:14:16.764 percent response rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

00:14:18.024 --> 00:14:19.704 Durable response is fifteen point

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:19.704 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.305$ two months, median progression free

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

00:14:21.305 --> 00:14:23.065 survival, eight point one months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:23.065 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.225$ median overall survival, twenty four

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:25.225 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.685$ months. This is for patients

 $00:14:26.985 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.060$ in the third line setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:29.120 \longrightarrow 00:14:30.000$ These are numbers that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:30.000 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.120$ would typically expect to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:31.120 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.080$ in the first line setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

00:14:32.080 --> 00:14:33.940 So very promising targeted therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.97195446

 $00:14:34.240 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.900$ for patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92610675

00:14:35.280 --> 00:14:36.560 May main side effect of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92610675

 $00:14:36.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.160$ the combination being diarrhea to

NOTE Confidence: 0.92610675

00:14:38.160 --> 00:14:39.140 watch out for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

00:14:39.680 --> 00:14:41.520 but, overall, thought to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

 $00:14:41.520 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.425$ a good alternative to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

 $00:14:43.425 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.585$ chemotherapy options these patients have

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

00:14:45.585 --> 00:14:47.025 in these later lines. Whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

 $00:14:47.025 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.065$ or not this will translate

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

 $00:14:48.065 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.185$ to moving it up earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.94994193

00:14:49.185 --> 00:14:51.025 is being evaluated in, additional

00:14:51.025 --> 00:14:52.885 studies including first line study

NOTE Confidence: 0.9499419300:14:53.025 --> 00:14:53.525 now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9895523

 $00:14:54.225 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.765$ But, this has now become

NOTE Confidence: 0.9187247

 $00:14:56.370 \longrightarrow 00:14:57.810$ the, really the standard of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9187247

 $00:14:57.810 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.790$ care for HER2

NOTE Confidence: 0.978997

00:14:59.090 --> 00:15:00.310 positive disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99776584

 $00:15:01.010 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.550$ in the refractory setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00:15:04.290 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.050$ One other very important biomarker

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

00:15:06.050 --> 00:15:07.650 is mismatch repair deficiency, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00:15:07.650 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.770$ this is a biomarker that

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00:15:08.770 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.615$ comes up very regularly in

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00:15:10.615 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.695$ our conferences and very regularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00{:}15{:}12.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}14.055$ in my discussions with patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00:15:14.055 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.214$ because of the the impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.98638505

 $00:15:16.214 \longrightarrow 00:15:17.654$ immunotherapy could have on these

 $00:15:17.654 \longrightarrow 00:15:18.154$ patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93090504

 $00{:}15{:}19.654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.175$ which we've we've known.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93090504

 $00{:}15{:}21.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}22.775$ Right? We've known keynote one

NOTE Confidence: 0.93090504

 $00:15:22.775 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.675$ seventy seven,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9950773

 $00:15:24.440 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.220$ immunotherapy is better than chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.993759

00:15:26.840 --> 00:15:27.340 Pembrolizumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8873523

 $00:15:28.520 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.880$ in blue here, showing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8873523

00:15:29.880 --> 00:15:32.360 prolonged progression free survival compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.8873523

 $00:15:32.360 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.020$ to chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.973886

 $00:15:34.040 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.540$ The,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00{:}15{:}35.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}36.760$ immune check on inhibitors like

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00:15:36.760 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.065$ pembrolizumab, nivolumab, glumab have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00:15:39.065 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.265$ used in the factory setting

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00:15:40.265 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.385$ for some time, but moving

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00:15:41.385 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.265$ them up into the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00:15:42.265 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.265$ line was what one seventy

00:15:44.265 --> 00:15:45.305 seven did for the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.90660983

 $00{:}15{:}45.305 --> 00{:}15{:}45.805 \ \mathrm{time},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.97887117

 $00:15:46.185 \longrightarrow 00:15:47.645$ and it showed an impressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.97887117

00:15:47.705 --> 00:15:49.305 PFS benefit. Because of their

NOTE Confidence: 0.97887117

 $00:15:49.305 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.225$ use later, the the OS

NOTE Confidence: 0.97887117

 $00:15:51.225 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.590$ benefit has not been,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97967064

 $00:15:53.150 \longrightarrow 00:15:54.910$ shown or reported yet, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.97967064

 $00{:}15{:}54.910 --> 00{:}15{:}56.270$ I think will likely take

NOTE Confidence: 0.97967064

 $00:15:56.270 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.070$ a long time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9987055

 $00:15:57.470 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.090$ to see to see that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7354075

 $00{:}16{:}00.430 {\: -->\:} 00{:}16{:}02.430$ Hazard ratio, so pembrolizumab protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.7354075

 $00:16:02.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.030$ works better in in all

NOTE Confidence: 0.7354075

 $00{:}16{:}04.030 --> 00{:}16{:}04.530 \text{ subtypes}.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.8899054

 $00:16:06.204 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.644$ But what's new what's new

NOTE Confidence: 0.8899054

 $00:16:07.644 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.105$ is Checkmate h w.

 $00:16:09.565 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.524$ This is a story that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9526311

 $00:16:10.524 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.045$ the has been evolving for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9526311

 $00:16:12.045 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.245$ a couple of years for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9526311

 $00:16:13.245 \longrightarrow 00:16:14.524$ this trial because it's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9526311

 $00:16:14.524 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.964$ three arm trial. And what

NOTE Confidence: 0.9526311

 $00:16:15.964 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.024$ do we see first?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982674

 $00:16:17.325 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.985$ We saw,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92243034

 $00:16:18.524 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.699$ the nivo arm presented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9775603

 $00{:}16{:}21.160 --> 00{:}16{:}22.600$ and now what we're seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9775603

 $00:16:22.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:24.220$ is the nivoipi arm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98154616

 $00{:}16{:}25.240 --> 00{:}16{:}25.740 \ {\rm versus},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.97356015

 $00:16:27.240 \longrightarrow 00:16:27.740$ versus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92191297

 $00:16:28.360 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.860$ chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93228596

 $00:16:30.279 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.560$ At first, we saw the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9322859600:16:31.560 --> 00:16:31.880 the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9266923

00:16:33.205 --> 00:16:34.565 the nivo ipi arm versus

00:16:34.565 --> 00:16:36.005 chemotherapy. Excuse me. And then

NOTE Confidence: 0.9266923

 $00{:}16{:}36.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}37.845$ now we're seeing nivo versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.9266923

 $00:16:37.845 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.205$ ipi nivo, which is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.9266923

 $00:16:39.205 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.325$ the comparison we wanted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9266923

 $00:16:40.325 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.545$ see all the whole time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8982542

 $00:16:42.005 \longrightarrow 00:16:43.225$ We already knew that immunotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8982542

 $00:16:43.445 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.725$ should be not chemotherapy from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8982542

 $00:16:44.725 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.265$ keynote one seventy seven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90118074

 $00:16:46.640 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.080$ So we saw this last

NOTE Confidence: 0.90118074

 $00:16:48.080 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.900$ step GISCO.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9991782

 $00:16:49.520 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.180$ So this

NOTE Confidence: 0.99876994

 $00:16:50.640 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.220$ is important

NOTE Confidence: 0.9795346

00:16:51.680 --> 00:16:53.279 data to have, but but

NOTE Confidence: 0.9795346

00:16:53.279 --> 00:16:54.880 in many ways, this isn't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.990119

00:16:55.840 --> 00:16:57.760 this isn't necessarily changing the

00:16:57.760 --> 00:16:58.260 paradigm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9881075

00:16:58.800 --> 00:17:00.740 completely. So this was ipinivo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93520623

 $00:17:01.524 \longrightarrow 00:17:03.065$ dual immune checkpoint blockade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9761524

00:17:03.445 --> 00:17:04.345 versus nivolumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8098812

00:17:05.045 --> 00:17:06.825 excuse me, versus chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97900236

 $00:17:07.684 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.184$ alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95966554

 $00:17:08.565 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.645$ And you can see very

NOTE Confidence: 0.95966554

00:17:10.645 --> 00:17:12.165 big separation of these curves

NOTE Confidence: 0.95966554

00:17:12.165 --> 00:17:13.945 here. Not even reached medium

NOTE Confidence: 0.8555286

00:17:14.325 --> 00:17:15.385 pressure free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98467475

00:17:16.910 --> 00:17:18.210 Very impressive durability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77057964

 $00:17:19.070 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.570$ Ipinivo

NOTE Confidence: 0.9397152

 $00:17:19.869 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.330$ clearly outperforming chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:21.630 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.230$ here. But, again, what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:23.230 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.270$ need to see is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:24.270 \longrightarrow 00:17:25.710$ two main immune checkpoint better

 $00{:}17{:}25.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}27.309$ inhibitors really better than one

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

00:17:27.309 --> 00:17:28.350 because it could be potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.475$ more toxic. So, that's what

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:29.475 \longrightarrow 00:17:30.595$ we that's what we got

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:30.595 \longrightarrow 00:17:32.115$ to see this year at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:32.115 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.635$ at GISCO in twenty twenty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9153138

 $00:17:33.635 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.415$ five. We saw NivoIPI

NOTE Confidence: 0.93644863

00:17:35.795 --> 00:17:36.775 versus IPI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9824127

 $00:17:37.234 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.595$ This is first line therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9824127

 $00:17:38.595 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.455$ for mismatch repair deficient tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98443687

00:17:40.915 --> 00:17:41.415 Moreover,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78979266

 $00:17:42.869 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.850$ central confirmation

NOTE Confidence: 0.9047743

 $00{:}17{:}44.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}45.750$ was done for mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.9047743

 $00:17:45.750 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.050$ steps which is really important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83427835

00:17:47.750 --> 00:17:48.790 and wasn't done in t

 $00:17:48.790 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.010$ note one seventy seven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9269314

 $00:17:50.630 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.450$ So ipinivo

NOTE Confidence: 0.95776755

00:17:51.830 --> 00:17:53.690 did though demonstrate improved PFS

NOTE Confidence: 0.95776755

 $00:17:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.050$ compared to nivolumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00:17:55.990 \longrightarrow 00:17:57.625$ This This was simultaneously published

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

00:17:57.625 --> 00:17:58.585 in The Lancet, so this

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00:17:58.585 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.465$ is the reference from The

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00:17:59.465 \longrightarrow 00:18:01.065$ Lancet. If we look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00:18:01.065 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.085$ the central confirmation of microcecal

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00:18:03.145 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.265$ instability high where we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00{:}18{:}04.265 \to 00{:}18{:}06.265$ be darn certain that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

 $00{:}18{:}06.265 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}07.865$ tumor is truly mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.93209577

00:18:07.865 --> 00:18:08.365 deficient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9129717

 $00:18:08.910 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.630$ This is a kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9129717

 $00:18:09.630 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.910$ separation we can we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.9129717

00:18:10.910 --> 00:18:12.990 here. So, again, chemotherapy that

00:18:13.070 --> 00:18:14.190 those curves were down here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9129717

 $00:18:14.190 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.869$ but, we are collecting very

NOTE Confidence: 0.9129717

00:18:15.869 --> 00:18:17.330 clear separation that ipinivo

NOTE Confidence: 0.87378407

 $00:18:17.869 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.230$ has a as an improved

NOTE Confidence: 0.87378407

 $00:18:19.230 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.430$ PFS. You can see highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.87378407

 $00:18:20.430 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.270$ statistically significant, has your ratio

NOTE Confidence: 0.87378407

00:18:22.270 --> 00:18:23.250 of sixty two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6168448

 $00:18:23.625 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.365$ And the

NOTE Confidence: 0.82057583

00:18:24.665 --> 00:18:26.285 whole monomonee centrally confirm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9541702

 $00:18:27.065 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.125$ subset of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9542679

00:18:28.505 --> 00:18:30.105 it's very similar numbers. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9542679

00:18:30.105 --> 00:18:31.425 it does seem that ipinivo

NOTE Confidence: 0.9542679

 $00:18:31.425 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.845$ will be better than nivolumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9525302

00:18:33.145 --> 00:18:34.425 What about in the subgroup

NOTE Confidence: 0.9525302

 $00:18:34.425 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.910$ analysis when we look just

00:18:35.910 --> 00:18:36.890 about all subgroups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90686786

 $00:18:37.750 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.109$ were were favored using the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90686786

 $00:18:39.109 \longrightarrow 00:18:41.050$ dual immune checkpoint block blockade?

NOTE Confidence: 0.99915504

 $00:18:41.670 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.130$ What about response rate?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9286248

 $00:18:43.670 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.550$ Well, if we just look

NOTE Confidence: 0.9286248

 $00:18:44.550 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.250$ at the, oh, the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97356963

 $00:18:46.790 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.230$ the number of overall response

NOTE Confidence: 0.97356963

00:18:48.230 --> 00:18:49.109 rate, you see it's seventy

NOTE Confidence: 0.97356963

 $00{:}18{:}49.109 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}50.550$ one versus fifty eight percent

NOTE Confidence: 0.97356963

 $00:18:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.205$ with two immune checkpoint inhibitors

NOTE Confidence: 0.97356963

 $00:18:52.345 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.885$ versus one immune checkpoint inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8988836

 $00:18:54.345 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.705$ Notably, this is way higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.8988836

00:18:55.705 --> 00:18:56.664 response rate than we saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.8988836

 $00:18:56.664 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.105$ with, in keynote one seventy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8988836

 $00:18:58.105 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.005$ seven and pembrolizumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96965426

00:18:59.465 --> 00:19:00.345 Again, that may have some

 $00:19:00.345 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.225$ things to do with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96965426

00:19:01.225 --> 00:19:02.125 central confirmation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96549493

00:19:02.505 --> 00:19:04.125 mismatch repair status testing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9514951

 $00:19:05.580 \longrightarrow 00:19:06.540$ or there could be other

NOTE Confidence: 0.9514951

 $00:19:06.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.900$ other reasons for that. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9514951

 $00:19:07.900 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.680$ higher response rate, better progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.9514951

 $00:19:09.740 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.400$ free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99790746

 $00:19:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.760$ What about toxicities?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8507809

 $00:19:12.300 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.900$ Not unexpected to see more

NOTE Confidence: 0.8507809

 $00{:}19{:}13.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}15.920$ toxicities with Duo immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.8507809

 $00:19:16.140 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.580$ blockade. With the dose of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8507809

00:19:17.580 --> 00:19:19.255 ipi we use now, Certainly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8507809

 $00:19:19.255 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.375$ these are more much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.8507809

 $00:19:20.375 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.875$ manageable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89467585

 $00:19:21.575 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.215$ And I think when you

 $00:19:22.215 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.934$ really just look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.89467585

 $00:19:22.934 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.975$ totality of grade three of

NOTE Confidence: 0.89467585

 $00{:}19{:}23.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.734$ Versa Vent's twenty two versus four
teen

NOTE Confidence: 0.89467585

 $00:19:25.734 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.234$ percent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90659344 00:19:27.174 --> 00:19:27.655 is, NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00:19:28.135 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.815$ is different, but, is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00{:}19{:}29.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}31.575$ not dramatically different. And I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00:19:31.575 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.855$ think many of these we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00:19:32.855 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.230$ become able to manage effectively.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00:19:35.369 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.570$ But, frankly, there are some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00{:}19{:}36.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}37.929$ patients that will be left

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563656

 $00:19:37.929 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.750$ with lifelong,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82623065

00:19:41.769 --> 00:19:42.269 endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.92982495

 $00:19:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.230$ disorders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9979059

 $00:19:43.690 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.649$ and that needs to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9979059

 $00:19:44.649 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.789$ taken into account.

 $00:19:46.090 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.195$ So at the end of

NOTE Confidence: 0.95831805

 $00{:}19{:}47.195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}48.115$ the day, though, I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.95831805

00:19:48.115 --> 00:19:49.335 ipnivo is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924883

 $00:19:50.115 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.875$ become standard of care for

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924883

 $00:19:51.875 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.075$ a lot of patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924883

00:19:53.075 --> 00:19:54.835 first first line mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924883

 $00:19:54.835 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.435$ deficient tumors. I think for

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924883

00:19:56.435 --> 00:19:57.635 patients that you're more worried

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924883

 $00:19:57.635 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.375$ about toxicities

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404822

 $00:19:58.890 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.010$ or that have lower burdens

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404822

 $00:20:00.010 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.790$ of disease, it's not unreasonable

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404822

 $00:20:01.850 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.890$ to think about the single

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404822

 $00{:}20{:}02.890 --> 00{:}20{:}04.410$ agent and IPD one if

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404822

 $00:20:04.410 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.869$ you're concerned about toxicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9083085

 $00:20:06.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.970$ But, APNivo is what I

 $00:20:08.970 \longrightarrow 00:20:10.270$ am using in

NOTE Confidence: 0.92305857

 $00:20:10.570 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.770$ the majority of my practice

NOTE Confidence: 0.92305857

00:20:11.770 --> 00:20:12.970 for patients first line with

NOTE Confidence: 0.92305857

 $00:20:12.970 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.950$ this disease now

NOTE Confidence: 0.9409214

00:20:14.325 --> 00:20:16.345 given that very dramatic durability

NOTE Confidence: 0.9409214

 $00:20:16.404 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.065$ of the curve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99660915

00:20:17.365 --> 00:20:19.044 So what's my summary for

NOTE Confidence: 0.99660915

 $00:20:19.044 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.484$ the approach to biomarkers in

NOTE Confidence: 0.99660915

 $00:20:20.484 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.544$ twenty twenty five?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79619986

00:20:22.085 --> 00:20:23.365 Your FE six hundred d,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79619986

 $00:20:23.365 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.424$ what what changed?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8712293

 $00:20:24.965 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.924$ What changed is now we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8712293

 $00:20:25.924 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.164$ use fofloxacin, carafenib, zetuximab as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8712293

 $00{:}20{:}28.164 --> 00{:}20{:}29.800$ first line. K. RS g

NOTE Confidence: 0.8712293

 $00:20:29.800 \longrightarrow 00:20:31.240$ twelve c. What changed? Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8712293

 $00:20:31.240 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.300$ now we have these approved.

 $00{:}20{:}32.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}33.660$ Now they're FDA approved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336507

 $00{:}20{:}34.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35.960$ There's not just just data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336507

 $00:20:35.960 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.700$ There's approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.80925715

 $00:20:37.080 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.840$ behind them. So for flow

NOTE Confidence: 0.80925715

 $00:20:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.680$ of permeating refractory CRC with

NOTE Confidence: 0.80925715

 $00:20:40.680 \longrightarrow 00:20:42.600$ the appropriate eGFR inhibitor given

NOTE Confidence: 0.80925715

 $00:20:42.600 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.100$ alongside,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295124

 $00{:}20{:}43.785 \to 00{:}20{:}44.585$ Whether or not we get

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295124

 $00:20:44.585 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.145$ to start,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226

 $00{:}20{:}45.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}46.585$ considering that in the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226

 $00:20:46.585 \longrightarrow 00:20:47.865$ line setting will depend on

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226

 $00:20:47.865 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.984$ how some of these other

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226

 $00:20:48.984 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.825$ trials read out. Tucatinib and

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226

 $00:20:50.825 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.325$ trastuzumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.98626596

00:20:51.945 --> 00:20:53.465 is the only HER2 directed

 $00:20:53.465 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.965$ therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.81661206

 $00:20:54.665 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.885$ FDA approved for

NOTE Confidence: 0.99013454 00:20:56.940 --> 00:20:57.440 for NOTE Confidence: 0.89869463

 $00:20:58.539 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.619$ HER2 positive colorectal cancer. Although

NOTE Confidence: 0.89869463

00:21:00.619 --> 00:21:02.720 there are other agents, trastuzumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.63131803

00:21:03.820 --> 00:21:04.960 lepatent and trastuzumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5152311

00:21:06.700 --> 00:21:07.200 DS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8923586

 $00:21:07.580 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.960$ eighty two zero one a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95585823

 $00:21:09.340 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.639$ that that can be considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.95585823 00:21:10.859 --> 00:21:11.259 for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952176

 $00{:}21{:}12.325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13.525$ considered as well. But this

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952176

 $00:21:13.525 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.645$ is the FDA group regimen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952176

00:21:14.645 --> 00:21:15.365 This is what I use

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952176

 $00:21:15.365 \longrightarrow 00:21:16.085$ in the majority of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952176

00:21:16.085 --> 00:21:17.685 patients, the first HER2 directed

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952176

00:21:17.685 --> 00:21:18.185 therapy.

