WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:49:36" NOTE recognizability:0.534

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:02.196$  Thank you so much for coming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}00{:}02.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}03.894$  You know, we are getting back to

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:03.894 \dashrightarrow 00:00:05.671$  full in person and I know there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:05.671 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.400$  a lot of people on Zoom as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:00:07.400 --> 00:00:09.240 So thank you so much for coming today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}00{:}09.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}11.711$  And I will be talking about immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}00{:}11.711 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}13.385$  checkpoint inhibition and Novant

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:13.385 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.597$  the rapies for myelodysplastic syndromes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:15.600 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.720$  These are my disclosures

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:16.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:18.120$  and this is the outline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}00{:}18.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.640$  I'm going to cover 4 areas that have seen a

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:20.699 \longrightarrow 00:00:23.155$  lot of developments in the last few years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:23.160 \longrightarrow 00:00:25.904$  The first one is updates and classification

 $00:00:25.904 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.344$  as well as risk stratification

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:28.344 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.716$  and response assessment MD's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:30.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.478$  the evolving therapies for lower risk MD's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}00{:}33.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.646$  high risk MD's and then specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:35.646 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.475$  about the immune checkpoint inhibition

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}00{:}37.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39.874$  efforts that I have been trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:39.874 \dashrightarrow 00:00:42.513$  kind of doing in these disease areas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:00:42.520 --> 00:00:44.320 So what are myelodysplastic syndromes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:44.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.661$  neoplasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:00:44.661 --> 00:00:47.048 You can see that we actually have

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:47.048 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.306$  formally added the name neoplasms finally

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:49.306 \longrightarrow 00:00:51.568$  because for a long time myelosplastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:51.629 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.832$  syndromes were thought of as syndrome

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:00:53.832 --> 00:00:56.688 or pre leukemia or a disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:56.688 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.956$  but they are actually cancers and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:00:58.956 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.440$  has been formally diagnosed by The Who.

 $00:01:01.440 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.168$  They are basically uncommon

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:03.168 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.760$  only four in 100,000 a year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:05.760 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.756$  20,000 cases of MD's in the US.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:01:08.760 --> 00:01:09.028 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:09.028 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.904$  the median ages in the early 70s

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:01:10.904 --> 00:01:13.115 and the number of patients with MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:01:13.115 --> 00:01:15.115 has been increasing because we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}15.115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}16.755$  more and more cancer survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:01:16.760 --> 00:01:19.064 I share many patients with many of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}19.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.958$  on the solid pumor side because those

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}21.958 \rightarrow 00{:}01{:}23.886$  patients have secondary myelodysplastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:23.886 \longrightarrow 00:01:26.715$  syndromes and those can be among the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}26.715 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}28.510$  most challenging patients to treat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:28.510 \longrightarrow 00:01:31.062$  And you can see here another fact that

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:31.062 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.268$  emphasizes the malignant nature of MD's.

 $00:01:33.270 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.433$  So this is the five year survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}35.433 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}37.256$  of patients with MD's in Violet

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:37.256 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.906$  and you can see it's 31%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:38.910 \longrightarrow 00:01:40.646$  very close to what you get with

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:01:40.646 --> 00:01:42.586 AML which is 25% but much worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:42.586 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.768$  than some of the more common solid

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}44.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}46.994$  tumors such as breast and lung when

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:46.994 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.358$  you take all the patients together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}01{:}49.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51.296$  Again further emphasizing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:51.296 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.716$  malignant nature of these conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:53.720 \longrightarrow 00:01:55.484$  And more recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:55.484 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.713$  we also understood that there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:01:58.713 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.750$  large number of people who go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:00.812 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.022$  a process called clonal hematopoiesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:03.022 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.232$  of indeterminate potential or CHIP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:05.240 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.949$  And this is a condition that happens

 $00:02:07.949 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.140$  in up to 10% of people older than 70.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}02{:}11.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}13.324$  And some of those progress to MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:13.324 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.260$  and some don't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:14.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.086$  but they are also associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:17.086 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.499$  inflammation and cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:18.499 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.831$  risk and many other syndromic

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:20.831 \longrightarrow 00:02:22.615$  dysfunction across the body.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:22.620 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.972$  This is why multiple disciplines including

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:24.972 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.020$  cardiology have been interested in this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}02{:}27.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}28.868$  And for that more and more cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:28.868 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.442$  centers have been interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:30.442 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.620$  establishing clinics for chip and seekers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00{:}02{:}32.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}35.165$  And here our newest recruit, Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:35.165 \longrightarrow 00:02:37.235$  Lourdes Mendez has taken over this

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:37.235 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.065$  aspect and I think this is going to

 $00:02:40.065 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.740$  become very important in the coming years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:42.740 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.540$  The management of MD's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.458$  as I'm going to show you in a little bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:45.460 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.420$  has been difficult to get new therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:47.420 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.956$  And part of this is because of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:02:49.956 --> 00:02:51.539 large heterogeneity of the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

 $00:02:51.540 \longrightarrow 00:02:53.580$  This is a schema showing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5386517

00:02:53.580 --> 00:02:54.940 genetic landscape of MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}02{:}54.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}57.127$  And you can see here that there are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:02:57.127 --> 00:02:58.946 than 40 recurrently abnormal somatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}02{:}58.946 \to 00{:}03{:}01.220$  mutations that can happen in patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:01.220 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.332$  However, less than six of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:03.332 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.794$  happen in more than 10% of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:05.794 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.116$  Therefore, there are many different driver