00:21:18.645 --> 00:21:19.145 Although,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9926013

 $00:21:20.005 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.505$ trastuzumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332355

 $00:21:20.805 \longrightarrow 00:21:22.405$ drugs, TCAN, yeah, is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332355

 $00:21:22.405 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.005$ certainly something I use, if

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332355

00:21:24.005 --> 00:21:26.025 there's a KRAS mutation present

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332355 00:21:26.244 --> 00:21:26.985 or if

NOTE Confidence: 0.8213045

 $00:21:27.350 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.470$ like, in addition to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8213045

 $00{:}21{:}28.470 --> 00{:}21{:}31.030~\mathrm{HER2}$ or if, patients are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8213045

 $00:21:31.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.570$ too congestive in refractory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9477308

00:21:33.109 --> 00:21:34.070 And then now what changed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9477308

 $00:21:34.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.750$ with deficient mismatch repair? I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9477308

00:21:35.750 --> 00:21:37.930 think ipi, limumab, and nivolumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.9477308

 $00:21:38.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.270$ as first line therapy has

NOTE Confidence: 0.9477308

 $00:21:39.270 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.250$ become my standard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9611492

 $00:21:40.630 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.795$ except in circumstances where I

 $00:21:42.795 \longrightarrow 00:21:44.475$ think that toxicity is my

NOTE Confidence: 0.9611492

00:21:44.475 --> 00:21:45.295 major concern

NOTE Confidence: 0.8103212

 $00:21:45.675 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.075$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8733795

 $00:21:46.475 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.235$ and maybe disease burden is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8733795

 $00:21:48.235 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.735$ lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99415725

 $00:21:49.595 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.955$ So I'm gonna pivot now

NOTE Confidence: 0.99415725 00:21:50.955 --> 00:21:51.455 to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99410295

 $00:21:52.235 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.295$ localized disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97511905

00:21:54.715 --> 00:21:56.130 I'm not gonna talk as

NOTE Confidence: 0.97511905

 $00{:}21{:}56.130 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}> 00{:}21{:}58.050$ much about localized disease in

NOTE Confidence: 0.97511905

 $00{:}21{:}58.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}59.570$ the management about around the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97511905

 $00:21:59.570 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.410$ perioperative setting, but I'm gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.97511905

 $00:22:01.410 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.070$ talk about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9511605

 $00:22:02.930 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.890$ what we do with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9511605

 $00:22:03.890 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.690$ some of some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9511605

 $00:22:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:22:06.390$ biomarkers for adjuvant therapy.

 $00:22:06.770 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.990$ So we've seen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9338804

 $00{:}22{:}08.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}10.530$ the dynamic study presented at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9338804

 $00:22:10.530 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.605$ ASCO a couple of times.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9338804 00:22:11.605 --> 00:22:12.105 It's NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:12.484 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.524$ been published in the New

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

00:22:13.524 --> 00:22:15.284 England Journal of Medicine initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:15.284 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.885$ at the two year mark,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:16.885 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.845$ and then now this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:17.845 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.524$ the five year follow-up from

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:19.524 \longrightarrow 00:22:21.284$ the DYNAMICS study. And so

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

00:22:21.284 --> 00:22:22.644 the DYNAMICS study sought to

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:22.644 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.644$ evaluate patients with stage two

NOTE Confidence: 0.98198026

 $00:22:24.644 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.865$ colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9958021

00:22:26.550 --> 00:22:28.390 and evaluated for the presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.9958021

 $00:22:28.390 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.990$ or absence of circulating tumor

 $00:22:29.990 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.490$ DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99649835

 $00:22:31.030 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.790$ And if patients had positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.99649835

00:22:32.790 --> 00:22:34.170 circulating tumor DNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98370785

 $00:22:35.350 \longrightarrow 00:22:36.790$ they were deemed high risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.98370785

 $00:22:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.510$ and and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9740867

00:22:38.150 --> 00:22:39.590 and given adjuvant the rapy. And

NOTE Confidence: 0.9740867

 $00:22:39.590 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.190$ if patients didn't have circulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.9740867

00:22:41.190 --> 00:22:42.010 tumor DNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77728343

 $00:22:43.244 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.744$ then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8078041

 $00:22:44.445 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.484$ then they when they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8078041

 $00:22:45.484 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.105$ not, so given the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9417773

 $00:22:49.565 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.185$ So this is the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9417773

 $00:22:51.244 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.445$ kind of the breakdown of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9417773

 $00:22:52.445 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.945$ patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98349273

00:22:53.565 --> 00:22:55.005 and and adjuvant therapy could

NOTE Confidence: 0.98349273

 $00:22:55.005 \longrightarrow 00:22:55.805$ be by the way, it

 $00:22:55.805 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.025$ could be well, I guess,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97864807

 $00:22:57.720 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.919$ we have it here. It

NOTE Confidence: 0.97864807

 $00:22:58.919 \longrightarrow 00:22:59.500$ could be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9731049

 $00:23:00.440 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.340$ just oxaliplatin

NOTE Confidence: 0.587386

 $00{:}23{:}01.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}02.280 \ it's,$

NOTE Confidence: 0.7171446

 $00:23:02.760 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.659$ just floropyrimidine

NOTE Confidence: 0.8492108

00:23:04.280 --> 00:23:04.840 or it could be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9679392

 $00:23:05.640 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.140$ oxaliplatin

NOTE Confidence: 0.98083496

 $00:23:06.679 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.299$ oxaliplatin based chemo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9473476

 $00:23:08.760 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.054$ When you look at these

NOTE Confidence: 0.9473476

 $00:23:10.054 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.095$ numbers, they look low because

NOTE Confidence: 0.9473476

 $00{:}23{:}11.095 \to 00{:}23{:}12.295$ why? The majority of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9473476

00:23:12.295 --> 00:23:13.434 who you test for ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9473476

 $00:23:13.575 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.695$ will be negative, even the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9473476

 $00:23:14.695 \longrightarrow 00:23:15.515$ ones that relapse.

00:23:16.695 --> 00:23:17.195 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00{:}23{:}20.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21.174$ about twenty percent of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00:23:21.174 \longrightarrow 00:23:22.875$ patients were mismatch repair deficient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00:23:23.015 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.789$ And And, again, you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00:23:23.789 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.630$ see very few, well, fifteen

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

00:23:25.630 --> 00:23:27.230 ish percent were t four

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00:23:27.230 \longrightarrow 00:23:28.429$ disease. So the majority of

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00:23:28.429 \longrightarrow 00:23:29.869$ these, patients would be t

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

00:23:29.869 --> 00:23:31.309 three n zero, so earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.93157643

 $00:23:31.309 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.809$ stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.9199435

00:23:32.269 --> 00:23:34.369 t earlier stage two tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9199435

 $00:23:34.669 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.470$ And what do we see?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9199435

 $00:23:35.470 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.434$ We saw, well, look, if

NOTE Confidence: 0.9199435

 $00:23:36.434 \longrightarrow 00:23:37.234$ if you look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9199435

 $00:23:37.234 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.475$ ctDNA guided management versus the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9199435

 $00:23:39.475 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.375$ standard management,

00:23:41.715 --> 00:23:42.835 so in the blue line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.974881

 $00{:}23{:}42.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}43.955$ if you're positive, you got

NOTE Confidence: 0.974881

00:23:43.955 --> 00:23:45.554 adjuvant therapy. If you're negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.974881

00:23:45.554 --> 00:23:46.595 you didn't. And if you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.974881

 $00:23:46.595 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.955$ in the red line, we

NOTE Confidence: 0.974881

 $00:23:47.955 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.394$ we did the standard management,

NOTE Confidence: 0.974881

 $00:23:49.394 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.695$ so the typical histopathologic

NOTE Confidence: 0.92560095

 $00:23:51.075 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.815$ risk factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92493874

 $00{:}23{:}53.760 --> 00{:}23{:}54.960$ You can see very little

NOTE Confidence: 0.92493874

00:23:54.960 --> 00:23:56.580 difference in overall survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9167867

 $00{:}23{:}57.039 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}58.720$ although arguably, maybe five year

NOTE Confidence: 0.9167867

 $00:23:58.720 \longrightarrow 00:24:00.100$ overall survival is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99523085

00:24:01.279 --> 00:24:02.480 not even long enough for

NOTE Confidence: 0.99523085

 $00:24:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.460$ stage two disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9924062

 $00:24:04.255 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.054$ But what about when we

 $00:24:05.054 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.174$ start to look at cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9924062

00:24:06.174 --> 00:24:07.155 specific survival?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9760578

00:24:07.535 --> 00:24:08.835 Again, not much difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9342617

 $00:24:09.215 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.135$ And looking about recurrence free

NOTE Confidence: 0.9342617

00:24:11.135 --> 00:24:13.375 survival, again, not much difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.9342617

 $00{:}24{:}13.375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}15.375$ with CTD guided management versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.9342617

00:24:15.375 --> 00:24:16.275 standard management.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519866

00:24:16.830 --> 00:24:18.109 If not much different, then

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519866

 $00:24:18.109 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.070$ why use it? The whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519866

 $00:24:19.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.990$ this was all predicated on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519866

 $00{:}24{:}21.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22.690$ trying to use less oxaliplatin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98629063

00:24:23.150 --> 00:24:25.309 less neuropathy, less chemotherapy, less

NOTE Confidence: 0.98629063

 $00:24:25.309 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.690$ complications from chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9407764

 $00:24:27.070 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.809$ with CTD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99683124

 $00:24:28.429 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.809$ DNA guided management.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872633

 $00:24:31.955 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.234$ But I think that when

 $00:24:33.234 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.274$ you start to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872633

 $00:24:34.274 \longrightarrow 00:24:35.554$ some of the details of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872633

 $00:24:35.554 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.994$ the subgroups, it's important to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872633

 $00:24:36.994 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.955$ know who this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872633

 $00:24:37.955 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.234$ good strategy for and who

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872633 00:24:39.234 --> 00:24:39.734 this NOTE Confidence: 0.96765643

00:24:40.115 --> 00:24:40.914 is not as good of

NOTE Confidence: 0.96765643

 $00:24:40.914 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.615$ a strategy for. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99937487

 $00:24:43.970 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.250$ there are patients that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.99937487

 $00{:}24{:}45.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}46.710$ gonna have high risk features

NOTE Confidence: 0.9784653

 $00:24:47.010 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.150$ that may be ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9724564

 $00:24:48.450 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.950$ negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91627514

 $00:24:49.490 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.869$ And what should trump what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.91627514

 $00:24:50.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:51.670$ Should ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8687155

 $00:24:52.050 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.609$ negative negativity trump t four

 $00:24:54.609 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.109$ status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9281422

 $00:24:55.570 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.830$ other high risk histopathological features?

NOTE Confidence: 0.93599796

00:24:58.585 --> 00:24:59.544 I would argue it should

NOTE Confidence: 0.93599796

00:24:59.544 --> 00:25:00.744 not trump p four status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93599796

 $00:25:00.744 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.705$ and this curve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9978218

 $00:25:02.264 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.465$ is part of my my

NOTE Confidence: 0.9978218

 $00:25:03.465 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.445$ thinking on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97840136

 $00:25:05.065 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.345$ This is a similar curve

NOTE Confidence: 0.97840136

 $00{:}25{:}06.345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}07.965$ that that was presented in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9895225

 $00:25:08.424 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.625$ the two year follow-up as

NOTE Confidence: 0.9895225

 $00:25:09.625 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.065$ well. For patients that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9895225 00:25:11.065 --> 00:25:11.565 CT

NOTE Confidence: 0.9783275

 $00:25:12.030 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.470$ that are negative, everybody on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9783275

 $00:25:13.470 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.990$ this slide here has is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9783275 00:25:14.990 --> 00:25:15.490 CT NOTE Confidence: 0.86777985

 $00:25:15.790 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.530$ DNA negative.

 $00:25:17.390 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.510$ But if your t four

NOTE Confidence: 0.9683198

00:25:18.590 --> 00:25:19.310 if you have a t

NOTE Confidence: 0.9683198

 $00:25:19.310 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.770$ four tumor and you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.98596084

00:25:21.070 --> 00:25:23.330 negative, you still have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.98596084

 $00:25:23.470 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.750$ close to a twenty percent

NOTE Confidence: 0.98596084

 $00:25:24.750 \longrightarrow 00:25:25.650$ risk of recurrence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233235

00:25:27.375 --> 00:25:28.734 And I I don't think

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233235

00:25:28.734 --> 00:25:30.595 that, that's, justifiable

NOTE Confidence: 0.9418213

 $00:25:30.895 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.195$ to kind of omit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671285

00:25:33.135 --> 00:25:34.835 chemotherapy based on this alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671285

 $00:25:35.055 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.095$ Again, this is a share

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671285

 $00:25:36.175 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.695$ an opportunity for shared decision

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671285

 $00{:}25{:}37.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38.755$ making with patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97030747

 $00:25:39.535 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.855$ but,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9371011

 $00:25:40.415 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.375$ I I worry that the

00:25:41.375 --> 00:25:42.790 negative predictive value in t

NOTE Confidence: 0.9371011

00:25:42.790 --> 00:25:43.609 four disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99750566

 $00:25:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.790$ is not as good as

NOTE Confidence: 0.99750566

 $00:25:44.790 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.530$ it could be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9509553

00:25:48.470 --> 00:25:49.910 This was another important piece

NOTE Confidence: 0.9509553

00:25:49.910 --> 00:25:51.510 of data, I think, that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9509553

 $00:25:51.510 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.550$ many of us were in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9509553

 $00:25:52.550 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.050$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9159152

 $00:25:53.510 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.450$ excited to see, at GISCO,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9788679

 $00:25:56.845 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.044$ was, well, what about what

NOTE Confidence: 0.9788679

 $00{:}25{:}58.044 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59.885$ else about ctDNA can we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9788679

 $00:26:00.205 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.244$ can we do differently in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9788679

 $00:26:01.244 \longrightarrow 00:26:02.765$ twenty twenty five? This was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9788679

00:26:02.765 --> 00:26:04.225 a study that took patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9824235

 $00:26:04.525 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.825$ after chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96611196

00:26:07.325 --> 00:26:08.684 after the surgery, I guess,

 $00{:}26{:}08.684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.544$ first, and then after adjuvant

NOTE Confidence: 0.96611196

 $00:26:10.605 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.105$ chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

00:26:11.804 --> 00:26:13.270 And And it evaluated patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

 $00{:}26{:}13.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}15.030$ that were positive, either right

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

 $00:26:15.030 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.369$ after that chemotherapy finished or

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

00:26:17.430 --> 00:26:19.350 when they were minimally residual

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

 $00:26:19.350 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.790$ disease positive when that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

00:26:20.790 --> 00:26:22.630 had a ctDNA recurrence, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

 $00:26:22.630 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.070$ tried to say, can I

NOTE Confidence: 0.92541724

 $00:26:24.070 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.130$ cure more patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.98975897

00:26:26.615 --> 00:26:29.195 by giving additional systemic therapy?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820754

 $00:26:29.655 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.335$ So patients had cured of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820754

00:26:31.335 --> 00:26:32.535 resection. Could have been stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820754

00:26:32.535 --> 00:26:33.755 four. Could have been cured

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820754

00:26:33.815 --> 00:26:35.415 of liver metastatic resection or

 $00:26:35.415 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.455$ could have been a root

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820754

00:26:36.455 --> 00:26:37.735 section of that stage two

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820754

00:26:37.735 --> 00:26:39.515 tumor, stage three tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960598

 $00:26:40.180 \longrightarrow 00:26:41.880$ They got the chemotherapy for

NOTE Confidence: 0.960598

00:26:42.020 --> 00:26:43.460 three months, six months, whatever

NOTE Confidence: 0.960598

 $00:26:43.460 \longrightarrow 00:26:45.300$ it was, and then they

NOTE Confidence: 0.960598

 $00:26:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.820$ got a c tDNA positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.960598

 $00:26:46.820 \longrightarrow 00:26:47.720$ that could have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.8358066

 $00:26:48.180 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.240$ it two months later

NOTE Confidence: 0.92252094

 $00:26:49.780 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.460$ or eight you know, eleven

NOTE Confidence: 0.92252094

 $00:26:51.460 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.095$ months later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9500321

00:26:52.655 --> 00:26:54.275 If they had that positivity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9500321

 $00:26:54.335 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.375$ they were randomized one to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9500321

 $00:26:55.375 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.075$ one to control

NOTE Confidence: 0.9907904

 $00:26:57.375 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.355$ arm of placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.99473065

00:26:58.975 --> 00:27:00.895 versus experimental arm of,

 $00:27:02.255 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.635$ trifluridin to bristle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97922945

 $00:27:04.734 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.234$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9052911

 $00:27:06.335 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.635$ followed for three years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.927973

 $00:27:08.869 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.789$ And the main endpoint was

NOTE Confidence: 0.927973

 $00{:}27{:}10.789 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}12.470$ looking at disease free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.927973

 $00:27:12.470 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.510$ And so what do we

NOTE Confidence: 0.927973

 $00:27:13.510 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.990$ see? We

NOTE Confidence: 0.9001184

 $00:27:15.109 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.649$ so this is, again, placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.9001184

 $00:27:16.789 \longrightarrow 00:27:17.450$ in red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873273

 $00:27:18.789 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.409$ investigational arm in blue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90436584

 $00:27:21.855 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.295$ a hazard ratio point seven

NOTE Confidence: 0.90436584

 $00:27:23.295 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.675$ nine that was not statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.90436584

 $00{:}27{:}24.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}26.755$ significant for disease free survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9257399

 $00:27:27.055 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.355$ but treating these persistently

NOTE Confidence: 0.8781264

 $00:27:28.655 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.155$ positive,

 $00:27:29.935 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.435$ tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98746395

 $00:27:30.975 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.135$ with additional systemic therapy. When

NOTE Confidence: 0.98746395

 $00:27:33.135 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.415$ looking only at the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.98746395

 $00:27:34.415 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.635$ with stage four disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.941451

 $00:27:36.650 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.650$ the hazard ratio was was

NOTE Confidence: 0.941451

 $00:27:38.650 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.770$ a bit better and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.941451

00:27:39.770 --> 00:27:41.210 p value also a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.941451

 $00:27:41.210 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.869$ bit better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9816216

 $00{:}27{:}42.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}44.409$ But when certainly, when looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9816216

 $00:27:44.409 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.690$ at all patients, there didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9816216

 $00:27:45.690 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.490$ seem to be as much

NOTE Confidence: 0.9816216

 $00:27:46.490 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.309$ of a benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.970499

 $00:27:47.770 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.529$ And, again, this is disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.970499

 $00:27:49.529 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.130$ free survival, and you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.970499

 $00:27:51.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.630$ see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8975014

 $00:27:52.295 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.775$ at,

 $00:27:53.255 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.695$ as as the curve as

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328331

 $00:27:54.695 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.655$ as time goes on, the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328331

 $00:27:55.655 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.855$ curves do get closer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328331

00:27:56.855 --> 00:27:58.934 closer to, unfortunately, zero. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328331

 $00:27:58.934 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.975$ what I think we're mostly

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328331

 $00:27:59.975 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.815$ just delaying recurrences in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.9328331

 $00:28:01.815 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.554$ set settings

NOTE Confidence: 0.9650757

 $00:28:03.335 \longrightarrow 00:28:04.075$ rather than,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644071

 $00:28:04.375 \longrightarrow 00:28:06.000$ rather than enhancing cure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9398808

 $00:28:06.560 \longrightarrow 00:28:07.760$ So the summary, I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9398808

 $00:28:07.760 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.740$ now for ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9150539

 $00:28:09.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:10.980$ is still incredibly prognostic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9388349

 $00:28:11.920 \longrightarrow 00:28:13.680$ in the adjuvant setting. For

NOTE Confidence: 0.9388349

 $00{:}28{:}13.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}15.359$ patients with t four stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.9388349

 $00:28:15.359 \longrightarrow 00:28:17.280$ two colorectal cancer, I to

00:28:17.280 --> 00:28:19.040 me, recurrent risk remains high

NOTE Confidence: 0.9388349

 $00:28:19.040 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.160$ even if even in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9388349

 $00:28:20.160 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.660$ ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8907607

 $00:28:21.465 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.525$ negativity setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95581317

 $00:28:23.065 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.265$ So, I would argue that

NOTE Confidence: 0.95581317

 $00{:}28{:}24.265 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}26.105$ the negative predictive value is

NOTE Confidence: 0.95581317

 $00:28:26.105 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.505$ not not sufficient to

NOTE Confidence: 0.95581317

 $00:28:28.505 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.125$ recommend widespread use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7962146

00:28:30.905 --> 00:28:31.965 to omit the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9843417

 $00{:}28{:}33.225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}34.664$ Additional studies going on in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9843417

 $00:28:34.664 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.325$ that space,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9777284

 $00:28:35.705 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.765$ some of them here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834806

 $00:28:38.080 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.279$ We don't have really any

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834806

 $00{:}28{:}39.279 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41.200$ data to support treating patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834806

 $00:28:41.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.600$ with persistently positive ctDNA after

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834806

 $00:28:43.600 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.760$ adjuvant therapy. So that's, with

 $00{:}28{:}45.760 \longrightarrow 00{:}28{:}47.440$ additional systemic therapy. So for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834806

 $00:28:47.440 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.519$ somebody that has minimally residual

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834806

 $00:28:49.519 \longrightarrow 00:28:50.340$ disease positivity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9951072

 $00:28:51.039 \longrightarrow 00:28:52.500$ I after chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94826955

 $00{:}28{:}53.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.524$ I would not recommend giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.94826955

 $00:28:54.524 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.385$ that patient additional chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95143366

 $00:28:57.804 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.005$ If there's a treadmill, that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.95143366

 $00{:}28{:}59.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}00.125$ one thing, but I wouldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.95143366

 $00:29:00.125 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.765$ do with any of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95143366

00:29:00.765 --> 00:29:01.985 standard agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9922841

00:29:03.404 --> 00:29:04.524 And so I'm gonna I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9922841

 $00:29:04.524 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.645$ gonna finish with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98315376

00:29:06.365 --> 00:29:07.885 a a quick discussion about

NOTE Confidence: 0.98315376

 $00:29:07.885 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.865$ anal cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94857997

 $00:29:09.940 \longrightarrow 00:29:10.760$ So the podium,

 $00:29:11.220 \longrightarrow 00:29:12.360$ the podium study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9758483

 $00:29:12.820 \longrightarrow 00:29:13.860$ I think that this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9758483

 $00:29:13.860 \longrightarrow 00:29:15.140$ a a very important study

NOTE Confidence: 0.9758483

 $00:29:15.140 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.920$ for a disease that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97970766

 $00:29:19.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.180$ has not seen as much

NOTE Confidence: 0.97970766

00:29:20.180 --> 00:29:21.460 development as we would like

NOTE Confidence: 0.97970766

 $00:29:21.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.280$ over the last,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7516326

 $00:29:23.235 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.735$ decade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87933856

00:29:24.755 --> 00:29:26.275 Evaluating patients with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94107175

 $00:29:26.835 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.335$ metastatic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83001715

 $00:29:27.635 \longrightarrow 00:29:29.155$ so no prior treatment for

NOTE Confidence: 0.83001715

 $00:29:29.155 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.515$ metastatic disease, all the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.83001715

 $00:29:30.515 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.075$ to those,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7530987

 $00:29:31.955 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.135$ neoadjuvant therapy and relapse

NOTE Confidence: 0.7626487

 $00:29:34.595 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.415$ with carboplatin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76396614

 $00:29:36.370 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.590$ plus retin filumab,

 $00:29:38.049 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.030$ anti p one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94322205

 $00:29:39.490 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.990$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85696

00:29:40.770 --> 00:29:42.549 versus placebo plus carboplacam,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84690666

 $00:29:43.090 \longrightarrow 00:29:43.590$ craglitaxel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9826296

 $00:29:44.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.030$ And,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916068

 $00:29:45.409 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.809$ the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90681255

 $00:29:46.770 \longrightarrow 00:29:48.309$ the the trial's

NOTE Confidence: 0.96171236

 $00{:}29{:}48.715 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}50.555$ primary endpoint was PFS, but

NOTE Confidence: 0.96171236

 $00:29:50.555 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.835$ also, of course, looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.96171236

00:29:51.835 --> 00:29:52.735 overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92209834

 $00:29:53.195 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.495$ So, it was a well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90415925

00:29:55.195 --> 00:29:56.495 well designed study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9220374

 $00:29:57.515 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.715$ We use a very reasonable

NOTE Confidence: 0.9220374

 $00:29:58.715 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.835$ size. This is a hard

NOTE Confidence: 0.9220374

 $00:29:59.835 \longrightarrow 00:30:01.115$ study to do in this

 $00:30:01.115 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.415$ subtype of the disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799239

 $00:30:03.160 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.360$ as many of these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799239

 $00:30:04.360 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.640$ are cured. But those that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799239

 $00:30:05.640 \longrightarrow 00:30:07.080$ are not cured have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799239

 $00:30:07.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.080$ very poor survival, and, it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799239

 $00:30:09.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.280$ a rare cancer to begin

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799239

 $00:30:10.280 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.780$ with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93404865

 $00:30:12.200 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.240$ So we saw it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.93404865

 $00{:}30{:}13.240 --> 00{:}30{:}13.740 \ \mathrm{primarily},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.9764822

00:30:14.600 --> 00:30:16.780 primarily a female population, primarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.9764822

 $00{:}30{:}16.840 --> 00{:}30{:}17.340$ white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93113333

 $00:30:17.960 \longrightarrow 00:30:19.125$ So that gives us some

NOTE Confidence: 0.93113333

 $00:30:19.125 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.185$ questions about generalizability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8235553

 $00:30:22.725 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.705$ And then patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9214555

 $00:30:24.565 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.445$ a lot of about a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9214555

 $00{:}30{:}25.445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}26.325$ third of patients with both

 $00{:}30{:}26.325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}28.245$ arms had metastatic disease, very

NOTE Confidence: 0.9214555

 $00:30:28.245 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.865$ low rates of HIV positivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9214555

 $00:30:30.085 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.585$ Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87548995

 $00:30:31.205 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.725$ these are raising questions about

NOTE Confidence: 0.87548995

 $00:30:32.725 \longrightarrow 00:30:33.225$ generalizability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9613887

00:30:34.010 --> 00:30:35.210 Most patients had some PD

NOTE Confidence: 0.9613887

 $00:30:35.210 \longrightarrow 00:30:36.730$ L1 expression. So what did

NOTE Confidence: 0.9613887

 $00:30:36.730 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.930$ we see for progression free

NOTE Confidence: 0.9613887

 $00:30:37.930 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.430$ survival?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00:30:38.730 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.170$ We saw nine point three

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00:30:40.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.530$ versus seven point four months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00:30:41.530 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.250$ So you see there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00{:}30{:}42.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}43.530$ some separation of these curves

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00{:}30{:}43.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}45.310$ here. This is statistically significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00:30:45.450 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.490$ A hazard ratio of point

 $00:30:46.490 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.225$ six three. This looks great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92575306

 $00:30:48.465 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.325$ Definitely suggest that rifapilimumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.99802667

 $00:30:50.945 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.005$ is playing a role,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891172

 $00:30:52.465 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.905$ in the improvement here. And

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891172

 $00:30:53.905 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.945$ when we look at overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891172

00:30:54.945 --> 00:30:56.785 survival, you can see, again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891172

00:30:56.785 --> 00:30:58.225 twenty nine point two months

NOTE Confidence: 0.9891172

 $00:30:58.225 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.945$ with the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99438065

 $00{:}30{:}59.345 --> 00{:}30{:}59.845 \text{ immunotherapy}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.91690415

 $00:31:00.145 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.285$ added on to the carboplatin

NOTE Confidence: 0.98494935

 $00:31:01.860 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.059$ versus twenty three months with

NOTE Confidence: 0.98494935

 $00:31:03.059 \longrightarrow 00:31:04.360$ the chemotherapy alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90558594

 $00{:}31{:}04.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}06.420$ Hazard ratio, point seven. P

NOTE Confidence: 0.90558594

 $00:31:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:31:07.860$ value, less than point o

NOTE Confidence: 0.90558594

 $00:31:07.860 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.460$ five. Although, because this was

NOTE Confidence: 0.90558594

 $00:31:09.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.200$ an interim

 $00:31:10.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:11.480$ look at the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9860544

 $00:31:13.140 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.500$ at the overall survival, this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9860544

 $00:31:14.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.680$ doesn't technically meet statistical significance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9676574

00:31:17.415 --> 00:31:18.875 But, again, this is interim.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9676574

 $00:31:19.015 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.135$ I think many of us

NOTE Confidence: 0.9676574

 $00:31:20.135 \longrightarrow 00:31:21.275$ expect this to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9642246

 $00:31:21.975 \longrightarrow 00:31:23.815$ hold over time and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9642246

 $00:31:23.815 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.275$ gain statistical significance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9912193

 $00:31:27.015 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.895$ This made it as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9912193

 $00:31:27.895 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.395$ category

NOTE Confidence: 0.84183615

 $00:31:28.695 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.835$ two b, so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95518273

 $00{:}31{:}30.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}31.890$ a recommendation as first line

NOTE Confidence: 0.95518273

 $00:31:31.890 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.409$ therapy. I think when the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95518273

 $00{:}31{:}33.409 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}35.090$ overall survival data is mature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95518273

 $00:31:35.090 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.970$ as long as it supports

 $00:31:35.970 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.350$ its use, I would expect

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842874

 $00{:}31{:}37.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}39.669$ this this recommendation to become

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842874

 $00:31:39.809 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.169$ a bit firmer. But at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842874

 $00:31:41.169 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.370$ the moment, it is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842874

 $00:31:42.370 \longrightarrow 00:31:43.669$ category two b,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9920063

 $00:31:44.690 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.909$ for first line therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9902649

 $00:31:47.384 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.245$ So I'm gonna end here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9892032

 $00:31:49.784 \longrightarrow 00:31:50.904$ So I just wanted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9892032

 $00{:}31{:}50.904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}52.505$ quickly summarize and unpack some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9892032

 $00:31:52.505 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.625$ of the the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8987856

 $00:31:54.345 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.445$ points we discussed. And BRAFV600

NOTE Confidence: 0.9282408

 $00:31:56.985 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.100$ e now has a, a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9282408

 $00:31:59.179 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.380$ new approval and a new

NOTE Confidence: 0.9282408

00:32:00.380 --> 00:32:01.900 strategy for first line treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.9282408

00:32:01.900 --> 00:32:03.840 with Foflox, engraft, and ipincetuximab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98606265

 $00:32:04.460 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.500$ the standard of care for

 $00:32:05.500 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.559$ metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96867347

 $00{:}32{:}08.059 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}09.760$ as the initial therapy now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96867347

 $00:32:09.820 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.320$ Ipilimumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.95225567

 $00{:}32{:}10.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}12.460$ and nivolumab should be considered,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95225567

 $00:32:12.460 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.340$ I think, for the majority

NOTE Confidence: 0.95225567

 $00:32:13.340 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.880$ of patients as initial therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75451034

00:32:16.095 --> 00:32:17.935 added for mismatch repair deficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.75451034

00:32:17.935 --> 00:32:18.435 disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72717863

00:32:18.895 --> 00:32:19.395 adagrasimstuximab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7003477

 $00:32:20.255 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.755$ seracipentumab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9763055

 $00:32:21.935 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.195$ both acceptable regimens for refractory

NOTE Confidence: 0.9763055

 $00{:}32{:}24.335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}26.115$ g twelve c
 mutated tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9858646

 $00{:}32{:}26.495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}27.795$ And I think while ctDNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9858646

 $00:32:27.935 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.835$ is very promising,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85544455

00:32:30.019 --> 00:32:31.639 its negative predictive value,

 $00:32:32.419 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.779$ is is not sufficient for

NOTE Confidence: 0.91532874

 $00:32:33.779 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.980$ me to use it as

NOTE Confidence: 0.91532874

 $00:32:34.980 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.820$ a as a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.91532874

 $00:32:36.820 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.200$ tool to omit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9446195

 $00:32:39.059 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.820$ adjuvant therapy for patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9446195

00:32:40.820 --> 00:32:41.960 PT four disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9131096

 $00:32:42.899 \longrightarrow 00:32:44.580$ where recurrent rates still are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9131096

 $00:32:44.580 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.799$ around twenty percent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9468046

 $00:32:47.035 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.395$ And I'm very encouraged by

NOTE Confidence: 0.9468046

 $00:32:48.395 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.455$ the data with retinolumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332144

00:32:50.475 --> 00:32:51.675 I'm I'm looking forward to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332144

00:32:51.675 --> 00:32:53.355 the overall survival, hopefully, at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332144

 $00:32:53.355 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.335$ a future congress.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9994583

00:32:55.675 --> 00:32:56.415 I will

NOTE Confidence: 0.9836006

 $00:32:56.715 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.655$ stop here, and we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.9836006

 $00{:}32{:}58.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}00.815$ we can discuss any questions

 $00:33:00.875 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.375$ that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336152

 $00:33:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.770$ hadn't you ended up come

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336152

 $00:33:04.770 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.650$ through or that you wanna

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336152

00:33:05.650 --> 00:33:06.850 ask, and then I will

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336152

 $00:33:06.850 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.970$ pass the baton over to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336152

 $00{:}33{:}07.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}08.950$ you for your presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295702

00:33:09.330 --> 00:33:10.610 Alright. I'm gonna start with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295702

00:33:10.610 --> 00:33:11.810 an audience question that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295702

 $00:33:11.810 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.850$ might have my own. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295702

00:33:13.090 --> 00:33:14.610 question from the audience. First,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9295702

 $00{:}33{:}14.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.910$ they said a mazing presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9931884 00:33:17.170 --> 00:33:17.670 So

NOTE Confidence: 0.8537991

00:33:18.105 --> 00:33:18.925 agree completely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9803736

00:33:19.465 --> 00:33:20.265 The question was, do you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9803736

00:33:20.265 --> 00:33:21.625 see any prospect of vaccines

 $00:33:21.625 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.225$ for treatment in colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9803736

 $00:33:23.225 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.125$ in the future?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94915974

 $00:33:25.225 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.525$ Yeah. What a great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8976823

00:33:27.545 --> 00:33:28.445 So I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96465355

 $00:33:29.705 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.825$ as I mentioned, co direct

NOTE Confidence: 0.96465355

00:33:30.825 --> 00:33:32.525 our colorectal cancer program

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664652

 $00:33:33.070 \longrightarrow 00:33:34.430$ and treat patients with standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664652

00:33:34.430 --> 00:33:35.550 of care treatments. But I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664652

 $00{:}33{:}35.550 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}33{:}36.590$ also am a phase one

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664652

 $00{:}33{:}36.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}38.110$ investigator here at Yale. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9664652 00:33:38.110 --> 00:33:38.610 I, NOTE Confidence: 0.99641514

 $00:33:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:40.750$ have been involved in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.99641514

00:33:40.750 --> 00:33:42.130 number of vaccine trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.8831464

 $00:33:42.750 \longrightarrow 00:33:43.250$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9918411

 $00:33:43.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.250$ certainly follow this literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95968574

 $00:33:46.995 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.955$ I I do think that

 $00:33:47.955 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.095$ the promise of vaccines

NOTE Confidence: 0.99356556

 $00:33:49.795 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.135$ is is very solid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9986406 00:33:52.915 --> 00:33:53.415 The NOTE Confidence: 0.99420875

 $00:33:53.875 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.795$ problem thus far has really

NOTE Confidence: 0.99420875

00:33:55.795 --> 00:33:58.215 been how we've studied vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.99420875

 $00:33:58.275 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.015$ based therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8943571

 $00:34:00.370 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.590$ I think the paradigm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9425898

 $00:34:01.890 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.250$ of drug development has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.9425898

 $00:34:03.250 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.210$ to study drugs in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9425898

 $00:34:04.210 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.809$ advanced setting first, make sure

NOTE Confidence: 0.9425898

 $00:34:05.809 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.710$ you see a signal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9454421

 $00:34:07.090 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.290$ and then hopefully move them

NOTE Confidence: 0.9454421

 $00{:}34{:}08.290 --> 00{:}34{:}09.030$ up earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8649903

00:34:09.489 --> 00:34:11.170 But vaccines, I think, maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8649903

 $00:34:11.170 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.150$ it's certainly different.