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:08.116 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.171$  genes and developing the rapies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:10.171 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.601$  work across the spectrum for patients

 $00:03:12.601 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.976$  with MD's has been quite challenging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}03{:}14.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}16.865$  Another I think challenging feature

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:03:16.865 --> 00:03:19.100 has been the classification of MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:19.100 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.420$  And over the years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:20.420 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.400$  how do you separate MD's from

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}03{:}22.467 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}24.417$  AML has been a moving target.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.686$  Historically A+ count of 30% was used

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}03{:}27.686 \to 00{:}03{:}30.793$  and then this was changed to 20% most

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:30.793 \longrightarrow 00:03:34.244$  recently last year and this created a

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:34.244 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.500$  huge difficulty in the field is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:37.500 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.100$  target blast count has been moved to 10%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:40.100 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.634$  So now there is this new entity

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:42.634 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.149$  called MD's slash AML which is 10 to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:03:45.149 --> 00:03:47.373 19% blast and this is causing a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:47.373 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.071$  of confusion for patients especially

 $00:03:49.071 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.477$  that the PATH reports get released

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:51.477 \longrightarrow 00:03:53.263$  immediately to patient nowadays or

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:53.263 \longrightarrow 00:03:55.419$  they are being told that you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}03{:}55.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}58.564$  MD's by 1 classification and AML

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:03:58.564 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.136$  by another classification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:00.140 --> 00:04:02.060 And to address this issue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}02.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}04.804$  we actually have worked with a large

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:04.804 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.115$  number of international colleagues to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:07.115 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.775$  establish international consortium of MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:09.780 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.084$  This is an effort that involves

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}12.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}14.277$  many experts across the world to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:14.277 --> 00:04:16.621 try to come up with a unified way

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:16.694 --> 00:04:18.578 of classifying the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}18.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.800$  And indeed we have put together

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:20.800 \longrightarrow 00:04:23.304$  more than 70 more than 7000 cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}23.304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}25.558$  which by the numbers of MD's is

00:04:25.558 --> 00:04:27.896 quite actually quite large of highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}27.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}30.087$  annotated cases to try to come up

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:30.087 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.229$  with one unified classification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:32.230 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.970$  There's another update of this effort

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}33.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}36.124$  that will be presented in ASH in an

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:36.124 --> 00:04:37.540 oral fashion this year and hopefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:37.597 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.186$  the paper will be published soon so

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:39.186 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.955$  that we can have one common way in

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}41.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}45.979$  which we can talk to patients with MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:45.980 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.528$  After that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:46.528 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.720$  What is I think important is the risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:04:48.780 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.764$  stratification. Why is that important?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}50.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}51.908$  Because patients with MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:51.908 --> 00:04:52.980 have variable prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:52.980 --> 00:04:54.930 Some patients can live for multiple

00:04:54.930 --> 00:04:56.592 years while other patients have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}56.592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}58.137$  prognosis that's almost akin to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:04:58.137 --> 00:04:59.900 that of acute leukemia patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}04{:}59.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}01.315$  meaning that the prognosis can

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}05{:}01.315 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}03.554$  be less than six to nine months

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:03.554 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.474$  and therefore having good risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:05.474 \longrightarrow 00:05:07.539$  stratification systems is very important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:05:07.540 --> 00:05:07.814 Historically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}05{:}07.814 \longrightarrow 00{:}05{:}10.280$  you can see in this table four of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:10.334 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.589$  most commonly used stratification systems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}05{:}12.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}14.550$  All of them rely on the number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:14.550 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.279$  the plast in the bone marrow as

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:16.279 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.950$  well as the karyotypic abnormalities

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:17.950 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.870$  and the blood counts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:19.870 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.203$  However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:20.203 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.534$  none of those were very good because

 $00:05:22.534 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.112$  for a long time we and others have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:05:25.112 --> 00:05:27.506 shown that some of the patients that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:05:27.506 --> 00:05:30.068 are called lower risk MD's die guickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:30.070 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.870$  die within two years of diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}05{:}31.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}34.355$  More than 1/4 of those lower risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:34.355 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.655$  MD's patients and it was clear that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:36.655 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.240$  these prognostic risk scores are

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:05:38.307 --> 00:05:40.187 not capturing the whole spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:40.190 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.558$  of the disease severity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:41.558 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.144$  And we also have shown that among

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:05:44.144 --> 00:05:46.350 patients with therapy related MD's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.790$  which historically have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00{:}05{:}47.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.590$  considered very high risk disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

00:05:49.590 --> 00:05:51.790 some of them do OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87494814

 $00:05:51.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:53.910$  do better than some of the other patients.