 $00:34:13.170 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.724$ And maybe arguably, that should

NOTE Confidence: 0.9587898

 $00:34:14.724 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.085$ all be different. But but

NOTE Confidence: 0.9587898

00:34:16.085 --> 00:34:18.005 vaccines, I think, we're probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.9587898

 $00:34:18.005 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.445$ not setting ourselves up for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9587898

 $00:34:19.445 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.645$ success in terms of their

NOTE Confidence: 0.9587898

 $00:34:20.645 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.145$ effectiveness

NOTE Confidence: 0.957914

 $00:34:21.765 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.005$ in the treatment refractory setting

NOTE Confidence: 0.957914

 $00:34:24.005 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.045$ and where the immune system

NOTE Confidence: 0.957914

00:34:25.045 --> 00:34:26.344 is a lot more dysfunctional

NOTE Confidence: 0.957914

 $00:34:26.484 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.085$ or tumor burden is very

NOTE Confidence: 0.957914

 $00{:}34{:}28.085 --> 00{:}34{:}28.585 \text{ high}.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238996

 $00:34:29.469 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.590$ Probably as a rule for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238996

00:34:30.590 --> 00:34:31.870 immunotherapy, but but I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238996

 $00:34:31.870 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.989$ vaccines may be even more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238996

 $00:34:32.989 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.370$ extreme example of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9744532

 $00{:}34{:}34.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}36.370$ And so I we've seen

 $00:34:36.590 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.210$ data in pancreas cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90678984

 $00{:}34{:}38.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}41.330$ another cancer with, I arguably,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90678984

 $00:34:41.390 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.670$ a very high unmet need

NOTE Confidence: 0.90678984

 $00:34:42.670 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.969$ like colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.943503

 $00:34:44.565 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.685$ that a vaccine in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.943503

 $00{:}34{:}45.685 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}47.204$ adjuvant setting when there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.943503

 $00:34:47.204 \longrightarrow 00:34:48.344$ no visible cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9625526

 $00:34:48.724 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.844$ showed promise in a small

NOTE Confidence: 0.9625526

 $00{:}34{:}49.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51.125$ subset of patients because that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9625526

 $00:34:51.125 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.265$ all that was studied.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9697749

 $00:34:53.045 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.005$ And we've seen some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9697749

 $00{:}34{:}54.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55.464$ that data actually for colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9697749

 $00{:}34{:}55.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}57.330$ cancer too. There's a Nature

NOTE Confidence: 0.9697749

 $00{:}34{:}57.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}59.170$ Medicine paper with a KRAS

NOTE Confidence: 0.9697749

 $00{:}34{:}59.170 --> 00{:}34{:}59.670 \ {\rm vaccine}$

 $00:35:01.170 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.570$ that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9374879

00:35:02.770 --> 00:35:04.130 I I think looks promising

NOTE Confidence: 0.9374879

 $00:35:04.130 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.330$ for patients that had liver

NOTE Confidence: 0.9374879

 $00:35:05.330 \longrightarrow 00:35:07.489$ metastases resected then didn't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9374879

 $00:35:07.489 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.850$ any evidence of disease. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9374879

 $00:35:08.850 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.130$ again, the authors of that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9374879

 $00:35:10.130 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.430$ study was published in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86685574

00:35:11.885 --> 00:35:12.844 it was nature it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.86685574

00:35:12.844 --> 00:35:13.984 one of the nature journals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:15.325 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.364$ that looked at it in

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:16.364 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.405$ a minimal the the authors

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:17.405 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.964$ looked at it in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:17.964 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.565$ minimal residual disease setting, but

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00{:}35{:}19.565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}21.085$ after a metastectomy, and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:21.085 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.425$ showed certainly showed impressive signals

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00{:}35{:}23.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25.244$ of potential success, and I

 $00:35:25.244 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.780$ hope that work will continue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:26.920 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.719$ So I do I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:27.719 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.520$ think there is a role

NOTE Confidence: 0.93688875

 $00:35:28.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.260$ for vaccines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985729

 $00:35:29.560 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.280$ I think we need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.985729

 $00:35:30.280 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.239$ be smart about how we

NOTE Confidence: 0.985729

 $00:35:31.239 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.700$ use them, and it's it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.985729

00:35:32.760 --> 00:35:33.800 it's moving these types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.985729

 $00:35:33.800 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.500$ the rapies up earlier in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98827857

 $00:35:36.040 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.080$ in the in the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.98827857

 $00:35:37.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.580$ paradigm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9013052

 $00:35:37.880 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.400$ even even for their early

NOTE Confidence: 0.9013052

 $00{:}35{:}39.400 --> 00{:}35{:}39.900 \ {\rm development}.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.9795872

 $00:35:41.315 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.135$ So yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99815017

 $00:35:43.635 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.454$ Alright. Well,

 $00:35:45.234 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.835$ I I completely agree with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9937834

 $00:35:46.835 \longrightarrow 00:35:47.734$ the previous

NOTE Confidence: 0.72552717

 $00:35:48.674 \longrightarrow 00:35:49.875$ person about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99423647

00:35:50.275 --> 00:35:51.094 great presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

 $00:35:52.820 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.020$ In in disclosure, we I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

 $00{:}35{:}54.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}55.140$ asked I asked doctor Keeney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

00:35:55.140 --> 00:35:55.619 I said, do you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

00:35:55.619 --> 00:35:56.500 any questions you want me

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

 $00:35:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.980$ to ask? And he said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

 $00:35:56.980 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.780$ no. I'm gonna be on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

 $00{:}35{:}57.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}58.739$ my toes. He'll be set

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471

 $00:35:58.739 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.780$ to be ready for anything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9244471 00:35:59.780 --> 00:36:00.280 So, NOTE Confidence: 0.91342264

 $00:36:00.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.700$ just a little bit about

NOTE Confidence: 0.91342264

 $00:36:01.700 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.739$ detail. I really liked what

NOTE Confidence: 0.91342264

 $00{:}36{:}02.739 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}03.940$ you talked about, the DYNAMIC

 $00:36:03.940 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.440$ study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96305305

00:36:05.540 --> 00:36:06.180 You said that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

 $00:36:06.905 \longrightarrow 00:36:08.605$ where did those T4 patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

00:36:08.665 --> 00:36:09.785 recur? I wonder if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

 $00:36:09.785 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.224$ think that the T4 patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

 $00:36:11.224 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.185$ were much more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

00:36:12.185 --> 00:36:14.344 recur as peritoneal based disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

 $00:36:14.344 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.464$ as opposed to nodal or

NOTE Confidence: 0.9657974

 $00:36:15.464 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.285$ liver metastases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9908055

 $00:36:16.905 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.505$ and maybe that's why circulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.9908055

 $00:36:18.505 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.105$ tumor DNA was not so

NOTE Confidence: 0.9908055

00:36:20.105 --> 00:36:21.805 effective in picking it up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7313247

 $00:36:22.210 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.510$ Can you explain on it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7313247

00:36:23.570 --> 00:36:24.469 Site specific,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9628868

00:36:25.090 --> 00:36:26.850 utility for ctDNA, you know,

 $00:36:26.850 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.250$ perineal versus more hematologic or

NOTE Confidence: 0.9628868

 $00:36:29.250 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.750$ lymphatic?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931639

 $00:36:30.690 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.730$ Yeah. No. That's a great

NOTE Confidence: 0.931639

 $00:36:31.730 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.230$ question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93394965

 $00:36:32.770 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.410$ I think the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9565017

 $00{:}36{:}34.905 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}36.105$ unfortunately, we don't have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9565017

 $00:36:36.105 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.145$ data from the paper. If

NOTE Confidence: 0.9565017

 $00:36:37.145 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.785$ it's in there, I would

NOTE Confidence: 0.9565017

 $00:36:37.785 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.425$ have to look in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9565017

 $00:36:38.425 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.925$ supplementary

NOTE Confidence: 0.93135464

 $00{:}36{:}39.305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}40.985$ for where the recurrence was

NOTE Confidence: 0.93135464

 $00:36:40.985 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.105$ though. But you do bring

NOTE Confidence: 0.93135464

 $00:36:42.105 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.065$ up some good points. Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93135464

 $00:36:43.065 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.945$ so first of all, one

NOTE Confidence: 0.93135464

 $00:36:43.945 \longrightarrow 00:36:45.565$ of the points is unfortunately

NOTE Confidence: 0.93135464

00:36:45.705 --> 00:36:47.165 t four disease

00:36:47.630 --> 00:36:49.710 is incredibly prognostic. Obviously, lymph

NOTE Confidence: 0.8809776

 $00:36:49.710 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.010$ node status is two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92230535

 $00:36:51.390 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.510$ but we know that stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.92230535

 $00:36:52.510 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.110$ three a tumors have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.92230535

00:36:54.110 --> 00:36:55.950 better survival, frankly, than T4

NOTE Confidence: 0.92230535

 $00{:}36{:}55.950 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}36{:}57.390$ tumors that are just stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.92230535

 $00:36:57.390 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.670$ two. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98620176

 $00{:}36{:}58.989 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}00.190$ so that's a very important

NOTE Confidence: 0.98620176

 $00:37:00.190 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.690$ prognostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.9773491

 $00:37:00.989 \dashrightarrow 00:37:03.425$ marker just for relapsed anywhere.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9773491

 $00{:}37{:}03.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}04.765$ But as you point out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9773491

 $00:37:04.765 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.125$ are there different areas of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9773491

 $00:37:06.125 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.785$ the body

NOTE Confidence: 0.9638638

00:37:07.405 --> 00:37:08.925 that recurrence is more likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.9638638

 $00:37:08.925 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.364$ to be detected by circulating

 $00:37:10.364 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.485$ tumor DNA? And the answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9638638

 $00:37:11.485 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.625$ is certainly yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8841694

 $00{:}37{:}13.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}14.864$ Makes sense if there's hematogenous

NOTE Confidence: 0.7831309

 $00:37:15.245 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.745$ spread,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96119153

 $00:37:16.640 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.920$ a blood based test may

NOTE Confidence: 0.96119153

 $00:37:17.920 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.300$ be better picking that up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:19.600 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.280$ So peritoneal disease is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

00:37:21.280 --> 00:37:21.920 a little bit of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

00:37:21.920 --> 00:37:23.280 blind spot, I would say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:23.280 \dashrightarrow 00:37:24.960$ for for circulating tumor DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:37:25.840$ Now that does not mean

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:25.840 \longrightarrow 00:37:27.300$ you cannot have a positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00{:}37{:}27.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}29.625$ result for peritoneal disease, but

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:29.785 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.665$ certainly it seems like you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:30.665 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.705$ less likely to have that

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00{:}37{:}31.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}33.325$ compared to a liver metastases

 $00:37:33.545 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.985$ or a lung metastases or

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00{:}37{:}34.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}36.185$ something like that. I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.95808345

 $00:37:36.185 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.005$ liver metastases

NOTE Confidence: 0.9972472

 $00:37:37.385 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.765$ are probably the strongest

NOTE Confidence: 0.9829621

 $00:37:39.864 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.385$ correlation to having a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9829621

 $00:37:41.385 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.445$ positive ctDNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99773324

 $00:37:47.690 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.190$ Alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99823076

00:37:48.890 --> 00:37:49.370 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00:37:50.090 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.530$ please put your additional questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00:37:51.530 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.570$ through the chat. We'll have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00:37:52.570 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.090$ some time for kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00:37:54.090 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.050$ both of us to answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00{:}37{:}55.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}56.170$ them at the end. But

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

00:37:56.170 --> 00:37:57.210 now I'm gonna pass the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00:37:57.210 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.730$ baton over to doctor Hatten

 $00:37:58.730 \longrightarrow 00:37:59.975$ Pintell to do his his

NOTE Confidence: 0.9575341

 $00:37:59.975 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.475$ presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9964129

00:38:01.175 --> 00:38:02.715 Alright. Tough act to follow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.976425

 $00:38:03.575 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.535$ Hopefully, I think I'll be

NOTE Confidence: 0.976425

 $00:38:04.535 \longrightarrow 00:38:05.735$ around the twenty minute mark,

NOTE Confidence: 0.976425

 $00:38:05.735 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.795$ and we should be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8866432

 $00:38:07.575 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.955$ hopefully done around,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95218277

 $00:38:09.655 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.695$ seven. So I'm gonna just

NOTE Confidence: 0.95218277

 $00{:}38{:}10.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}11.995$ share my screen here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80778235

 $00:38:14.700 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.200$ Let's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9992529 00:38:16.380 --> 00:38:16.880 see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98856574

 $00:38:24.460 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.980$ Alright. Does that look okay

NOTE Confidence: 0.98856574

 $00:38:25.980 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.200$ just before I get started?

NOTE Confidence: 0.99905443

 $00:38:29.155 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.175$ It does. Yes. Okay. Alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96856004

 $00:38:31.875 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.995$ So thank you everyone for

NOTE Confidence: 0.96856004

 $00:38:32.995 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.615$ your time this this evening,

 $00:38:34.755 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.255$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94996685

 $00{:}38{:}36.275 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}38.115$ hopefully, this just, generates some

NOTE Confidence: 0.94996685

00:38:38.115 --> 00:38:39.635 questions and and, hopefully, some

NOTE Confidence: 0.94996685

 $00:38:39.635 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.475$ answers as well. So I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.94996685

 $00{:}38{:}41.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}43.095$ Hadden Pantel. I'm a colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.94996685

00:38:43.235 --> 00:38:44.130 surgeon here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99957216

 $00:38:44.849 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.230$ These are my disclosures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903292

00:38:47.730 --> 00:38:49.250 Before I start into a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903292

 $00:38:49.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.369$ little bit of the education

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903292

00:38:50.369 --> 00:38:51.329 part, I actually just wanna

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903292

 $00:38:51.329 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.289$ start with a call to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903292

 $00:38:52.289 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.789$ action.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96406966

 $00:38:53.410 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.849$ So as as, hopefully, some

NOTE Confidence: 0.96406966

00:38:54.849 --> 00:38:55.910 of you guys know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9493747

 $00{:}38{:}56.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}58.549$ March is Colorectal Cancer Awareness

00:38:58.609 --> 00:38:58.995 Month.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9723689

 $00{:}38{:}59.875 --> 00{:}39{:}00.195 \ \mathrm{And},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

00:39:01.635 --> 00:39:03.075 I've sort of started thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00:39:03.075 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.275$ about that a fair amount.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00:39:04.275 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.315$ I actually started thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00:39:05.315 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.355$ this even back when I

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00:39:06.355 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.475$ was a fellow. I, you

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

00:39:07.475 --> 00:39:09.155 know, I it's most people

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00{:}39{:}09.155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}11.075$ are probably aware October is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00{:}39{:}11.395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}13.400$ Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00:39:13.400 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.760$ think, one is a high

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

00:39:14.760 --> 00:39:16.680 prevalence of disease, but Breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.97060657

 $00:39:16.680 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.860$ Cancer Awareness Month, has these

NOTE Confidence: 0.96672344

00:39:19.239 --> 00:39:20.540 very high profile,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99104244

 $00:39:21.239 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.160$ public health campaigns supported by

NOTE Confidence: 0.99104244

 $00:39:23.160 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.739$ the NFL,

00:39:24.200 --> 00:39:25.094 Major League Baseball.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95428526

 $00:39:26.135 \longrightarrow 00:39:26.935$ There's a lot of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.990612

00:39:27.575 --> 00:39:29.415 industry and marketing tie ins

NOTE Confidence: 0.990612

 $00:39:29.415 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.655$ with pink ribbons and wearing

NOTE Confidence: 0.990612

 $00:39:31.655 \longrightarrow 00:39:33.114$ pink and things like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.994127

00:39:34.295 --> 00:39:35.655 So it's been, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.994127

00:39:35.655 --> 00:39:37.114 a very highly visible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834674

 $00{:}39{:}38.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}40.090$ you know, public health awareness

NOTE Confidence: 0.9834674

 $00:39:40.230 \longrightarrow 00:39:40.730$ campaign.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98879117

 $00:39:42.790 \longrightarrow 00:39:43.989$ You know, how have we

NOTE Confidence: 0.98879117

00:39:43.989 --> 00:39:44.489 done?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9829961

 $00:39:45.110 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.550$ So two thousand one is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9829961

 $00:39:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.850$ when March was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97164035

 $00:39{:}48.469 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}50.550$ designated as Colorectal Cancer Awareness

NOTE Confidence: 0.97164035

 $00:39:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.989$ Month. That was under, Bill

 $00:39:51.989 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.489$ Clinton.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9944385

 $00:39:53.295 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.795$ And,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97292113

 $00:39:55.295 \longrightarrow 00:39:56.335$ since that time, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97292113

 $00:39:56.335 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.135$ there's been a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.97292113

 $00:39:57.135 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.255$ things to raise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99536645

 $00:39:58.575 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.075$ awareness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9790776

 $00:40:00.094 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.055$ I think there's a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.9790776

 $00:40:01.055 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.134$ of things about it. Instead

NOTE Confidence: 0.9790776

00:40:02.134 --> 00:40:03.694 of pink, they picked blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9790776

 $00:40:03.694 \longrightarrow 00:40:04.655$ I'm not sure how blue

NOTE Confidence: 0.9790776

 $00{:}40{:}04.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}05.700$ is the colon, but

NOTE Confidence: 0.9448676

 $00:40:06.500 \longrightarrow 00:40:08.040$ unless we arrived at blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00:40:08.980 \longrightarrow 00:40:10.020$ And and so there's been

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00{:}40{:}10.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}11.140$ a lot of push to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00:40:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.660$ sort of promote our own

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00:40:12.660 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.780$ month, and and here we

 $00:40:13.780 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.900$ are. I think this this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00:40:14.900 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.420$ event itself is probably a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00:40:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.300$ sort of a tie in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9913428

 $00:40:17.300 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.960$ from that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8779586

00:40:18.414 --> 00:40:19.234 And and so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91586655

 $00:40:19.775 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.974$ it just kinda got me

NOTE Confidence: 0.91586655

 $00:40:20.974 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.474$ wondering,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9904474

00:40:21.775 --> 00:40:24.674 is this public campaign helpful?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9727967

 $00:40:25.375 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.494$ How does it do? Here's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9727967

 $00{:}40{:}26.494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}28.174$ information from our own

NOTE Confidence: 0.9727967

 $00:40:28.174 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.674$ institution,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9385315

00:40:29.614 --> 00:40:30.734 with with our own doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.9385315

00:40:30.734 --> 00:40:31.795 Giacchini here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

00:40:32.255 --> 00:40:34.680 talking about, one, public interest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

 $00:40:34.980 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.100$ And then sort of I

00:40:36.100 --> 00:40:37.400 I sort of started wondering,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

 $00:40:37.620 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.239$ well, we get people talking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

 $00:40:39.380 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.500$ but what do we do?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

 $00:40:40.500 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.700$ I feel, a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

 $00:40:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.820$ times in medicine as as

NOTE Confidence: 0.94870263

 $00:40:42.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.880$ a surgeon specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:44.420 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.219$ there's a lot of, you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

00:40:45.219 --> 00:40:46.580 know, writing notes and saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00{:}40{:}46.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}48.020$ things and having conferences, but

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:48.020 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.305$ what are we actually doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00{:}40{:}49.305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50.825$ for our patients? And that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:50.825 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.785$ really what I want this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:51.785 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.065$ sort of call to action

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:53.065 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.025$ to be and really sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:54.025 \longrightarrow 00:40:55.145$ of what got me wondering

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862391

 $00:40:55.145 \longrightarrow 00:40:55.885$ about this.

 $00:40:57.065 \longrightarrow 00:40:57.565$ So

NOTE Confidence: 0.974421

 $00:40:58.025 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.344$ when,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

00:40:58.905 --> 00:41:00.105 whenever you have a question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:00.105 \longrightarrow 00:41:01.239$ what do you do? You

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:01.239 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.680$ Google it. This is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:02.680 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.680$ really interesting website. It's Google

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:04.680 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.960$ Trends. If if anyone wants

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:05.960 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.920$ to look this up, they

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:06.920 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.140$ can. This is a screenshot

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:41:09.640$ from it last night. You

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:09.640 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.600$ know, this is what people

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868842

 $00:41:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.580$ are looking at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96944004

 $00:41:12.935 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.215$ So you can get pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.96944004

 $00:41:14.215 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.815$ good data. This actually goes

NOTE Confidence: 0.96944004

 $00:41:15.815 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.855$ back quite far, and you

00:41:16.855 --> 00:41:17.594 and you can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55142194 00:41:18.455 --> 00:41:18.955 use NOTE Confidence: 0.9349822

 $00:41:19.815 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.175$ this search terms, but also

NOTE Confidence: 0.9349822

00:41:21.175 --> 00:41:22.614 related search terms to build

NOTE Confidence: 0.9349822

 $00:41:22.614 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.055$ on on, like, concepts and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9349822

 $00:41:24.055 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.915$ things like that. And so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9219758

 $00:41:28.230 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.270$ you know, I looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9219758

 $00:41:29.270 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.770$ specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.94645387

 $00{:}41{:}30.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}31.910$ colon cancer. This actually has

NOTE Confidence: 0.94645387

00:41:31.910 --> 00:41:33.350 data from the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94645387

00:41:33.350 --> 00:41:34.230 but also I looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.94645387

 $00:41:34.230 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.430$ data from the UK or

NOTE Confidence: 0.94645387

 $00:41:35.430 \longrightarrow 00:41:36.170$ bowel cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99003106

 $00:41:36.630 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.590$ and a and a bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.99003106

 $00:41:37.590 \longrightarrow 00:41:38.710$ of other words. As you

NOTE Confidence: 0.99003106

 $00:41:38.710 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.250$ can see, we've got

 $00:41:40.785 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.565$ the search interest or popularity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96676785

 $00:41:42.704 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.984$ It's a scale of zero

NOTE Confidence: 0.96676785

 $00:41:43.984 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.805$ to a hundred,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:45.344 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.305$ and then this is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:46.305 \longrightarrow 00:41:47.825$ data by month. And if

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:47.825 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.864$ you look at the blue

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:48.864 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.145$ squares, I use blue because

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:50.145 \longrightarrow 00:41:51.424$ blue is March for colon

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00{:}41{:}51.424 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}53.025$ cancer awareness month, you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

00:41:53.025 --> 00:41:54.145 see here that there's these

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:54.145 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.580$ peaks. And, actually, if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:55.739 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.620$ when we looked at this

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00{:}41{:}56.620 --> 00{:}41{:}57.739$ data, we we fed it

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

00:41:57.739 --> 00:41:59.900 with a sinusoidal model looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.96929723

 $00:41:59.900 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.100$ at, is it quarterly? Is

 $00:42:01.100 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.000$ there a lag?