 $00:05:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.178$  And that's again reflective of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}05{:}56.178 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}05{:}58.669$  variability on prognosis of those patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}05{:}58.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}00.805$  And This is why it's important to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:00.805 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.054$  apply good risk stratification

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:03.054 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.646$  process for every patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:06:05.650 --> 00:06:07.996 After all of this basically the IPSSM,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:07.996 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.832$  the molecular IPSS was finally published

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:09.832 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.802$  after a large international effort in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}11.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}13.806$  the New England Journal of Evidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:13.810 \dashrightarrow 00:06:17.090$  You can see the Bernard ET al Citation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}17.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19.786$  But the short of this is that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}19.786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}21.332$  incorporated the molecular alterations

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}21.332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}25.175$  in the calculation and that led to a more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:25.175 \longrightarrow 00:06:27.487$  accurate risk stratification picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:27.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.807$  And we have shown in a large

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:29.807 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.330$  analysis of two phase,

 $00:06:31.330 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.521$  phase two and phase three trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}33.521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}35.825$  were presented last year in ASH that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:35.825 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.800$  system does lead to upstaging of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:06:38.800 --> 00:06:40.888 You can see in red the high risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:40.888 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.838$  patients by the old scoring system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:42.840 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.916$  the Ipss, then the revised Ipss,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:44.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.320$  then most recently the molecular IPSS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}47.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}49.184$  And you can see that the number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:49.184 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.569$  patients who are being diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}50.569 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52.297$  now as high risk disease because

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}52.297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}53.878$  their prognosis is indeed poor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:53.880 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.845$  is becoming higher and therefore

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}06{:}55.845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58.280$  more of those patients are being

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:06:58.280 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.610$  directed for aggressive treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:01.610 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.650$  The last area I want to cover before we go

 $00:07:03.699 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.685$  to the response criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:05.690 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.408$  This is actually a very important

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}07{:}08.408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10.611$ area because response criteria have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:10.611 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.462$  been quite problematic in MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:12.462 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.538$  And I can tell you that it's my

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:15.538 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.614$  belief and several of my colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:17.614 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.882$  at the same believe that it has

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:07:19.882 --> 00:07:21.770 impeded drug development in MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:21.770 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.532$  Why is that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:22.532 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.056$  Because some of the issues with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}07{:}24.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}25.788$  the response criteria have led

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:25.788 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.208$  to certain medications moving

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:27.208 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.977$  from phase one to phase three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:28.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.020$  That probably should not have been the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:31.020 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.302$  And This is why we have many

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:07:33.302 --> 00:07:34.939 Phase 3 failures in MD's.

 $00:07:34.940 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.952$  So again using a large international

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:37.952 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.770$  effort over the last two years

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:40.770 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.179$  that was coordinated through the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:07:43.179 --> 00:07:44.658 international working group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}07{:}44.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.350$  we have revised these response

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:47.350 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.040$  criteria and this consensus proposal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:50.040 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.832$  for revised international working

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:51.832 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.520$  group criteria has been now published

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:07:54.586 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.644$  and it started to be implemented

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}07{:}56.644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}58.466$  in some clinical trials protocols.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:07:58.466 --> 00:08:01.217 We have been in discussions with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:01.217 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.200$  FDA as well about implementing this in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}08{:}04.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07.260$  in their assessment and I'm hopeful

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:07.340 \longrightarrow 00:08:10.224$  that this will become a more uniform

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:08:10.224 --> 00:08:12.916 way of looking at clinical trial

 $00:08:12.916 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.296$  to further like establish their

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:15.296 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.113$  the efficacy of the rapeutics in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:18.113 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.367$  more consistent fashion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:19.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.010$  And we are validating this using

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:22.010 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.262$  WD database which will look both

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}08{:}24.262 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.977$  at the international working group

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:25.977 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.645$  criteria as well as the IPSSM.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:27.645 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.220$  We actually have this database

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:30.220 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.050$  again with 15 different centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:33.050 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.650$  Six of those presentations are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}08{:}34.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}36.729$  going to be upcoming in in ASH,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:36.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.046$  two of them are oral presentations

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:39.046 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.370$  by Doctor Tarek Iwan and by

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:41.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.125$  our newer newest recruit Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:43.130 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.852$  Ian Beversdorf.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

00:08:43.852 --> 00:08:46.379 So I think this is going to

 $00:08:46.379 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.521$  further validate these response

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:48.521 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.010$  criteria as the way to establish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:53.010 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.008$  establish them as a way to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:55.008 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.850$  approve medications in the future.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}08{:}56.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59.160$  So now moving from classification

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:08:59.160 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.470$  and response assessment to other

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:09:01.540 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.722$  therapies and you are looking here

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00{:}09{:}03.722 \longrightarrow 00{:}09{:}05.937$  at the approved the rapies in in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9671921

 $00:09:05.937 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.133$  top line by the FDA and in the lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:08.201 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.177$  line by the EMA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}09{:}09{:}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}10{.}902$  And what you can quickly see compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:10.902 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.848$  to many solid tumours is that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:09:12.848 --> 00:09:14.293 don't have many approved therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:14.300 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.134$  This has been a very frustrating Rd.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:09:16.140 --> 00:09:18.732 for drug development in MD's and

00:09:18.732 --> 00:09:21.172 in high risk MD's. For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:21.172 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.020$  we did not have a drug approved in

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:24.099 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.979$  the last 20 years until the year 2020.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:26.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.140$  So I'm going to show you the main

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:29.140 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.734$  therapies that we currently have

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:30.734 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.058$  available and how we are finally breaking

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:33.114 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.139$  through that deadlock of the rapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}09{:}35.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}37.359$  evolution and we are starting I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}09{:}37.359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}39.658$  to have better the rapies come along.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:39.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.520$  So the traditional approach of