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

00:42:03.739 --> 00:42:04.860 Is it every you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:04.860 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.540$ should this the cycle, be

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:06.540 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.820$ every twelve months? And and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:07.820 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.820$ in fact, this data does

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:09.820 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.474$ fit that that model. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:11.474 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.075$ you do see a peak.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:13.075 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.714$ I think you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:13.714 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.515$ it just with your eye.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

00:42:14.515 --> 00:42:15.234 I don't think you need

NOTE Confidence: 0.98074764

 $00:42:15.234 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.775$ the statistics behind it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9970063

 $00:42:17.154 \longrightarrow 00:42:18.434$ but but they are relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.9970063

 $00:42:18.434 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.654$ to what's coming later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9960874

 $00:42:20.035 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.234$ But, I think you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.9960874

 $00:42:21.234 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.974$ see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9015356

 $00:42:22.275 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.974$ if you look at has

 $00:42:24.035 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.065$ March as colorectal care

NOTE Confidence: 0.851949

 $00:42:26.114 \longrightarrow 00:42:28.030$ sorry. Sorry. Colorectal cancer awareness

NOTE Confidence: 0.851949

 $00:42:28.030 \longrightarrow 00:42:29.170$ month been successful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98230046

 $00:42:29.869 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.230$ if you look at Google

NOTE Confidence: 0.98230046

 $00:42:31.230 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.130$ search data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9964479

 $00:42:32.750 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.190$ whether it's perfect or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9956124

 $00:42:34.829 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.950$ I think the answer is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9956124

 $00:42:35.950 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.190$ yes. We've got people interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.9956124

 $00:42:38.190 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.170$ in this concept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9888517

00:42:40.965 --> 00:42:42.165 But now where I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9888517

00:42:42.165 --> 00:42:43.285 talking about sort of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9888517

 $00:42:43.285 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.725$ rubber meets the road or

NOTE Confidence: 0.9888517

00:42:44.725 --> 00:42:46.185 the scope meets the patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96182626

 $00:42:46.485 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.385$ so to speak,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9987855

 $00:42:48.245 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.305$ how has that

 $00:42:49.685 \longrightarrow 00:42:52.085$ public interest been leveraged into

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982802

 $00:42:52.085 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.245$ actually improving upon screening? What

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982802

 $00:42:54.245 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.205$ have we done for our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982802

 $00:42:55.205 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.705$ patients?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88363785 00:42:56.070 --> 00:42:56.570 So NOTE Confidence: 0.9859468

 $00:42:57.590 \longrightarrow 00:42:58.469$ in order to sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9859468

 $00:42:58.469 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.989$ dive into that, the more,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99786204

00:43:00.390 --> 00:43:01.770 functional end of things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91235524

00:43:02.390 --> 00:43:03.930 utilize looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.99956936

 $00:43:04.310 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.690$ rates of endoscopy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8997839

 $00{:}43{:}06.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}07.510$ across the United States across

NOTE Confidence: 0.8997839

00:43:07.510 --> 00:43:09.270 a a large endoscopy data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8997839 00:43:09.270 --> 00:43:09.770 set. NOTE Confidence: 0.9504935

 $00:43:10.614 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.535$ This represents both community and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9504935

 $00:43:12.535 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.435$ academic centers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9862094

00:43:14.295 --> 00:43:15.575 pretty much every region in

 $00:43:15.575 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.475$ the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945492

 $00:43:18.455 \longrightarrow 00:43:19.575$ And what we looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.945492

00:43:19.575 --> 00:43:21.195 specifically because there's obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.954306

00:43:21.495 --> 00:43:22.935 variation. Right? Some people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9748805

 $00:43:23.619 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.900$ take vacation in July and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9748805

 $00:43:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:43:26.359$ August. That's very common.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9142736

 $00:43:27.219 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.339$ Some types of people try

NOTE Confidence: 0.9142736

 $00:43:28.339 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.300$ and get a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9142736

 $00:43:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.060$ scopes in, you know, in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9142736

00:43:31.060 --> 00:43:32.680 in December and November

NOTE Confidence: 0.958685

 $00:43:33.060 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.420$ because they wanna get things

NOTE Confidence: 0.958685

00:43:34.420 --> 00:43:36.020 done or procedures done before

NOTE Confidence: 0.958685

 $00:43:36.020 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.739$ the end of the year

NOTE Confidence: 0.958685

 $00:43:36.739 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.339$ when their insurance before their

NOTE Confidence: 0.958685

 $00:43:38.339 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.145$ deductible sort of resets.

 $00:43:40.445 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.405$ So what we decided to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90644854

00:43:41.405 --> 00:43:42.545 look at in this dataset

NOTE Confidence: 0.96789527

 $00:43:43.005 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.364$ is what is how many

NOTE Confidence: 0.96789527

 $00:43:44.364 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.965$ endoscopists were scoping at that

NOTE Confidence: 0.96789527

 $00:43:45.965 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.165$ time and what percentage of

NOTE Confidence: 0.96789527

 $00:43:47.165 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.905$ their colonoscopies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9652378

 $00:43:48.285 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.425$ were done for screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98967654

00:43:51.245 --> 00:43:52.844 The reason I mentioned about

NOTE Confidence: 0.98967654

 $00:43:52.844 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.480$ all that sinusoidal model and

NOTE Confidence: 0.98967654

 $00:43:54.480 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.920$ everything like that is I

NOTE Confidence: 0.98967654

 $00:43:55.920 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.880$ don't think you guys need

NOTE Confidence: 0.98967654

 $00:43:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.580$ the statistics here to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.983042

 $00:43:58.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.400$ there is no peak. There

NOTE Confidence: 0.983042

 $00:44:00.400 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.020$ there is no annual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9608224

00:44:03.360 --> 00:44:05.280 you know, increase in percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.9608224

 $00:44:05.280 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.880$ of screening scopes done in

 $00:44:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.020$ this data set,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:08.864 \longrightarrow 00:44:10.065$ every March. And, also, we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:10.065 \longrightarrow 00:44:10.864$ did try and fit the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:10.864 \longrightarrow 00:44:11.825$ model to see, well, is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:11.825 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.625$ there a shift or a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

00:44:12.625 --> 00:44:13.905 delay. Right? Because you may

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:13.905 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.145$ expect that you see someone

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

00:44:16.145 --> 00:44:17.265 wearing blue, and you think

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

00:44:17.265 --> 00:44:18.385 maybe I should get screened

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:18.385 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.505$ for colon cancer, and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

00:44:19.505 --> 00:44:21.000 get your Cologuard. And then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

00:44:21.080 --> 00:44:22.600 you know, certain time later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:22.600 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.880$ you know, it comes back

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:23.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.840$ positive and then you get

NOTE Confidence: 0.9614283

 $00:44:24.840 \longrightarrow 00:44:26.140$ scope. So,

 $00:44:26.840 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.520$ this this model does fit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9912702

 $00:44:28.520 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.560$ for that sort of time

NOTE Confidence: 0.9912702

 $00:44:29.560 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.440$ delay. We sort of set

NOTE Confidence: 0.9912702

 $00:44:30.440 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.380$ it in different different, frequencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9622297

 $00:44:32.680 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.600$ or or different, cycles, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9622297

 $00{:}44{:}34.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}36.675$ also shifting it back across

NOTE Confidence: 0.9622297

 $00:44:36.675 \longrightarrow 00:44:37.975$ basically every month.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498023

 $00:44:38.355 \longrightarrow 00:44:39.715$ The bottom line is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498023

 $00:44:39.715 \longrightarrow 00:44:41.395$ really we don't see any

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498023

 $00:44:41.395 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.835$ effect for the impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9498023

00:44:42.835 --> 00:44:43.735 screening endoscopy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9990515 00:44:45.315 --> 00:44:45.815 So NOTE Confidence: 0.96099496

00:44:46.195 --> 00:44:47.735 getting back to my original

NOTE Confidence: 0.96099496

 $00:44:47.875 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.450$ sort of call to action

NOTE Confidence: 0.96099496

 $00:44:49.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.810$ or call to arms for

NOTE Confidence: 0.96099496

 $00:44:50.810 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.510$ for any health care providers

 $00:44:52.570 \longrightarrow 00:44:53.770$ or anyone who may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.96099496

 $00{:}44{:}53.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}55.530$ listening to this either right

NOTE Confidence: 0.96099496

 $00:44:55.530 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.150$ now or or just virtually

NOTE Confidence: 0.95930123

 $00:44:57.530 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.070$ later on in another date,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95930123

 $00:44:59.210 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.570$ when I think about what

NOTE Confidence: 0.95930123

 $00:45:00.570 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.410$ impact National Colon Cancer Awareness

NOTE Confidence: 0.95930123

 $00:45:02.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:03.975$ Month has had, I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.95930123

 $00:45:03.975 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.835$ we are being very successful

NOTE Confidence: 0.95930123

 $00:45:06.135 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.795$ in getting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9174963

 $00:45:07.175 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.675$ people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82455856

00:45:07.975 --> 00:45:08.475 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9778509

00:45:09.175 --> 00:45:11.355 interested or aware in what

NOTE Confidence: 0.9778509

 $00:45:11.415 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.415$ colon cancer is, what rectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9778509

 $00:45:13.415 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.175$ cancer is. I think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9778509

 $00:45:15.175 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.935$ is made aware by sorry.

 $00:45:16.935 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.055$ That's that to me is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9778509

 $00:45:18.055 \longrightarrow 00:45:19.469$ is evident by the search

NOTE Confidence: 0.974845

 $00:45:20.030 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.150$ data. But where I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.974845

 $00:45:21.150 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.190$ we as a health care

NOTE Confidence: 0.974845

00:45:22.190 --> 00:45:23.630 community can do better for

NOTE Confidence: 0.974845

 $00:45:23.630 \longrightarrow 00:45:25.489$ our patients is actually leveraging

NOTE Confidence: 0.974845

 $00:45:25.550 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.210$ that awareness

NOTE Confidence: 0.9872468

 $00:45:26.670 \longrightarrow 00:45:27.969$ into something meaningful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96665627

 $00:45:29.230 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.130$ And because

NOTE Confidence: 0.83314025

 $00:45:30.830 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.290$ from the the endoscopy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9769574

 $00:45:32.590 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.950$ data, I don't think we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.9769574

 $00:45:33.950 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.770$ there yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9504311

00:45:35.744 --> 00:45:37.505 because, you know, I'd hope

NOTE Confidence: 0.9504311

 $00:45:37.505 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.184$ to see some increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9504311

 $00:45:39.184 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.085$ rate of endoscopy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9972931

 $00:45:40.385 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.125$ or something

00:45:41.505 --> 00:45:43.525 moving forward. So my conclusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.9590083

 $00:45:43.664 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.944$ from all this, really, I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9590083

00:45:44.944 --> 00:45:45.444 think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:45:45.744 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.785$ for us, we've done it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

00:45:47.025 --> 00:45:48.145 I mean, I said stop

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

00:45:48.145 --> 00:45:50.010 talking, start acting. I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:45:50.010 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.290$ quite mean that. I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

00:45:51.290 --> 00:45:53.210 keep talking. Great. We've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

00:45:53.210 --> 00:45:54.730 successful there. But now I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:45:54.730 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.250$ think it's things about start

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00{:}45{:}56.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57.770$ acting. So it's great to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:45:57.770 \longrightarrow 00:45:58.890$ wear blue. It's great to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:45:58.890 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.770$ have all these things, but

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:45:59.770 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.810$ I think there's other things

NOTE Confidence: 0.9631281

 $00:46:00.810 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.790$ we could be doing.

00:46:02.235 --> 00:46:04.315 Increasing access to endoscopy, things

NOTE Confidence: 0.990412

00:46:04.315 --> 00:46:05.455 like opening our endoscopy

NOTE Confidence: 0.95485765

 $00:46:05.755 \longrightarrow 00:46:07.435$ suites on the weekend or

NOTE Confidence: 0.95485765

 $00:46:07.435 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.295$ focusing on other screening methods

NOTE Confidence: 0.9960551

 $00:46:09.595 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.715$ at that time of year

NOTE Confidence: 0.9960551

00:46:10.715 --> 00:46:12.155 to, you know, potentially get

NOTE Confidence: 0.9960551

 $00:46:12.155 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.975$ things out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404745

00:46:14.250 --> 00:46:15.450 Alright. I'm gonna get off

NOTE Confidence: 0.9404745

 $00:46:15.450 \longrightarrow 00:46:16.989$ my soapbox and then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9278159

00:46:17.690 --> 00:46:19.230 hopefully talk about something

NOTE Confidence: 0.8773971

 $00{:}46{:}20.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}21.230$ else. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99281424

00:46:21.930 --> 00:46:22.810 I'm gonna talk a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.99281424

 $00:46:22.810 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.250$ bit about the cyclic nature

NOTE Confidence: 0.99281424

 $00:46:24.250 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.910$ of something,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95328397

 $00:46:25.210 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.830$ and that's specifically about

NOTE Confidence: 0.99906427

 $00:46:27.135 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.915$ local excision of rectal cancer.

 $00:46:29.614 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.415$ I think a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

 $00{:}46{:}30.415 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}32.015$ times in in medicine, we

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

 $00:46:32.015 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.455$ have these we started one

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

 $00:46:33.455 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.815$ way, we changed, and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

 $00:46:34.815 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.775$ came back all the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

 $00:46:35.775 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.215$ around. I think of, I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

 $00:46:37.215 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.255$ a surgeon, but I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153

00:46:38.255 --> 00:46:39.614 endoscopy. I operate you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.98423153 00:46:39.614 --> 00:46:40.114 So NOTE Confidence: 0.92208934

00:46:40.415 --> 00:46:41.614 I think about bowel preps

NOTE Confidence: 0.92208934

00:46:41.614 --> 00:46:42.114 during

NOTE Confidence: 0.9547192

 $00:46:42.950 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.850$ colorectal surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94443804

 $00{:}46{:}44.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}45.530$ It was initially nothing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92095745

 $00:46:45.910 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.690$ Then started with both antibiotic

NOTE Confidence: 0.92095745

 $00:46:47.750 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.050$ and mechanical prep.

 $00:46:49.350 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.310$ Then it went to just

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644084

 $00:46:50.310 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.810$ mechanical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7715912

00:46:51.510 --> 00:46:52.010 Nothing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89528924

 $00:46:52.630 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.170$ Mechanical and lo and behold,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89528924

 $00:46:54.230 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.270$ we're back there to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.89528924

 $00{:}46{:}55.270 \to 00{:}46{:}56.550$ Nichols Condon prep, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89528924

 $00:46:56.550 \longrightarrow 00:46:57.050$ with

NOTE Confidence: 0.95676523

 $00:46:57.635 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.315$ antibiotics and mechanical prep. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.95676523

 $00:46:59.315 \longrightarrow 00:47:00.035$ I think a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.95676523

 $00:47:00.035 \longrightarrow 00:47:01.635$ things in medicine are cyclic

NOTE Confidence: 0.95676523

 $00:47:01.635 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.474$ as we get more and

NOTE Confidence: 0.95676523

 $00:47:03.474 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.295$ more data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97930527

 $00:47:04.835 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.795$ And so I'm gonna really

NOTE Confidence: 0.97930527

 $00{:}47{:}05.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}07.395$ be talking about that sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.97930527

 $00:47:07.395 \longrightarrow 00:47:08.135$ of cycle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9705734

 $00:47:08.915 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.415$ in regards to, rectal cancer,

 $00{:}47{:}12.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}14.599$ specifically local excision. So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95924634

 $00:47:14.900 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.780$ we're gonna start in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95924634

00:47:15.780 --> 00:47:17.300 past. We're gonna start, around

NOTE Confidence: 0.95924634

 $00:47:17.300 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.900$ the thirteen hundreds. So this

NOTE Confidence: 0.95924634

 $00:47:18.900 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.099$ is around the hundred year

NOTE Confidence: 0.9592463400:47:20.099 --> 00:47:20.599 war.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94729584

 $00:47:20.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.359$ And this is John Arden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96398735

 $00{:}47{:}22.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}24.819$ He was considered England's first

NOTE Confidence: 0.96398735

 $00:47:24.819 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.319$ surgeon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9983878

 $00:47:25.994 \longrightarrow 00:47:27.515$ but the thing that's germane

NOTE Confidence: 0.9983878

 $00:47:27.515 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.174$ to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9379694

 $00:47:28.555 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.594$ is that he is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9379694

 $00{:}47{:}29.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}31.194$ first person to describe or

NOTE Confidence: 0.9379694

 $00:47:31.194 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.234$ at least actually to write

NOTE Confidence: 0.9379694

 $00{:}47{:}32.234 --> 00{:}47{:}32.734 \ down$

 $00:47:33.275 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.775$ the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871893

 $00:47:34.714 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.114$ diagnosis of rectal cancer. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871893

 $00:47:37.114 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.315$ back at this time, obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871893

 $00:47:38.315 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.954$ there was a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871893

 $00:47:38.954 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.394$ infectious colitis, a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871893

 $00:47:40.394 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.400$ infectious problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9762059

 $00{:}47{:}41.700 --> 00{:}47{:}43.140$ And so often times, it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9762059

00:47:43.140 --> 00:47:44.440 hard to differentiate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95015943

 $00:47:45.780 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.780$ between dysentery or or or

NOTE Confidence: 0.95015943

 $00:47:47.780 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.560$ something else and a malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9890536

 $00:47:49.940 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.060$ And so he's the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.9890536

00:47:51.060 --> 00:47:52.580 person to really describe actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9890536

 $00:47:52.580 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.119$ doing a rectal exam

NOTE Confidence: 0.9684444

 $00:47:54.695 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.915$ for the diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9529965

 $00:47:56.855 \longrightarrow 00:47:58.375$ And, you know, he said

NOTE Confidence: 0.9529965

 $00:47:58.375 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.735$ that you should do on

00:47:59.735 --> 00:48:01.495 exam, you should find something

NOTE Confidence: 0.9529965

 $00:48:01.495 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.875$ hard as a stone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99242085

 $00:48:03.655 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.175$ And so he was basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.99242085

 $00{:}48{:}05.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}06.555$ able to make that correlation

NOTE Confidence: 0.99242085

 $00:48:06.695 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.850$ that the blood, the mucus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99242085

 $00:48:09.150 \longrightarrow 00:48:09.890$ the urgency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90071243

 $00:48:10.670 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.450$ was not all infectious ideology

NOTE Confidence: 0.90071243

00:48:12.510 --> 00:48:14.109 like dysentery, but was in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90071243 00:48:14.109 --> 00:48:14.609 fact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842701

 $00{:}48{:}15.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}17.489$ a malignancy. So first diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842701

 $00:48:17.630 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.670$ then, that's what we started

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842701

 $00:48:18.670 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.869$ at. I'm not sure they

NOTE Confidence: 0.9842701

 $00{:}48{:}19.869 --> 00{:}48{:}21.250$ had gloves back then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9729636

00:48:21.695 --> 00:48:23.055 This is my I I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9729636

00:48:23.055 --> 00:48:24.175 I don't speak much Latin.