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:41.520 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.815$  treating patients with lower risk MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}09{:}43.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}46.047$  depends on symptom control because we

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:46.047 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.099$  cannot currently cure these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:48.100 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.036$  The only way to cure a patient with

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:09:50.036 --> 00:09:51.819 MD's with bone marrow transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}09{:}51.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}53.420$  but bone marrow transplants are

 $00:09:53.420 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.700$  usually reserved for patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:09:54.700 --> 00:09:56.297 who have higher risk disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:56.300 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.680$  not lower risk disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:57.680 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.060$  For patients with anaemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:09:59.060 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.126$  the standard treatment would be ESA's

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:02.126 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.659$  erythropoiesis stimulating agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:03.660 \longrightarrow 00:10:06.282$  However, those drugs are not active

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:06.282 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.389$  except in less than 1/2 of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:09.390 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.442\ 40\%$  and the response last less

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:11.442 \longrightarrow 00:10:12.468$  than 12 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:10:12.470 --> 00:10:14.990 And I'm going to show you how this landscape

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:14.990 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.429$  has changed in the last couple of years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}10{:}17.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}19.712$  So the first I think major improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}10{:}19.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}21.828$  was the introduction and final approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:21.828 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.623$  of this drug called luspetercept,

 $00:10:23.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.830$  what is luspetercept,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:24.830 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.030$  the silicon trap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:26.030 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.142$  It works on a pathway called

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:10:28.142 --> 00:10:29.550 transforming growth factor pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:29.550 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.246$  These ligands suppress erythropoiesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:32.246 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.268$  especially late erythropoiesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:10:34.270 --> 00:10:36.340 and using this ligand trap has

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:36.340 \longrightarrow 00:10:38.390$  led to restoration of effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:10:38.390 --> 00:10:40.508 erythropoiesis and ultimately

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:40.508 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.626$  improved transition independence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:42.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.240$  This led to transition independence in

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:45.240 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.748$  around 40% of patients in the in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}10{:}47.748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}49.515$  phase three Middle East trial which

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:49.515 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.357$  was the landmark paper published in

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:51.357 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.587$  the New England Journal of Medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:53.590 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.398$  And based on this this drug was approved.

 $00:10:56.400 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.265$  And we have subsequently published

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:10:58.265 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.473$  additional follow up from this trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:00.473 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.440$  that showed that this drug not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:02.440 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.557$  lead to high rates of transfusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:04.557 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.422$  independence but it actually also

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:06.422 --> 00:11:08.260 leads to significant reduction in

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:08.260 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.450$  transfusions for patients who do not

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}11{:}10.511 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}12.395$  become transfusion dependent and

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}11{:}12.395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}14.279$  lead to hematologic improvements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:11:16.158$  And this year the major development

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:16.158 --> 00:11:18.815 in lower risk MD's has been the final

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:18.815 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.495$  publication of the commands trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}11{:}20.495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}22.563$  which looked at the activity of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:22.563 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.636$  specter sit in the frontline setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:24.636 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.708$  So this is comparing it against

 $00:11:27.708 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.346$  erythropoiesis stimulating agents

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}11{:}29.346 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}31.530$  in patients with ringsid roplasts

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}11{:}31.593 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}33.348$  and without rings idroplasts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:33.350 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.988$  So this was a primary analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:34.990 --> 00:11:38.366 This paper is now out in The Lancet

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:38.366 --> 00:11:40.494 journal showing that patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:40.494 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.198$  received Los Pertoset achieved

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:42.198 --> 00:11:43.470 60% transition independence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:43.470 --> 00:11:45.990 almost double that what you expect

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.656$  with patients who receive ESA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}11{:}47.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}50.000$  So clearly a very active drug and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:50.063 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.857$  moving to the frontline treatment of

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:51.857 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.131$  MD's which is a fundamental change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:11:54.131 --> 00:11:56.907 how we treat patients with lower risk MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:56.907 \longrightarrow 00:11:59.289$  We are trying to move this

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:11:59.289 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.549$  further through two other trials.

 $00:12:01.550 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.110$  One is the element trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00{:}12{:}03.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}05.091$  which is a large phase three trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

00:12:05.091 --> 00:12:07.230 that will be looking at patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:12:07.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.265$  who are not transfusion dependent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:12:09.270 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.789$  Here we are trying to move the

NOTE Confidence: 0.62744665

 $00:12:10.789 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.440$  bar higher and

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:11.489 --> 00:12:13.337 we are trying to prevent patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:13.337 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.569$  from even becoming transfusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:14.625 --> 00:12:16.185 dependent by treating them at a

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}12{:}16.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}17.607$  earlier stage of their anaemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:17.607 --> 00:12:20.246 So this trial which will open at

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}12{:}20.246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}22.971$  TLI think will be very important as

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}12{:}22.971 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}24.597$ a landmark trial in the management

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}12{:}24.597 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26.624$  of MD's if it's positive because it

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:26.624 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.978$  would be the first time we get a drug

00:12:28.980 --> 00:12:31.080 potentially approved for patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:31.080 \longrightarrow 00:12:33.180$  are not yet transfusion dependent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:33.180 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.980$  And another phase three trial that

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:34.980 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.011$  we are working on with the sponsor

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:37.011 --> 00:12:38.950 basically is looking at the use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:39.009 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.060$  the drug at maximal doses because we

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:41.060 --> 00:12:42.881 currently many of the patients are

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:42.881 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.932$  not being escalated to the right dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}12{:}44.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}47.670$  that leads to highest response rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:47.670 --> 00:12:49.553 So I think starting with the higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}12{:}49.553 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}51.520$  response with the higher dose is going

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:51.520 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.170$  to increase the response rate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:53.221 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.461$  potentially open the door for more and

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:12:55.461 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.573$  more patients responding to this drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:12:57.573 --> 00:13:01.349 And this trial is also up going to open ATL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}01.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}02.934$  another drug that I think generated

 $00{:}13{:}02.934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.790$  a lot of interest is Amitelestad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.520$  This is a first in class telomerase

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:07.520 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.910$  inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:07.910 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.275$  So telomerase activity in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}10.275 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}12.950$  with MD's has been associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:12.950 \longrightarrow 00:13:14.710$  high risk disease and inhibition

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.318$  of the telomerase it has led to

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}17.318 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}18.874$  restoration of effective erythropoiesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:13:18.874 --> 00:13:21.119 in a large phase two trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:21.120 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.284$  This is a drug that's given intravenously

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}24.284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}27.050$  every four weeks and in a phase two trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}27.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}28.562$  lead to 40% transfusion independence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:28.562 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.240$  So this was taken to a phase three trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}32.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}35.159$  We have presented the data of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:13:35.160 --> 00:13:39.200 paper in in Asch or sorry in ASCO

 $00:13:39.200 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.900$  2023 and the paper is now in Lancet in

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}41.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44.971$  press where patients were randomized to

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}44.971 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47.127$ receive hematillostat versus placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:47.130 \longrightarrow 00:13:49.188$  Again those are patients who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:49.188 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.560$  heavily transfusion dependent with

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}13{:}50.617 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}52.810$  lower risk MD's and you can see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:13:52.810 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.758$  again that the rate of transfusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:13:54.758 --> 00:13:57.038 dependence was similar to phase two

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:13:57.038 --> 00:14:00.138 trial with 40% compared to 15%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:00.138 --> 00:14:01.530 And importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}14{:}01.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}03.565$  the degree of hemoglobin elevation

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:03.565 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.193$  is actually quite prominence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:05.200 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.252$  So the hemoglobin increase was almost

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:07.252 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.643$  3 grams on average from a hemoglobin

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:09.643 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.557$  of eight to hemoglobin of 11.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:11.560 --> 00:14:13.318 So quite active and the durability

00:14:13.318 --> 00:14:15.812 is very good, It's around 51 weeks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:15.812 \longrightarrow 00:14:18.230$  which fought by MD's criteria is

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:18.311 --> 00:14:19.880 actually pretty good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:19.880 --> 00:14:21.581 So this drug is currently in front

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:21.581 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.274$  of the FDA for consideration of

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:23.274 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.388$  approval and if it gets approved it

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:25.451 --> 00:14:27.565 will offer another I think very good

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:27.565 --> 00:14:29.128 opportunity for our patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:29.128 --> 00:14:31.396 lower risk MD's to become transition free,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:31.400 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.360$  which is very important moving

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}14{:}33.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34.928$  to high risk MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:34.930 --> 00:14:37.874 This is where we have more of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}14{:}37.874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40.090$  recent failures I would say in

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:40.090 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.930$  in development of new therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:41.930 --> 00:14:43.694 This figure I'm showing you has not

 $00:14:43.694 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.690$  really changed in the last almost 20 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}14{:}45.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}47.690$  So patients who are candidates

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:47.690 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.690$  for transplant go for transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:49.757 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.571$  and those who are not the receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:52.571 \longrightarrow 00:14:53.375$  hypomythylating agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

00:14:53.380 --> 00:14:53.900 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:53.900 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.500$  we know that hypomuthilating agent

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:14:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.618$  treatment by itself is not great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}14{:}58.620 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}15{:}00.909$  The long term survival only if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:15:00.909 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.946$  use HMA without going to transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}15{:}02.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06.024$  is less than 4% and for that reason

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00{:}15{:}06.024 \to 00{:}15{:}07.788$  we strongly encourage patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.34587935

 $00:15:07.788 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.670$  to consider

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:15:08.747 --> 00:15:10.440 transplant whenever possible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:15:10.440 --> 00:15:13.160 but also try to build up on HMA

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}15{:}13.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}14.968$  therapy to improve outcomes.

00:15:14.970 --> 00:15:17.178 And this is kind of a summary of

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:17.178 \longrightarrow 00:15:18.661$  three different real life studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:18.661 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.062$  that we have done that show that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:21.062 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.000$  real life outcomes with Hmas are

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:23.000 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.924$  actually much worse than what you

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:24.924 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.832$  see in clinical trials with immediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:26.832 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.800$  survival of only one year on average

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:28.800 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.449$  for patients with high risk MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:30.450 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.935$  Again further emphasizing the point

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:32.935 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.856$  for new therapies for patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:15:35.856 --> 00:15:37.958 high risk MD's and we have tried,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:37.958 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.846$  we have tried for a very long

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}15{:}39.846 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}41.538$  time over the last 20 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:41.540 \longrightarrow 00:15:43.244$  Unfortunately this graveyard of