00:48:24.175 --> 00:48:25.614 Here's his original Latin text

NOTE Confidence: 0.9729636

 $00:48:25.614 \longrightarrow 00:48:26.275$ on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97616756

 $00{:}48{:}28.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}29.635$ So that was initial diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92403954

00:48:29.935 --> 00:48:30.895 So we're going, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92403954

00:48:30.895 --> 00:48:32.195 thirteen hundreds, and now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94238806

 $00:48:32.575 \longrightarrow 00:48:33.775$ sort of where we at

NOTE Confidence: 0.94238806

 $00:48:33.775 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.280$ now. I think most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94238806

 $00:48:35.280 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.719$ us know sort of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94238806

00:48:36.719 --> 00:48:37.700 initial treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9020843

00:48:38.640 --> 00:48:40.400 CT, chest, abdomen, pelvis, you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9020843

 $00:48:40.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.600$ know, our sort of rule

NOTE Confidence: 0.9020843

 $00:48:41.600 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.980$ out metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99552

 $00:48:43.440 \longrightarrow 00:48:45.060$ And then for local staging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95018303

 $00{:}48{:}45.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}47.680$ MRI, pelvis with and without

NOTE Confidence: 0.95018303

 $00:48:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:49.215$ contrast, we we also use

NOTE Confidence: 0.95018303

 $00:48:49.375 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.835$ ultrasound gel in the lumen,

 $00:48:51.295 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.335$ which can give you sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.960347

 $00:48:52.335 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.375$ of I I have here

NOTE Confidence: 0.960347

00:48:53.375 --> 00:48:54.755 what we call nice ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.960347

00:48:54.815 --> 00:48:56.655 for bread slicing, making sure

NOTE Confidence: 0.960347

 $00:48:56.655 \longrightarrow 00:48:58.094$ that as the slices of

NOTE Confidence: 0.960347

 $00:48:58.094 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.455$ the MRI are coming through,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960347

 $00:48:59.455 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.355$ that we're being

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644368

 $00:49:01.055 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.335$ perpendicular to the rectum and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644368

 $00:49:02.335 \longrightarrow 00:49:03.360$ that we're really able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644368

 $00:49:03.440 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.140$ get nice heights and measurements

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644368

 $00:49:05.200 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.480$ between the levator plate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644368

 $00:49:06.480 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.520$ the pelvic floor and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9644368

 $00:49:07.520 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.020$ tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9617702

 $00:49:09.440 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.720$ And so I think most

NOTE Confidence: 0.9617702

 $00:49:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.600$ of us know about our

 $00:49:11.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.060$ CT or MRIs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97978085

 $00:49:13.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.720$ Yes. I do think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.97978085

 $00:49:14.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:15.760$ there is still a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.97978085

 $00:49:15.760 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.540$ place for endorectal ultrasound.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9571523

 $00:49:18.000 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.965$ It's obviously it this this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9571523

 $00:49:19.965 \longrightarrow 00:49:20.845$ is a picture actually out

NOTE Confidence: 0.9571523

 $00:49:20.845 \longrightarrow 00:49:22.205$ of our textbook. We, as

NOTE Confidence: 0.9571523

 $00:49:22.205 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.485$ surgeons, are still tested on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9571523

 $00{:}49{:}23.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}24.765$ this. These pictures still appear

NOTE Confidence: 0.9571523

 $00:49:24.765 \longrightarrow 00:49:25.505$ on our exams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9732488

00:49:25.885 --> 00:49:26.845 but I do think it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9732488

 $00{:}49{:}26.845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}28.525$ also germane because I'm gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.9732488

 $00:49:28.525 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.145$ be talking about local excision,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9377009

 $00:49:30.925 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.125$ other in places where it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9377009

 $00:49:32.125 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.325$ should or maybe shouldn't be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9377009

 $00:49:33.325 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.205$ done or or where we're

 $00{:}49{:}34.205 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}35.289$ going with it. And so

NOTE Confidence: 0.9377009

 $00{:}49{:}35.289 --> 00{:}49{:}36.410$ I do think it's important

NOTE Confidence: 0.9377009

 $00:49:36.410 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.309$ to highlight that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9669683

 $00:49:37.769 \longrightarrow 00:49:39.130$ one of the advantages of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9669683

 $00:49:39.130 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.890$ endorectal ultrasound is having the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9669683

 $00:49:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:49:42.269$ probe directly on the mass

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

00:49:42.650 --> 00:49:44.489 can help differentiate between a

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

 $00{:}49{:}44.489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}45.450$ t one and a t

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

00:49:45.450 --> 00:49:47.390 tumor, and maybe help differentiate

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

 $00:49:47.450 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.650$ between who is a candidate

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

 $00:49:48.650 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.010$ for local excision and who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

 $00:49:50.010 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.375$ not. And then, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96924525

00:49:51.375 --> 00:49:52.755 CEA complete colonoscopy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9180003

 $00{:}49{:}53.535 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}55.295$ but also digital rectal exam.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9180003 00:49:55.295 --> 00:49:55.795 So, NOTE Confidence: 0.9680153 $00:49:56.255 \longrightarrow 00:49:57.695$ yes, we have all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9680153

 $00:49:57.695 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.895$ these tests and all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9680153

 $00:49:58.895 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.435$ these high, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97789145

00:50:00.815 --> 00:50:02.335 high pollutant things, but we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.97789145

00:50:02.335 --> 00:50:04.050 still also going back to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97789145

 $00:50:04.210 \longrightarrow 00:50:05.730$ you know, the thirteen hundreds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97789145

 $00:50:05.730 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.610$ And and I do think

NOTE Confidence: 0.97789145

 $00:50:06.610 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.969$ it's very important to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.97789145

 $00:50:07.969 \longrightarrow 00:50:08.790$ a good exam.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97364825

 $00:50:10.370 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.290$ If you're a surgeon or

NOTE Confidence: 0.97364825

 $00{:}50{:}11.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}13.010$ a radiation oncologist prior to

NOTE Confidence: 0.97364825

 $00:50:13.010 \longrightarrow 00:50:13.510$ treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9175596

 $00:50:14.450 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.570$ is this fixed to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9175596

 $00:50:15.570 \longrightarrow 00:50:16.850$ anorectal ring? Is this a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9175596

 $00:50:16.850 \longrightarrow 00:50:18.275$ t four lesion involving the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9175596

00:50:18.275 --> 00:50:19.535 sphincters and the pelvic floor?

 $00{:}50{:}19.915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}21.435$ What is the relationship like

NOTE Confidence: 0.94129217

 $00{:}50{:}21.435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}22.635$ anterior to the posterior wall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94129217

 $00:50:22.635 \longrightarrow 00:50:23.915$ the vagina, or the prostate?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94129217 00:50:23.915 --> 00:50:24.415 So, NOTE Confidence: 0.98671484

00:50:24.875 --> 00:50:26.335 I do you know, MRI

NOTE Confidence: 0.98671484

 $00:50:26.555 \longrightarrow 00:50:27.994$ is is excellent for things

NOTE Confidence: 0.98671484

 $00:50:27.994 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.655$ like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9821159

00:50:29.355 --> 00:50:30.895 but it's a single snapshot

NOTE Confidence: 0.9821159

 $00:50:30.954 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.335$ in time. So a dynamic

NOTE Confidence: 0.99598986

00:50:32.635 --> 00:50:33.614 physical exam

NOTE Confidence: 0.98279625

 $00:50:33.920 \longrightarrow 00:50:35.600$ can also give information, which

NOTE Confidence: 0.98279625

 $00:50:35.600 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.560$ I which I think is

NOTE Confidence: 0.98279625

 $00{:}50{:}36.560 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}50{:}37.540$ absolutely quintessential

NOTE Confidence: 0.98133713

 $00:50:37.920 \longrightarrow 00:50:39.360$ for the patient and for

NOTE Confidence: 0.98133713

 $00:50:39.360 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.580$ for planning and treatment.

 $00:50:42.160 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.280$ Okay. So we've sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.99293274

 $00:50:43.280 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.500$ talked about historical

NOTE Confidence: 0.9839447

00:50:46.344 --> 00:50:46.844 diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98092926

 $00:50:47.945 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.065$ where we're at now, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.98092926

 $00:50:49.065 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.285$ then what about historical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673243

 $00:50:50.825 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.325$ resection?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457724

 $00:50:51.785 \longrightarrow 00:50:52.825$ And, actually, when I initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457724

 $00:50:52.825 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.785$ made this slide, I said

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457724

 $00{:}50{:}53.785 \to 00{:}50{:}55.145$ historical resection, and then I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457724

 $00{:}50{:}55.145 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}57.305$ said historical local excision. And

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457724

 $00:50:57.305 \longrightarrow 00:50:58.605$ the the thing is that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9599524

 $00:50:59.270 \longrightarrow 00:51:00.070$ at at the time of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9599524

 $00:51:00.070 \longrightarrow 00:51:01.190$ the initial so now we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.9599524

 $00:51:01.190 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.710$ five hundred years later. It

NOTE Confidence: 0.9599524

 $00:51:02.710 \longrightarrow 00:51:03.830$ took five hundred years from

NOTE Confidence: 0.9599524

 $00:51:03.830 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.190$ figuring out the diagnosis to

 $00:51:05.190 \longrightarrow 00:51:06.469$ now someone attempting to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.9599524

 $00:51:06.469 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.369$ and treat this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8628669

 $00:51:07.830 \longrightarrow 00:51:09.290$ But really local excision

NOTE Confidence: 0.936321

 $00:51:09.750 \longrightarrow 00:51:10.250$ for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9995323

 $00:51:11.030 \longrightarrow 00:51:11.690$ the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.9915139

 $00:51:12.045 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.545$ about

NOTE Confidence: 0.987623

 $00:51:12.925 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.364$ fifty to a hundred years

NOTE Confidence: 0.987623

 $00:51:14.364 \longrightarrow 00:51:15.565$ was really the only way

NOTE Confidence: 0.987623

 $00:51:15.565 \longrightarrow 00:51:16.224$ of treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92491317

00:51:17.165 --> 00:51:18.944 So, this is Jacques Lisfranc,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92491317

 $00:51:19.085 \longrightarrow 00:51:20.204$ who did the first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91487104

 $00:51:21.085 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.585$ excision,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9894243

 $00:51:22.605 \longrightarrow 00:51:23.425$ in Paris.

NOTE Confidence: 0.981026

 $00{:}51{:}23.805 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}25.025$ This was through a peritoneal

NOTE Confidence: 0.981026

 $00:51:25.085 \longrightarrow 00:51:25.585$ approach,

 $00:51:26.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:27.690$ and, really, it was only

NOTE Confidence: 0.9668703

 $00:51:27.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.550$ used for distal tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9679618

00:51:30.010 --> 00:51:31.290 Essentially, the patient this was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9679618

 $00:51:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.130$ done without anesthetic. The patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.9679618

 $00:51:33.130 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.090$ would bear down. They would

NOTE Confidence: 0.9679618

 $00:51:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.969$ do a pull through and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9679618

 $00:51:34.969 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.270$ a and a local excision.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9873284

 $00:51:37.210 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.570$ And, really, that was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9873284

 $00:51:38.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:40.430$ only option at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.977444

 $00:51:43.565 \longrightarrow 00:51:44.864$ And as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9870715

 $00:51:45.405 \longrightarrow 00:51:47.085$ the the outcomes were were

NOTE Confidence: 0.9870715

00:51:47.085 --> 00:51:48.065 quite poor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9383197

 $00:51:49.565 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.385$ Excuse me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99666303

 $00{:}51{:}52.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}53.905$ Very high operative mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.94801086

 $00:51:55.809 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.890$ and very high local recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.94801086

00:51:57.890 --> 00:51:59.569 rates too. I'm gonna skip

 $00:51:59.569 \longrightarrow 00:52:00.710$ back from that. Sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:02.450 \longrightarrow 00:52:03.410$ And really a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:03.410 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.609$ the mortality was due to

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.890$ again, they were not able

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:05.890 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.849$ to if you entered the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00{:}52{:}06.849 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}08.369$ per itoneal cavity, that was considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:08.369 \longrightarrow 00:52:09.569$ a technical error in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:09.569 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.950$ operation, and then the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:11.214 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.675$ usually would succumb to complications

NOTE Confidence: 0.95793927

 $00:52:12.734 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.474$ like peritonitis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238949

 $00:52:13.775 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.155$ So really this is just

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238949

 $00:52:15.454 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.614$ operating or treating distal third

NOTE Confidence: 0.9238949

 $00{:}52{:}17.614 --> 00{:}52{:}18.114 \ \mathrm{tumors}.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.99836063

 $00:52:19.295 \longrightarrow 00:52:20.575$ So that's sort of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.99836063

00:52:20.575 --> 00:52:22.355 early stages of local excision.

 $00:52:23.214 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.690$ There were some people. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9667947

 $00:52:24.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:26.130$ Liz Frank had a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9667947

00:52:26.130 --> 00:52:26.630 disciple,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9484754

 $00:52:27.250 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.930$ who sort of advocated for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9484754

 $00:52:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.450$ resection of the coccyxin block

NOTE Confidence: 0.9484754

 $00:52:30.450 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.890$ for better exposure, and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.9484754

 $00:52:31.890 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.250$ there were cert were some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9484754

 $00:52:33.250 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.790$ improvements for local excision.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93697584

 $00:52:35.410 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.825$ But really things did not

NOTE Confidence: 0.93697584

 $00{:}52{:}36.905 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}38.185$ change much. This is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.93697584

00:52:38.185 --> 00:52:39.625 a picture from our most

NOTE Confidence: 0.93697584

 $00:52:39.625 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.605$ recent textbook

NOTE Confidence: 0.97905356

 $00:52:41.224 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.305$ about what transanal excision was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97905356

 $00:52:43.305 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.425$ So I have this recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.97905356

 $00:52:44.425 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.925$ history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875759

 $00:52:46.905 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.645$ Again, this

 $00:52:48.025 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.464$ is operating through through an

NOTE Confidence: 0.9867763

 $00:52:49.464 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.964$ anoscope,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603074

 $00:52:50.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.040$ showing an excision here and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603074

 $00:52:52.040 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.940$ then a closure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9634063

 $00:52:53.239 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.200$ So a little different from

NOTE Confidence: 0.9634063

 $00:52:54.200 \longrightarrow 00:52:55.640$ that picture, but but actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9634063

 $00:52:55.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:57.260$ probably not that much different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9914462

00:52:58.120 --> 00:52:59.080 And, you know, our our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9914462

 $00:52:59.080 \longrightarrow 00:52:59.980$ current recommendations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9936646

00:53:00.760 --> 00:53:01.880 just like I was talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9936646

 $00:53:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:53:03.020$ about, before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9975088

 $00:53:04.235 \longrightarrow 00:53:05.135$ are for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9359305

 $00{:}53{:}05.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}07.675$ really just favorable t one

NOTE Confidence: 0.9359305

 $00:53:07.675 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.175$ cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871085

 $00:53:08.475 \longrightarrow 00:53:09.675$ really things that are just

 $00:53:09.675 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.815$ confined to the submucosa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9579682

00:53:11.515 --> 00:53:12.715 Because, you know, in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9579682

00:53:12.715 --> 00:53:14.155 situation, you're not gonna be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9579682

 $00:53:14.155 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.415$ sampling any mesorectal lymph nodes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96471417

 $00:53:17.300 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.580$ And so anything that's gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.96471417

 $00:53:18.580 \longrightarrow 00:53:19.300$ put you at risk for

NOTE Confidence: 0.96471417

 $00:53:19.300 \longrightarrow 00:53:20.660$ that, whether it's lymph vascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.96471417

00:53:20.660 --> 00:53:21.960 invasion, poor differentiation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9847099

 $00{:}53{:}22.739 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}24.260$ tumor budding, or something that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9847099

00:53:24.260 --> 00:53:26.760 just technically challenging to excise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96476287

 $00{:}53{:}27.300 \to 00{:}53{:}28.260$ those are folks who, you

NOTE Confidence: 0.96476287

00:53:28.260 --> 00:53:29.780 know, should be being considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.96476287

 $00:53:29.780 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.520$ for proctectomy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96796596

 $00:53:32.395 \longrightarrow 00:53:33.355$ At least based on these

NOTE Confidence: 0.96796596

 $00:53:33.355 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.395$ recommendations, I'll talk to you

NOTE Confidence: 0.96796596

 $00{:}53{:}34.395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}35.114$ a little bit. We're gonna

00:53:35.114 --> 00:53:35.835 talk a little bit more

NOTE Confidence: 0.96796596

 $00:53:35.835 \longrightarrow 00:53:36.555$ about that, but I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.96796596

 $00:53:36.555 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.935$ wanna totally tip my hand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.997777

 $00:53:38.715 \longrightarrow 00:53:40.015$ So here's the outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957609

 $00:53:40.555 \longrightarrow 00:53:41.435$ This is a, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957609

 $00{:}53{:}41.435 \to 00{:}53{:}42.875$ case series starting from ninety

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957609

 $00:53:42.875 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.335$ nine to two thousand three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99297243

 $00{:}53{:}44.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}45.890$ The interesting thing about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.99297243

 $00:53:45.890 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.010$ is it does include some

NOTE Confidence: 0.99297243

00:53:47.010 --> 00:53:48.210 t two disease, and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.99297243

 $00{:}53{:}48.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}49.570$ you can see recurrence rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.99297243

 $00:53:49.570 \longrightarrow 00:53:50.550$ are quite high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9929738

 $00{:}53{:}52.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}54.310$ Survival rates are are lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92962706

 $00:53:54.770 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.490$ Some of this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.92962706

00:53:55.490 --> 00:53:56.850 little bit selection bias because

 $00:53:56.850 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.070$ these t two patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90322816

00:53:58.645 --> 00:53:59.685 we even even, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90322816

 $00:53:59.685 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.805$ not back then, but even

NOTE Confidence: 0.90322816

 $00:54:00.805 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.005$ this time people knew that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90322816

 $00:54:02.005 \longrightarrow 00:54:03.465$ probably should be doing proctectomy

NOTE Confidence: 0.90322816

 $00:54:03.605 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.265$ or TME.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277044

 $00:54:04.805 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.605$ But so some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277044

 $00:54:05.605 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.725$ selection bias may be the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277044

 $00{:}54{:}06.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}07.925$ folks with a little larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277044

 $00:54:07.925 \longrightarrow 00:54:08.825$ or deeper tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.9138547

00:54:09.205 --> 00:54:11.000 maybe were less, fit, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9138547

 $00:54:11.000 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.119$ so we're maybe more likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.9138547

 $00:54:12.119 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.579$ to undergo transanal excision.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98992693

 $00{:}54{:}14.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}15.960$ But you can see, recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.98992693

 $00:54:15.960 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.660$ rates, like I said, high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97452646

 $00:54:18.680 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.119$ for these t twos. And

 $00:54:20.119 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.079$ and even for the t

NOTE Confidence: 0.97452646

 $00:54:21.079 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.579$ ones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875148

 $00:54:22.200 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.660$ survival is low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261688

00:54:25.160 --> 00:54:25.900 And, again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9927462

00:54:27.535 --> 00:54:29.135 moving forward, I'm just, trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.9927462

 $00:54:29.135 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.015$ to make sure we stay

NOTE Confidence: 0.9927462

 $00:54:30.015 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.755$ on time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96532744

00:54:31.135 --> 00:54:32.094 I'm gonna talk about, you

NOTE Confidence: 0.96532744

 $00:54:32.094 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.695$ know, additional advances. Right? Because

NOTE Confidence: 0.96532744

 $00:54:33.695 \longrightarrow 00:54:35.155$ like I said, this picture

NOTE Confidence: 0.9991778

00:54:35.535 --> 00:54:36.975 doesn't look that much different

NOTE Confidence: 0.9991778

 $00:54:36.975 \longrightarrow 00:54:37.875$ from that picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9501478

 $00:54:39.055 \longrightarrow 00:54:40.175$ So here we are now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9501478

 $00:54:40.175 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.050$ I guess, in maybe, in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9501478