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:43.244 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.800$  combinations of drugs that were added

 $00:15:45.867 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.337$  to hypomthilating agents keep expanding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:48.340 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.536$  The latest addition was this drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:50.536 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.179$  magrolimab which works on the CD 47 pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:53.180 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.140$  This is a very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:55.140 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.667$  this drug has generated a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:15:57.667 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.675$  excitement early on but unfortunately

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:15:59.675 --> 00:16:02.219 a recent press release couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:02.219 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.560$  months ago showed that phase three

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}16{:}04.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}06.638$  trial of this drug was negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:16:06.638 --> 00:16:09.320 We can talk I guess in a in another

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}16{:}09.388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}12.027$  time once the data is publicly released

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:16:12.027 --> 00:16:14.195 about the reasons for for failure and

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:14.195 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.230$  how we can try to come up out of this system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:17.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.518$  The good news is that we have other

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:16:19.518 --> 00:16:21.734 drugs that are more exciting and

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:21.734 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.704$  potentially could lead to approval.

 $00:16:23.710 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.230$  One of them is venetoclax.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:25.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.230$  So venetoclax is an oral PCL 2 inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:28.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.184$  This is already approved for patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:31.184 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.429$  acute myeloid leukemia who are older.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:33.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.878$  The frontline phase two trial should

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:35.880 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.986$  CR responses of around 35% and across

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:39.986 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.899$  the genetic spectrum of MD's we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:42.899 \longrightarrow 00:16:45.090$  published a phase 1P study that shows

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:45.157 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.221$  that adding venetoclax to HMA is

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:16:47.221 --> 00:16:49.920 actually active in the HMA failure setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:49.920 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.540$  which is a very difficult

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:51.540 \longrightarrow 00:16:53.160$  setting to treat patients in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}16{:}53.160 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}16{:}55.926$  It leads to responses as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:55.926 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.309$  as transition independence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:16:57.310 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.498$  But the pivotal phase three trial is is

00:17:00.498 --> 00:17:02.106 fully accrued now it's called Verona.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:17:02.110 --> 00:17:04.180 This trial might change the

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:04.180 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.949$  landscape of how high risk MD's is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:06.950 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.870$  is going to be treated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:08.870 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.502$  This is the scheme of the trial that

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:10.502 \longrightarrow 00:17:11.868$  we presented a couple of years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}11.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}13.466$  This trial is now fully accrued.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:13.470 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.955$  It's the results are actually expected by

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}15.955 \to 00{:}17{:}19.544$  early 2024 and if this trial is possible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:19.550 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.457$  it would lead to a new standard of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}22.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24.990$  Now moving to immune dysregulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}24.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}27.520$  myeloid malignancies and this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:27.598 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.474$  an area where I have personally

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}29.474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31.560$  invested quite a bit of time trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:17:31.618 --> 00:17:34.260 to develop new therapies for both

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}34.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}36.860$  MD's and acute myeloid leukemia.

 $00:17:36.860 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.799$  So we know that the most effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}38.799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}40.214$  treatment for patients with MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}40.214 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41.816$  and AML is bone marrow transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:41.820 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.260$  which is effectively is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:44.260 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.236$  immune intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:45.240 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.075$  We know there is significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

00:17:47.075 --> 00:17:48.910 dysfunction in the immune system

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:48.980 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.297$  happens in patients with MD's and AML

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}51.297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}53.186$  both at diagnosis but also during

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:53.186 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.916$  the progression of the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}54.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}57.030$  There is both quantitative and

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:17:57.030 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.140$  qualitative abnormalities that happen in

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}17{:}59.203 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}01.875$  the T cells including the regulatory T cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:18:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.555$  but also in the macrophages

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:18:03.555 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.026$  and the ANKAE cells.

 $00:18:05.026 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.822$  And study after study have shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00{:}18{:}07.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}10.305$  that these increase in frequency

NOTE Confidence: 0.40800372

 $00:18:10.305 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.365$  as the disease progresses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:12.370 \longrightarrow 00:18:13.870$  The question has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:13.870 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.370$  always are these pathogenic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:15.370 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.430$  are they basically mediating the

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}18{:}17.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20.050$  progression and the resistance of AML and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:18:20.050 --> 00:18:22.073 MD's or are they basically are adhering,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}18{:}22.073 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}24.460$  they are just a phenomena that comes

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:24.521 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.567$  with the progression of the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:26.570 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.538$  And the first trial I think that generated

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:28.538 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.785$  a lot of interest of immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:30.785 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.480$  inhibition which clearly in solid

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:18:32.536 --> 00:18:34.489 tumors have led to a major revolution,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:34.490 \longrightarrow 00:18:37.490$  but in in in blood tumors has not

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:37.490 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.489$  led to the same impact so far.