 $00:54:42.050 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.730$ twenty ten. I consider that

00:54:43.730 --> 00:54:44.930 modern time, so maybe I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9501478

00:54:44.930 --> 00:54:45.410 getting old,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99790263

 $00:54:47.250 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.630$ with using better visualization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9479074

 $00:54:49.489 \longrightarrow 00:54:51.410$ for transanal excision. So now

NOTE Confidence: 0.9479074

 $00:54:51.410 \longrightarrow 00:54:53.010$ we're talking about, what's called

NOTE Confidence: 0.9479074

 $00{:}54{:}53.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}54.950$ TAMUS or transanal minimally invasive

NOTE Confidence: 0.9479074

 $00:54:55.010 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.510$ surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96448535

 $00:54:57.344 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.105$ Mike, can you see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96448535

 $00:54:58.145 \longrightarrow 00:54:59.105$ is this is the video

NOTE Confidence: 0.96448535

00:54:59.105 --> 00:54:59.844 coming through?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9918598

 $00:55:01.265 \longrightarrow 00:55:02.864$ Yes. It is. Okay. Good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9918598

00:55:02.864 --> 00:55:03.844 Alright. Sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.961364

 $00:55:05.185 \longrightarrow 00:55:06.485$ So you can see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98400366 00:55:06.945 --> 00:55:07.445 so, NOTE Confidence: 0.9766209

00:55:07.985 --> 00:55:09.069 showing you some views now

NOTE Confidence: 0.9766209

 $00:55:09.069 \longrightarrow 00:55:09.869$ from so this is the

 $00:55:09.869 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.750$ setup of the case and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9766209

 $00{:}55{:}10.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}11.950$ then showing some views here

NOTE Confidence: 0.9766209

 $00:55:11.950 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.690$ for resection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99094224

 $00{:}55{:}13.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}14.450$ You can see the visualization

NOTE Confidence: 0.99094224

 $00:55:14.670 \longrightarrow 00:55:15.630$ is is much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96519643

 $00:55:16.109 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.550$ is much better. So we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.96519643

 $00.55:17.550 \longrightarrow 00.55:18.750$ able to clearly see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96519643

 $00:55:18.750 \longrightarrow 00:55:20.190$ tumor, and we're able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.96519643

00:55:20.190 --> 00:55:21.710 clearly mark out a nice

NOTE Confidence: 0.96519643

00:55:21.710 --> 00:55:22.930 circumferential margin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92470837

 $00:55:23.835 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.675$ and ensure. So a much

NOTE Confidence: 0.92470837

 $00:55:25.675 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.355$ different and better view from

NOTE Confidence: 0.92470837

 $00:55:27.355 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.075$ what we're saying. It's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92470837

 $00:55:28.155 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.195$ it's base it is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92470837

00:55:29.195 --> 00:55:30.094 same technique

 $00:55:30.555 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.835$ as was shown or sorry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91935486

00:55:31.835 --> 00:55:32.815 the same principle

NOTE Confidence: 0.97169155

 $00:55:33.114 \longrightarrow 00:55:33.994$ as was shown in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.97169155

 $00:55:33.994 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.835$ other slides, but maybe with

NOTE Confidence: 0.97169155

 $00:55:35.835 \longrightarrow 00:55:36.815$ easier technique,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87299883

 $00:55:37.690 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.150$ and an easier visualization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9952957

 $00:55:40.010 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.050$ And then as you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.995295700:55:41.050 --> 00:55:41.550 see

NOTE Confidence: 0.9683776

 $00{:}55{:}44.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}45.290$ I think I'm just going

NOTE Confidence: 0.9683776

 $00:55:45.290 \longrightarrow 00:55:46.570$ in circles. Here we go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9683776

 $00:55:46.570 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.450$ You can see, though, the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9683776

 $00{:}55{:}47.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}49.150$ same same exact concepts

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957877

 $00:55:49.690 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.130$ of resection all the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957877

 $00:55:51.130 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.630$ through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003338

00:55:52.125 --> 00:55:53.565 You can see some fat

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003338

 $00:55:53.565 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.065$ here.

 $00{:}55{:}56.445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}57.425$ But the visualization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9971312

 $00{:}55{:}57.725 --> 00{:}55{:}58.525$ you stop it when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9971312

 $00:55:58.525 \longrightarrow 00:55:59.985$ get into bleeding, of course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97637534

00:56:01.405 --> 00:56:02.205 And then I think one

NOTE Confidence: 0.97637534

 $00:56:02.205 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.665$ of the additional advantages

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411985

 $00:56:04.125 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.864$ is then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945656

 $00:56:06.180 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.460$ ease of of in block

NOTE Confidence: 0.945656

 $00{:}56{:}07.460 \longrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09.060$ and complete resection so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.945656

 $00:56:09.060 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.760$ we can formally assess,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9637452

 $00:56:11.380 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.440$ the depth of invasion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752599

 $00:56:12.900 \longrightarrow 00:56:13.700$ So which I think is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752599

 $00:56:13.700 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.980$ one of the advantages of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752599

 $00:56:14.980 \longrightarrow 00:56:16.339$ of this type of technique

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752599

 $00{:}56{:}16.339 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}17.540$ is we can get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9752599

00:56:17.540 --> 00:56:20.114 nice corked out fully complete

 $00:56:20.114 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.614$ specimen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9766298

00:56:21.075 --> 00:56:22.114 which is helpful for our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9766298

00:56:22.114 --> 00:56:22.614 pathologists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9835805

00:56:23.235 --> 00:56:24.275 And then closure, which I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9835805

 $00:56:24.275 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.435$ do for hemostatic hemostasis. Excuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.9835805

 $00:56:26.435 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.735$ me. But you certainly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95561326

 $00:56:28.275 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.475$ do not have have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.95561326

 $00:56:29.475 \longrightarrow 00:56:30.375$ do for tamus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9867555

00:56:30.675 --> 00:56:32.114 Though, again, I I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.9867555

 $00:56:32.114 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.035$ think it's, helpful for closure

NOTE Confidence: 0.9867555

 $00:56:34.035 \longrightarrow 00:56:35.100$ and somewhat for symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9958348

 $00:56:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.600$ Okay.

NOTE Confidence: 0.997666

 $00:56:37.900 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.340$ So I've been talking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.997666

 $00{:}56{:}39.340 --> 00{:}56{:}40.320 \ local \ excision,$

NOTE Confidence: 0.977763

 $00:56:40.860 \longrightarrow 00:56:41.680$ all of this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9858779

 $00:56:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.820$ but but isn't this

 $00:56:43.820 \longrightarrow 00:56:44.700$ a little bit of ancient

NOTE Confidence: 0.9858779

00:56:44.700 --> 00:56:46.540 history? Right? Aren't we still

NOTE Confidence: 0.9858779

 $00:56:46.540 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.000$ now even more modern?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9313211

 $00:56:48.425 \longrightarrow 00:56:50.045$ Aren't we into the paradigm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9313211

 $00:56:50.185 \longrightarrow 00:56:52.665$ of, total neoadjuvant therapy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9313211

 $00:56:52.665 \longrightarrow 00:56:53.565$ watch and wait?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9910037

 $00:56:53.945 \longrightarrow 00:56:54.984$ Right? So when we talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.9910037

 $00:56:54.984 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.484$ about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9797595

00:56:56.505 --> 00:56:58.265 local excision, really, it's just

NOTE Confidence: 0.9797595

 $00{:}56{:}58.265 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}59.625$ reserved for the patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9797595

 $00:56:59.625 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.145$ the earliest of disease with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9797595

00:57:01.145 --> 00:57:03.484 just favorable t one tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8797302

 $00:57:04.280 \longrightarrow 00:57:04.940$ But, unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99003303

 $00:57:05.800 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.160$ that's just a small percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.99003303

 $00:57:07.160 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.739$ of patients.

 $00:57:08.040 \longrightarrow 00:57:09.320$ And so what about people

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

 $00{:}57{:}09.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}10.839$ with locally advanced disease? I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

 $00:57:10.839 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.359$ showed on those earlier things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

 $00:57:12.359 \longrightarrow 00:57:13.719$ even with t four disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

00:57:13.719 --> 00:57:15.239 the outcomes were poor. Sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

 $00:57:15.239 \longrightarrow 00:57:16.280$ With t two disease, I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

 $00:57:16.280 \longrightarrow 00:57:17.320$ I apologize. With t two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9595505

 $00:57:17.320 \longrightarrow 00:57:18.780$ disease, the outcomes were poor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99878734

 $00:57:19.194 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.315$ So how how would this

NOTE Confidence: 0.99878734

 $00:57:20.315 \longrightarrow 00:57:21.835$ ever be something that's applied

NOTE Confidence: 0.99878734 00:57:21.835 --> 00:57:22.335 to, NOTE Confidence: 0.9864098

00:57:23.515 --> 00:57:25.214 you know, more bulky disease?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9738966

 $00:57:26.234 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.355$ And, you know, in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9738966

 $00:57:27.355 \longrightarrow 00:57:28.714$ age of for locally advanced

NOTE Confidence: 0.9738966

 $00:57:28.714 \longrightarrow 00:57:30.734$ tumors, either a consolidation approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.96654207

00:57:31.089 --> 00:57:32.150 with with chemoradiation

 $00:57:32.770 \longrightarrow 00:57:34.450$ followed by chemotherapy or an

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519122

 $00{:}57{:}34.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}36.369$ induction approach where the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519122

 $00:57:36.369 \longrightarrow 00:57:37.809$ paradigm is flipped, we still

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519122

 $00:57:37.809 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.089$ have to check for response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519122

 $00:57:39.089 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.630$ Right? How do we tell

NOTE Confidence: 0.9519122

00:57:40.690 --> 00:57:42.790 if folks still have disease?

NOTE Confidence: 0.982959

 $00.57:43.765 \longrightarrow 00.57:45.045$ How do we, one, assess

NOTE Confidence: 0.982959

 $00:57:45.045 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.244$ if they still have residual

NOTE Confidence: 0.982959

 $00:57:46.244 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.744$ disease?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9795746

 $00:57:47.205 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.005$ And two, what do we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9795746

 $00:57:48.005 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.065$ do if it's equivocal?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9866825

 $00:57:50.244 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.365$ I was hoping that doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.9866825

 $00{:}57{:}51.365 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}52.485$ Giacchini was actually gonna do

NOTE Confidence: 0.9866825

 $00:57:52.485 \longrightarrow 00:57:53.205$ a little bit of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9866825

 $00{:}57{:}53.365 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}54.165$ I'm not gonna talk about

 $00{:}57{:}54.165 \rightarrow 00{:}57{:}55.605$ circulating tumor DNA here. I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9866825

00:57:55.605 --> 00:57:56.970 was hoping he would, but,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9906243

 $00:57:57.290 \longrightarrow 00:57:58.049$ we don't quite we're not

NOTE Confidence: 0.9906243

 $00:57:58.170 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.390$ we're quite that coordinated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95207083

00:57:59.770 --> 00:58:01.609 Okay? So talking about watch

NOTE Confidence: 0.95207083

00:58:01.609 --> 00:58:02.570 and wait, I'm just gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.95207083

 $00:58:02.570 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.770$ really briefly touch on so

NOTE Confidence: 0.95207083

 $00:58:03.770 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.210$ we can keep moving. But,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9320494

 $00{:}58{:}05.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}06.970$ really, first series published in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9320494

 $00:58:06.970 \longrightarrow 00:58:08.030$ two thousand four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9441699

 $00:58:09.530 \longrightarrow 00:58:10.810$ and really what the definition

NOTE Confidence: 0.9441699

 $00:58:10.810 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.485$ is, tumor bed replaced by

NOTE Confidence: 0.9441699

00:58:12.485 --> 00:58:14.345 scar or normal mucosa

NOTE Confidence: 0.97160065

 $00:58:14.805 \longrightarrow 00:58:16.665$ on clinical and endoscopic

NOTE Confidence: 0.9846137

 $00:58:17.045 \longrightarrow 00:58:18.165$ exam. And I think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9846137

 $00:58:18.165 \longrightarrow 00:58:19.225$ the the,

 $00{:}58{:}19.605 --> 00{:}58{:}20.425 \ \mathrm{most \ important}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.932765

00:58:21.925 --> 00:58:23.205 thing is really the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932765

00:58:23.205 --> 00:58:24.725 feel as as over an

NOTE Confidence: 0.932765

 $00:58:24.725 \longrightarrow 00:58:25.225$ endoscopic

NOTE Confidence: 0.9714632

 $00:58:25.605 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.105$ evaluation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99885637

 $00:58:26.690 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.050$ but there are other adjuncts

NOTE Confidence: 0.99885637

 $00:58:28.050 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.790$ for this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98531973

 $00{:}58{:}30.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}32.130$ Complete clinical response is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.98531973

 $00:58:32.130 \longrightarrow 00:58:33.970$ always predictive of pathologic complete

NOTE Confidence: 0.98531973

 $00:58:33.970 \longrightarrow 00:58:35.170$ response, and that's really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.98531973

 $00:58:35.170 \longrightarrow 00:58:36.690$ hard part. Just because it

NOTE Confidence: 0.98531973

 $00:58:36.690 \longrightarrow 00:58:38.770$ looks like something is either

NOTE Confidence: 0.98531973

 $00:58:38.770 \longrightarrow 00:58:39.910$ there or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.9991635

 $00:58:40.305 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.905$ does not always mean that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9991635

 $00:58:41.905 \longrightarrow 00:58:43.285$ it's the same thing.

00:58:43.585 --> 00:58:44.964 So, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9391752

 $00:58:45.585 \longrightarrow 00:58:46.785$ like anything in medicine, we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9391752

 $00:58:46.785 \longrightarrow 00:58:47.825$ always on the side of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9391752

 $00:58:47.825 \longrightarrow 00:58:49.365$ sensitivity and not specificity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9992521

 $00:58:49.825 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.885$ So we can certainly

NOTE Confidence: 0.97344

 $00:58:51.185 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.045$ tolerate situations where,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97662145

 $00:58:53.589 \longrightarrow 00:58:54.890$ we think that the person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98352134

 $00:58:55.430 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.050$ still has residual disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.933935

 $00:58:57.430 \longrightarrow 00:58:58.950$ but they've off actually had

NOTE Confidence: 0.933935

 $00:58:58.950 \longrightarrow 00:59:00.630$ a pathologic complete response, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.933935

 $00:59:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.770$ we tell that on proctectomy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952367

 $00:59:02.630 \longrightarrow 00:59:03.910$ But the harder situation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952367

 $00:59:03.910 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.869$ the one that we really

NOTE Confidence: 0.96952367

 $00:59:04.869 \longrightarrow 00:59:05.609$ don't tolerate

NOTE Confidence: 0.98908687

 $00:59:05.910 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.950$ is when we think there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.98908687

00:59:06.950 --> 00:59:08.410 a complete clinical response,

 $00:59:08.775 \longrightarrow 00:59:09.974$ but there's not. And that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9663239

 $00:59:09.974 \longrightarrow 00:59:10.934$ where we sort of have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9663239

 $00:59:10.934 \longrightarrow 00:59:12.234$ to talk about close surveillance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9987413

00:59:13.734 --> 00:59:15.355 So, how do you tell?

NOTE Confidence: 0.93830955

 $00:59:16.454 \longrightarrow 00:59:17.575$ There's a couple things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93830955

 $00:59:17.575 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.555$ you can get to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9560928

00:59:19.974 --> 00:59:21.414 Full I'm I put this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9560928

 $00:59:21.414 \longrightarrow 00:59:22.055$ a little bit out of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9560928

 $00:59:22.055 \longrightarrow 00:59:23.335$ order, but, really, your clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.9560928

 $00:59:23.335 \longrightarrow 00:59:23.835$ assessment

NOTE Confidence: 0.9868029

 $00:59:24.210 \longrightarrow 00:59:25.910$ can entail MRI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734

00:59:26.369 --> 00:59:27.650 I've got some features here

NOTE Confidence: 0.9734

 $00:59:27.650 \longrightarrow 00:59:29.109$ that we do, but also

NOTE Confidence: 0.95607644

 $00{:}59{:}29.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}31.250$ digital rectal exam and full

NOTE Confidence: 0.95607644

 $00:59:31.250 \longrightarrow 00:59:32.849$ thickness local excision. So now

 $00:59:32.849 \longrightarrow 00:59:33.890$ again, we're getting all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95607644

 $00:59:33.890 \longrightarrow 00:59:35.109$ way back to it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99911785

 $00:59:36.050 \longrightarrow 00:59:36.710$ The problem

NOTE Confidence: 0.9924095

 $00:59:39.165 \longrightarrow 00:59:39.965$ is that it can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9924095

 $00:59:39.965 \longrightarrow 00:59:41.185$ equivocal. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9414603

 $00:59:41.565 \longrightarrow 00:59:42.625$ things like MRI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83724123

 $00:59:43.805 \longrightarrow 00:59:44.945$ exam and endoscopy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96342707

00:59:46.365 --> 00:59:48.145 low sensitivity and specificity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8652303

 $00{:}59{:}48.685 {\: -->\:} 00{:}59{:}49.885$ depending on, again, a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.8652303

 $00:59:49.885 \longrightarrow 00:59:50.525$ of a lot of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9425459

 $00:59:52.029 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.510$ observer bias or or, inner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9280802

 $00:59:54.910 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.730$ inner observer

NOTE Confidence: 0.8023068

 $00:59:56.829 \longrightarrow 00:59:57.329$ variability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

00:59:58.109 --> 00:59:59.230 But, again, you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

 $00:59:59.230 \longrightarrow 01:00:01.150$ here this complete response. Okay.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

01:00:01.150 --> 01:00:01.869 I think we can all

 $01{:}00{:}01.869 --> 01{:}00{:}03.150$ agree this person can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

 $01:00:03.309 \longrightarrow 01:00:04.349$ well, not all. I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

 $01:00:04.349 \longrightarrow 01:00:05.390$ you'd feel I would feel

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

 $01:00:05.390 \longrightarrow 01:00:06.430$ comfortable with the watch and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688441

 $01:00:06.430 \longrightarrow 01:00:07.365$ wait approach for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9208749

01:00:08.405 --> 01:00:09.605 What about the, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9208749

 $01:00:09.605 \longrightarrow 01:00:12.325$ incomplete, obviously residual tumor? I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9208749

 $01:00:12.325 \longrightarrow 01:00:13.605$ think we can say, okay,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9464345

01:00:14.244 --> 01:00:15.845 going towards proctectomy or, you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9464345

01:00:15.845 --> 01:00:17.065 know, doing TME,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9964549

01:00:17.685 --> 01:00:18.645 but what about this sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.9964549

 $01:00:18.645 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.025$ of in between person?

NOTE Confidence: 0.96591616

 $01{:}00{:}20.870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}22.410$ Endoscopy can be challenging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99428535

 $01:00:23.670 \longrightarrow 01:00:25.110$ The the and the findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.99428535

 $01:00:25.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:25.930$ can be hard.