 $00:18:40.490 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.560$  However, the Dana Farber group

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}18{:}42.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}44.630$  published this trial using Epilumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:44.701 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.875$  which is a CTL A4 inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:46.875 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.450$  approved for multiple solar tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:49.450 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.290$  Now it was a small phase one study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:52.290 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.341$  but it was done in the post

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:54.341 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.952$  transplant setting where the drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:55.952 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.980$  was given for patients who relapse

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}18{:}57.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}59.765$  after transplant and what they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:18:59.765 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.423$  shown that the drug was tolerated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:19:01.423 --> 00:19:03.824 There were some GVHD but generally it

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:03.824 \dashrightarrow 00:19:06.728$  was well tolerated for the most part and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}19{:}06.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}10.100$  they were able to achieve 5 responses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:19:10.100 --> 00:19:13.040 5 complete remissions out of 13 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:13.040 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.231$  which again was a proof of principle

 $00:19:15.231 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.640$  that immune checkpoint inhibition

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:16.640 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.680$  post transplant does actually work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:18.680 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.720$  And this generated a number of trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:21.720 \longrightarrow 00:19:24.333$  looking at the drug in MD's and AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:24.333 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.199$  This is one of the trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:26.200 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.272$  one of the early trials that I have

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}19{:}28.272 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}30.264$  worked on actually when I was at

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:30.264 \dashrightarrow 00:19:32.200$  Hopkins and later moved it to Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}19{:}32.200 --> 00{:}19{:}33.379 \ \mathrm{It \ was \ multicentre},$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:19:33.379 --> 00:19:36.130 it was in the post relapse setting

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:36.205 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.877$  for patients with MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:37.880 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.560$  So this was not after transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:39.560 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.224$  this was after HMA failure in

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:42.224 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.556$  patients with MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:43.560 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.934$  And while we have shown that

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:44.934 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.400$  the drug was well tolerated,

 $00:19:46.400 \longrightarrow 00:19:48.470$  we could manage the immune related

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:48.470 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.850$  adverse events effectively similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:49.907 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.511$  to what they do in solid tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:51.511 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.917$  The clinical responses were generally very

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:53.917 \dashrightarrow 00:19:57.190$  low and the drug was not clinically active.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:19:57.190 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.848$  We did achieve some disease stabilisation

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:19:59.848 --> 00:20:02.313 but stable disease always very tricky

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:20:02.313 --> 00:20:04.801 in MD's to figure out is it related

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}20{:}04.868 \longrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07.276$  to the biology of the disease being

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:07.276 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.390$  indolent in some patients or is it

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:09.390 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.350$  related to the activity of the drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:20:11.350 --> 00:20:11.745 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}20{:}11.745 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}14.510$  among those patients who had stable disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:14.510 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.815$  we have conducted extensive correlative

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:16.815 \longrightarrow 00:20:19.740$  testing with Leo Loznick at Hopkins.

 $00:20:19.740 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.012$  And we have shown that there was an

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}20{:}22.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}24.157$  increase in the frequency of Icos

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:20:24.157 --> 00:20:26.013 which is costimulatory molecule,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:26.013 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.006$  but this this was not basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:30.006 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.136$  associated with increase in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:32.136 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.500$  peripheral T cell receptor diversity in

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}20{:}34.500 \to 00{:}20{:}36.660$  terms of association with the response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:36.660 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.698$  And I think trying to find biomarkers

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}20{:}39.698 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}42.989$  for patients has been one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:20:42.989 --> 00:20:45.364 also challenging areas in immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}20{:}45.364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47.450$  checkpoint inhibition in MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:47.450 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.235$  Of course single arm trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:49.235 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.450$  as I mentioned are not very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:51.450 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.418$  are not very definitive in any

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:53.418 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.402$  kind of activity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:54.410 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.330$  Some of those phase one trials

00:20:56.330 --> 00:20:57.610 have shown positive signals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:57.610 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.350$  but the definitive way to achieve

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:20:59.350 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.234$  that would be with a randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:21:01.234 --> 00:21:03.498 trial and we worked with the with

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:21:03.498 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.426$  the Celgene slash BMS to develop

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00:21:06.426 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.674$  this trial of randomized trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:21:08.674 --> 00:21:11.026 This was the only randomized published

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

 $00{:}21{:}11.026 \longrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13.267$  trial to date of immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.29320434

00:21:13.267 --> 00:21:15.361 inhibition both in MD's and AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:15.370 --> 00:21:17.836 So patients with MD's or AML

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:17.836 --> 00:21:19.480 in two separate cohorts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:19.480 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.420$  more than 210 patients were

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:21.420 --> 00:21:22.972 randomized to receive azacitidine

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:22.972 --> 00:21:25.120 or azacitidine with dorvalumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:25.120 --> 00:21:26.866 Many of you are probably familiar

 $00{:}21{:}26.866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29.167$  with this PDL 1 inhibitor which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}21{:}29.167 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}30.952$  approved to multiple solid tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:30.952 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.045$  and has shown overall survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:33.045 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.240$  prolongation in in several settings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:35.240 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.515$  However, again this was a negative trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.620$  You can see here complete overlap in

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}21{:}39.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41.210$  the overall survival and progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:41.210 --> 00:21:43.106 free survival cares and no difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}21{:}43.106 \to 00{:}21{:}44.842$  in the primary endpoint which

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:44.842 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.587$  was the overall response rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}21{:}46.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}48.126$  So this was disappointing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:48.126 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.046$  We try to understand better

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:50.046 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.627$  why is that the case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:21:51.630 --> 00:21:53.910 why did the drug not lead to improvement?