 $01:00:26.390 \longrightarrow 01:00:27.590$ There's a lot of false

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957733

 $01{:}00{:}27.590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}29.430$ positives and false negatives. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9957733 01:00:29.430 --> 01:00:29.930 then NOTE Confidence: 0.97396433

 $01:00:30.550 \longrightarrow 01:00:31.750$ talking about resection of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97396433

 $01:00:31.750 \longrightarrow 01:00:33.770$ tumor booked, tumor bed or

NOTE Confidence: 0.97396433

01:00:34.045 --> 01:00:35.565 resection of residual disease. I

NOTE Confidence: 0.97396433

 $01:00:35.565 \longrightarrow 01:00:36.765$ think of this as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.97396433

01:00:36.765 --> 01:00:38.365 diagnostic tool at this point

NOTE Confidence: 0.97396433

 $01:00:38.365 \longrightarrow 01:00:39.025$ in time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9878973

 $01:00:39.325 \longrightarrow 01:00:40.765$ There is ongoing studies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9878973

01:00:40.765 --> 01:00:41.905 see if this is the rapeutic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9416683

 $01:00:42.445 \longrightarrow 01:00:44.285$ meaning are you debulking that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9416683

 $01:00:44.285 \longrightarrow 01:00:45.405$ last or getting rid of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9416683

 $01:00:45.405 \longrightarrow 01:00:46.385$ that last amount,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9762971

 $01:00:46.720 \longrightarrow 01:00:48.000$ But it has the ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.9762971

 $01:00:48.000 \longrightarrow 01:00:49.780$ really to upstage or adequately,

 $01:00:50.880 \longrightarrow 01:00:52.580$ assess for residual disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.995084

 $01:00:53.440 \longrightarrow 01:00:54.980$ more so than maybe endoscopic

NOTE Confidence: 0.995084

 $01:00:55.200 \longrightarrow 01:00:55.700$ biopsies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9802451 01:00:56.240 --> 01:00:56.720 or, NOTE Confidence: 0.99909496

 $01:00:57.280 \longrightarrow 01:00:57.780$ MRI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9637139

 $01:00:59.365 \longrightarrow 01:01:00.405$ So sorry. I went a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9637139

01:01:00.405 --> 01:01:01.545 little bit over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97504824

01:01:01.925 --> 01:01:02.885 But, again, to get back

NOTE Confidence: 0.97504824

 $01:01:02.885 \longrightarrow 01:01:03.845$ to sort of the past

NOTE Confidence: 0.97504824

 $01:01:03.845 \longrightarrow 01:01:04.805$ and the present, I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.97504824

 $01:01:04.805 \longrightarrow 01:01:06.405$ that, yes, we've started with

NOTE Confidence: 0.97504824

 $01:01:06.405 \longrightarrow 01:01:08.905$ this very crude, though accurate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9922636

01:01:09.205 --> 01:01:10.405 way of telling what what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9922636

 $01:01:10.405 \longrightarrow 01:01:11.705$ going on. We have this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9947181

 $01:01:12.810 \longrightarrow 01:01:15.050$ very complicated treatment paradigm for

 $01:01:15.050 \longrightarrow 01:01:16.410$ rectal cancer, and this doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9947181

 $01:01:16.410 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.570$ even include metastatic disease, which

NOTE Confidence: 0.9947181

 $01:01:18.570 \longrightarrow 01:01:20.190$ which can even be more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427

01:01:20.650 --> 01:01:21.770 But I think, ultimately, when

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427

 $01:01:21.770 \longrightarrow 01:01:22.890$ we're thinking about these folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427

01:01:22.890 --> 01:01:23.690 in this watch and wait

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427

 $01:01:23.690 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.730$ setting, I still think there

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427

01:01:24.730 --> 01:01:25.950 is a place for, obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427

 $01:01:26.090 \longrightarrow 01:01:27.290$ the exam, but even things

NOTE Confidence: 0.97707427 01:01:27.290 --> 01:01:27.790 like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9272902

 $01{:}01{:}28.355 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}30.355$ transanal excision in that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9839732

01:01:31.555 --> 01:01:33.015 near complete response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99704194

 $01:01:33.555 \longrightarrow 01:01:34.055$ group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96935254

01:01:34.914 --> 01:01:36.035 And with that, I'm open

NOTE Confidence: 0.96935254

 $01:01:36.035 \longrightarrow 01:01:37.714$ to any questions we may

NOTE Confidence: 0.96935254

01:01:37.714 --> 01:01:38.214 have,

 $01:01:38.674 \longrightarrow 01:01:39.795$ and and thank you everyone

NOTE Confidence: 0.93537116

01:01:39.795 --> 01:01:40.515 for their time. I'm gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.93537116

01:01:40.515 --> 01:01:41.255 stop sharing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95215553

 $01:01:42.480 \longrightarrow 01:01:43.619$ Thank you, Hadden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9920066

01:01:44.720 --> 01:01:45.680 Can you talk a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.9920066

 $01:01:45.680 \longrightarrow 01:01:47.600$ bit about the timing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9920066

 $01:01:47.600 \longrightarrow 01:01:49.680$ of surgery after radiation for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9920066

 $01:01:49.680 \longrightarrow 01:01:50.980$ rectal cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9933728

 $01:01:51.280 \longrightarrow 01:01:52.560$ what what the practice is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9933728

 $01:01:52.560 \longrightarrow 01:01:53.220$ at Yale?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9726176

 $01:01:54.080 \longrightarrow 01:01:54.960$ Yeah. I think that's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9726176

 $01:01:54.960 \longrightarrow 01:01:56.260$ great question, and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9755957

01:01:57.665 --> 01:01:58.545 I think you must have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9755957

01:01:58.545 --> 01:01:59.744 heard me arguing with Jeremy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9755957

 $01:01:59.744 \longrightarrow 01:02:00.805$ on tumor board.

 $01:02:01.265 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.464$ Yeah. So I think it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9870455

01:02:02.464 --> 01:02:03.605 it's a really important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688186

 $01:02:04.305 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.224$ point because we know that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688186

 $01:02:06.224 \longrightarrow 01:02:08.165$ one of the major impacts

NOTE Confidence: 0.9688186 01:02:08.464 --> 01:02:08.964 on NOTE Confidence: 0.94878995 01:02:10.119 --> 01:02:10.619 on, NOTE Confidence: 0.9978651

 $01:02:10.920 \longrightarrow 01:02:12.780$ tumor regression is time

NOTE Confidence: 0.9707452

 $01:02:13.240 \longrightarrow 01:02:15.660$ between radiation and assessing response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99918884

 $01:02:16.119 \longrightarrow 01:02:17.080$ And we know that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.99918884

01:02:17.080 --> 01:02:18.380 more time you wait,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81364733

 $01:02:19.000 \longrightarrow 01:02:19.500$ often times,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98579454

 $01:02:19.800 \longrightarrow 01:02:21.560$ you're gonna see more response

NOTE Confidence: 0.98579454

 $01:02:21.560 \longrightarrow 01:02:22.300$ from radiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9809988

01:02:23.715 --> 01:02:24.675 And I I kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9809988

 $01:02:24.675 \longrightarrow 01:02:25.795$ alluded to that a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.9809988

 $01:02:25.795 \longrightarrow 01:02:26.295$ earlier

01:02:27.555 --> 01:02:29.395 about, induction I I talked

NOTE Confidence: 0.98627204

01:02:29.395 --> 01:02:30.135 about induction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97791636

 $01:02:31.795 \longrightarrow 01:02:34.135$ total neoadjuvant therapy versus consolidation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99101037

 $01:02:35.235 \longrightarrow 01:02:36.435$ And and so if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.99101037

 $01:02:36.435 \longrightarrow 01:02:37.415$ look at, like, the

NOTE Confidence: 0.71774966

 $01:02:37.715 \longrightarrow 01:02:39.240$ the the which we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.71774966

01:02:39.240 --> 01:02:39.740 there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9914751

 $01:02:41.000 \longrightarrow 01:02:42.040$ a lot of people will

NOTE Confidence: 0.9914751

01:02:42.040 --> 01:02:43.560 say, well, if you look

NOTE Confidence: 0.9914751

 $01:02:43.560 \longrightarrow 01:02:44.220$ at the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9751182

 $01:02:44.840 \longrightarrow 01:02:45.800$ and and this is in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9751182

 $01:02:45.800 \longrightarrow 01:02:47.240$ the conclusions, I I believe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9751182

 $01:02:47.240 \longrightarrow 01:02:48.440$ If you look at the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831936901:02:49.720 --> 01:02:49.880 the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9506352

 $01:02:51.174 \longrightarrow 01:02:53.815$ consolidation folks, so radiation chemo

 $01:02:53.815 \longrightarrow 01:02:54.315$ radiation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96221685

 $01:02:54.934 \longrightarrow 01:02:57.275$ FOLFOX, assess risk clinical response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96221685

 $01:02:57.335 \longrightarrow 01:02:58.135$ If you look at that

NOTE Confidence: 0.96221685

01:02:58.135 --> 01:02:59.575 group, they have a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.96221685

 $01:02:59.575 \longrightarrow 01:03:00.795$ rate of organ preservation

NOTE Confidence: 0.9881889

 $01:03:01.335 \longrightarrow 01:03:02.775$ and a higher rate of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94589907

01:03:03.095 --> 01:03:03.595 CCR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96296275

01:03:04.900 --> 01:03:06.980 compared to the induction folks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96296275

 $01:03:06.980 \longrightarrow 01:03:08.180$ the chemo and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96296275

 $01:03:08.180 \longrightarrow 01:03:08.680$ radiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9927072

01:03:08.980 --> 01:03:09.860 And to me, I just

NOTE Confidence: 0.9927072

 $01:03:09.860 \longrightarrow 01:03:10.740$ think that's a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9927072

 $01:03:10.740 \longrightarrow 01:03:12.520$ of comparing apples to oranges

NOTE Confidence: 0.89470565

 $01:03:12.980 \longrightarrow 01:03:14.580$ because in that in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.89470565

 $01:03:14.580 \longrightarrow 01:03:15.780$ first group, in the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91041213

 $01:03:17.585 \longrightarrow 01:03:19.265$ consolidation folks, the time between

 $01{:}03{:}19.265 --> 01{:}03{:}20.325 \ completion \ of \ radiation$

NOTE Confidence: 0.9977853

 $01:03:20.704 \longrightarrow 01:03:22.005$ and assessing response

NOTE Confidence: 0.91892064

 $01:03:22.385 \longrightarrow 01:03:23.585$ is long. It's like about

NOTE Confidence: 0.91892064

 $01:03:23.585 \longrightarrow 01:03:24.325$ three months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944056

01:03:24.704 --> 01:03:25.744 And if you look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.944056

 $01:03:25.744 \longrightarrow 01:03:27.904$ the induction TNT folks, it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.944056

01:03:27.904 --> 01:03:29.184 like eight. It's I sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944056

 $01:03:29.184 \longrightarrow 01:03:30.404$ It's no. It's like one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944056

 $01:03:30.464 \longrightarrow 01:03:32.060$ So I think that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.944056

 $01:03:32.060 \longrightarrow 01:03:33.200$ can make it challenging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.970104

01:03:34.460 --> 01:03:36.140 Our current practice here actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.970104

 $01:03:36.140 \longrightarrow 01:03:37.420$ does depend. I think we

NOTE Confidence: 0.970104

 $01:03:37.420 \longrightarrow 01:03:38.620$ do have a a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.970104

 $01:03:38.620 \longrightarrow 01:03:39.760$ specific approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9730499

01:03:41.260 --> 01:03:41.760 But,

 $01:03:42.540 \longrightarrow 01:03:44.540$ currently, we I usually try

NOTE Confidence: 0.98950213

 $01:03:44.540 \longrightarrow 01:03:45.680$ and assess response

NOTE Confidence: 0.99947023

 $01:03:46.205 \longrightarrow 01:03:47.825$ as far out as possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.97893983

 $01:03:48.205 \longrightarrow 01:03:49.405$ with also the caveat that

NOTE Confidence: 0.97893983

 $01:03:49.405 \longrightarrow 01:03:50.765$ they we we tend to

NOTE Confidence: 0.97893983

 $01{:}03{:}50.765 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}52.865$ try and plan intervention about

NOTE Confidence: 0.97893983

 $01:03:53.085 \longrightarrow 01:03:53.905$ ten weeks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99173975

 $01:03:54.925 \longrightarrow 01:03:56.545$ after completion of radiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.99226403

 $01:03:57.165 \longrightarrow 01:03:58.545$ But there's also the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9849974

 $01:03:58.850 \longrightarrow 01:03:59.970$ the legit this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9849974

 $01:03:59.970 \longrightarrow 01:04:01.490$ great thing on paper. Okay.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9849974

 $01:04:01.490 \longrightarrow 01:04:03.010$ Well, let's check it week

NOTE Confidence: 0.9849974

01:04:03.010 --> 01:04:04.290 eight after you know, two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9849974

 $01:04:04.290 \longrightarrow 01:04:06.050$ two months after completion. And

NOTE Confidence: 0.9849974

 $01:04:06.050 \longrightarrow 01:04:07.090$ then if there's still disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.8822356

01:04:14.365 --> 01:04:15.404 I guess we've lost hat

 $01:04:15.404 \longrightarrow 01:04:16.065$ in there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01{:}04{:}17.164 --> 01{:}04{:}18.845$ But, as he mentioned, our

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01:04:18.845 \longrightarrow 01:04:20.365$ general practice is to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01:04:20.365 \longrightarrow 01:04:22.125$ the the radiation at at

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01:04:22.125 \longrightarrow 01:04:23.484$ at about the the excuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01:04:23.484 \longrightarrow 01:04:24.444$ me. Do the surgery at

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01:04:24.444 \longrightarrow 01:04:25.565$ the at the twelve week

NOTE Confidence: 0.93898755

 $01:04:25.565 \longrightarrow 01:04:26.065$ mark

NOTE Confidence: 0.94127494

 $01:04:26.365 \longrightarrow 01:04:27.984$ after radiation. So I'll finish

NOTE Confidence: 0.94084835

 $01:04:28.350 \longrightarrow 01:04:29.650$ kind of his thoughts there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94084835

 $01:04:29.710 \longrightarrow 01:04:31.550$ And typically doing the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94084835

01:04:31.550 --> 01:04:32.050 MRI

NOTE Confidence: 0.9749593

 $01:04:32.910 \longrightarrow 01:04:34.670$ eight, nine, ten weeks after

NOTE Confidence: 0.9749593

 $01:04:34.670 \longrightarrow 01:04:35.410$ that radiation

NOTE Confidence: 0.9032903

 $01:04:35.710 \longrightarrow 01:04:36.830$ as well as with flexible

 $01:04:36.830 \longrightarrow 01:04:38.770$ sick endoscopy around that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98632914

01:04:41.165 --> 01:04:42.865 Well, I wanna thank everybody

NOTE Confidence: 0.98632914

 $01:04:43.005 \longrightarrow 01:04:45.165$ for joining this evening for

NOTE Confidence: 0.98632914

01:04:45.165 --> 01:04:46.065 our Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9499352

 $01:04:46.765 \longrightarrow 01:04:48.625$ continuing medical education for colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9499352

01:04:48.765 --> 01:04:49.265 cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563188

01:04:50.205 --> 01:04:51.485 for twenty twenty four, twenty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563188

01:04:51.485 --> 01:04:52.845 five. I hope you learned

NOTE Confidence: 0.9563188

 $01:04:52.845 \longrightarrow 01:04:53.345$ something.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:04:53.650 \longrightarrow 01:04:55.010$ You can please feel free

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:04:55.010 \longrightarrow 01:04:56.369$ to email me at michael

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

01:04:56.369 --> 01:04:57.410 dot chiquini at e l

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:04:57.410 \longrightarrow 01:04:58.690$ dot e d u or

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:04:58.690 \longrightarrow 01:05:00.130$ hadden dot pentel at e

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:05:00.130 \longrightarrow 01:05:01.010$ l dot e d u.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:05:01.010 \longrightarrow 01:05:01.810$ If you want to back,

01:05:01.810 --> 01:05:03.570 Mike. Sorry. Sorry. I wasn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

01:05:03.570 --> 01:05:04.610 sure if you're coming back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:05:04.610 \longrightarrow 01:05:05.410$ So I I had a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

01:05:05.410 --> 01:05:06.290 I had a technical error.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9170132

 $01:05:06.290 \longrightarrow 01:05:06.950$ I'm sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:07.410 \longrightarrow 01:05:08.744$ So, so, anyway, the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:08.744 \longrightarrow 01:05:09.464$ the point I was gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:09.464 \longrightarrow 01:05:10.265$ say is that that that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

01:05:10.265 --> 01:05:11.224 great, and that that really

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:11.224 \longrightarrow 01:05:12.025$ makes the most sense. But,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:12.025 \longrightarrow 01:05:13.385$ also, logistically, someone said, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

01:05:13.385 --> 01:05:14.105 I have to plan. You

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01{:}05{:}14.105 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}15.305$ know? You're gonna be planning

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:15.305 \longrightarrow 01:05:16.505$ an operation. I'm gonna need

NOTE Confidence: 0.95974547

 $01:05:16.505 \longrightarrow 01:05:17.625$ to take time off of

 $01:05:17.625 \longrightarrow 01:05:18.125$ work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97771597

01:05:18.585 --> 01:05:19.545 What about letting my family

NOTE Confidence: 0.97771597

 $01:05:19.545 \longrightarrow 01:05:20.744$ know? What about arranging for

NOTE Confidence: 0.97771597

 $01:05:20.744 \longrightarrow 01:05:21.944$ childcare or other things or

NOTE Confidence: 0.97771597

 $01:05:21.944 \longrightarrow 01:05:22.444$ transportation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8715804

 $01:05:23.580 \longrightarrow 01:05:25.020$ And so sometimes it it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8715804

 $01:05:25.020 \longrightarrow 01:05:26.720$ can be logistically hard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.99891055

 $01:05:27.340 \longrightarrow 01:05:28.480$ to to do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95277876

01:05:30.140 --> 01:05:31.220 I do yeah. So that

NOTE Confidence: 0.95277876

 $01:05:31.340 \longrightarrow 01:05:32.140$ those are sort of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.95277876

 $01:05:32.140 \longrightarrow 01:05:32.640$ thoughts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9997779

 $01:05:33.340 \longrightarrow 01:05:33.840$ Absolutely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9982648

01:05:34.300 --> 01:05:35.600 Alright. Sorry. Alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82260364

 $01:05:35.975 \longrightarrow 01:05:37.095$ No. All good. Well, I

NOTE Confidence: 0.82260364

 $01:05:37.095 \longrightarrow 01:05:38.375$ kind of was in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.82260364

 $01:05:38.375 \longrightarrow 01:05:39.495$ in the beginning stages at

 $01:05:39.495 \longrightarrow 01:05:40.155$ the end,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9177661

 $01:05:41.255 \longrightarrow 01:05:42.615$ of of ending the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9177661

01:05:42.615 --> 01:05:44.215 CME. But, again, thank you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9177661

 $01:05:44.215 \longrightarrow 01:05:45.035$ doctor Pantel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98867166

 $01:05:45.735 \longrightarrow 01:05:47.515$ This was a fantastic presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98867166

 $01{:}05{:}47.655 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}49.575$ fantastic discussion. Thank you to

NOTE Confidence: 0.98867166

 $01:05:49.575 \longrightarrow 01:05:50.475$ all our attendees,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85315216 01:05:51.570 --> 01:05:52.070 for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6703701

 $01:05:53.090 \longrightarrow 01:05:53.990$ for the questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9854409

01:05:55.170 --> 01:05:56.610 Please feel free to email

NOTE Confidence: 0.9854409

 $01:05:56.610 \longrightarrow 01:05:58.310$ either of us. Our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9371071

 $01:05:58.690 \longrightarrow 01:06:00.850$ names and, emails are on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9371071

 $01:06:00.850 \longrightarrow 01:06:01.890$ the website, but it's pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9371071

01:06:01.890 --> 01:06:02.690 simple at e l. It's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9371071

 $01:06:02.690 \longrightarrow 01:06:03.650$ first name dot last name

 $01:06:03.650 \longrightarrow 01:06:04.790$ at e l dot edu.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903207

 $01:06:05.734 \longrightarrow 01:06:06.775$ We'd be happy to answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9903207

01:06:06.775 --> 01:06:07.674 additional questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9389278

 $01{:}06{:}08.055 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}09.095$ Thank you so much. Have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9389278

 $01:06:09.095 \longrightarrow 01:06:10.234$ a great night here, everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9987986

 $01:06:11.095 \longrightarrow 01:06:11.595$ Thanks.