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.806$  So the first theory is that one common

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:21:56.806 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.146$  thing we see with MD's trials is that

 $00:21:59.146 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.267$  when you add a drug in top of MD's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:01.267 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.409$  you lead to less exposure of

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:03.409 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.292$  azacitidine which is the only

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:05.292 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.147$  drug shown to improve survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}07.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}09.262$  And therefore maybe adding the volumab

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:09.262 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.851$  has led to reduced exposure of Aza and

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:11.851 \longrightarrow 00:22:14.080$  that's why we did not see benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}14.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16.229$  But you can see in this analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:16.229 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.483$  in the green bars that the number

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}18.483 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}20.522$  of cycles between the two arms was

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}20.522 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}> 00{:}22{:}22.052$  actually similar and most patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}22.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}23.996$  have received more than four cycles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:24.000 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.568$  So it doesn't seem like this

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}26.568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}29.304$  underlines the lack of the rapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:29.304 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.621$  efficacy to the right.

 $00:22:30.621 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.938$  You can see also that there was similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}32.938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35.400$  hypomethylation which how we think how

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:35.400 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.150$  those drugs hypomethylating agents work

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:37.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.598$  and no difference between the two arms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.575$  So doesn't seem like there

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:41.575 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.760$  was antagonism there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:42.760 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.096$  We also tried to see if there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}22{:}45.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}46.970$  an increased expression in PDL 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:46.970 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.477$  as a mechanism to by pass the PDL 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:49.477 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.917$  inhibition and that also was not the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.594$  So none of those mechanisms seem to

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:22:54.600 --> 00:22:57.799 suggest why the drug did not work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:57.800 \longrightarrow 00:22:59.785$  What was actually quite surprising

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:22:59.785 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.370$  is that when we conducted serial

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:02.370 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.960$  flow cytometric analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}23{:}03.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}07.874$  we did not see T cell expansion in

00:23:07.874 --> 00:23:11.576 diversity or in quantity by flow cytometry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:11.576 --> 00:23:13.938 neither in the bone marrow or in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:13.938 \longrightarrow 00:23:15.924$  peripheral blood between the two arms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:15.930 --> 00:23:19.030 And this was particularly surprising

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}23{:}19.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21.190$  because there has been a prevailing

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:21.190 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.118$  theory that the reason why immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:23.118 --> 00:23:24.418 checkpoint inhibition does not

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}23{:}24.418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27.076$  work in AML is that once you give

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:27.076 --> 00:23:28.344 it subsequent lines, third,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:28.344 --> 00:23:28.932 fourth line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}23{:}28.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}30.990$  that the immune system has been beat

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:31.046 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.570$  up a lot by the chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:32.570 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.874$  So here we were giving it in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:34.874 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.519$  frontline sitting and still it did

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:36.519 --> 00:23:37.830 not lead to immune stimulation.

 $00:23:37.830 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.930$  And the last thing we tried to

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:39.930 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.493$  do with this trial is to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:42.493 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.188$  substance of patients because here

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:44.188 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.983$  you are putting all newcomers

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:45.983 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.908$  together and maybe certain subsets

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:47.908 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.860$  of patients benefit better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:49.860 \longrightarrow 00:23:52.092$  So we tried to look at 2 specific subsets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:52.100 --> 00:23:54.656 patients who have TP 53 mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:54.660 --> 00:23:56.876 which have been shown to have a micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:23:56.876 --> 00:23:58.751 environment in the bone marrow that

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:23:58.751 \longrightarrow 00:24:00.326$  is more immunosuppressive and might

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:24:00.326 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.696$  be more amenable to immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00{:}24{:}02.696 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}04.336$  inhibition based on multiple sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:24:04.336 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.664$  of data as well as patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

00:24:06.664 --> 00:24:08.300 have splicing factor mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69711691

 $00:24:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.830$  which Omar Abdullah have from

00:24:09.830 --> 00:24:11.360 Sloan Kettering and others have

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:11.410 \longrightarrow 00:24:13.190$  shown could be more susceptible

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:24:13.190 --> 00:24:14.614 to immune checkpoint inhibition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:24:14.620 --> 00:24:18.913 However, we also did not see any any

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}24{:}18.913 \rightarrow 00{:}24{:}22.537$  activity in those patients who have TB 53.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:22.540 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.564$  This analysis was presented by Yan in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:24:25.564 --> 00:24:28.709 couple of years at ASH and is currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}24{:}28.709 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}30.540$  under consideration for publication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:30.540 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.426$  So we tried to think further about how

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:34.426 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.084$  can we overcome this immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:37.090 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.926$  resistance for patients and one theory was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:40.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.000$  is that myeloid derived suppressor

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}24{:}43.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}45.890$  cells could be a mediating resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:45.890 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.912$  This was based on solid tumours

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:47.912 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.650$  and we replicated the data.

00:24:49.650 --> 00:24:52.110 Doctor Tikkun Kim who's currently at

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}24{:}52.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}55.523$  Vanderbilt was here at TL did very nice

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}24{:}55.523 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57.643$  preclinical trials that suggested that

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:24:57.643 \longrightarrow 00:25:00.152$  there could be the benefit of combining

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:00.152 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.330$  a drug that targets myeloid derived

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:02.395 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.330$  suppressor cells such as entenostat

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}04.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.756$  which is a Estonia acetylase inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:06.756 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.260$  with with Pimpro or PD1 inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}10.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}12.180$  And based on these preclinical data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:12.180 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.057$  this was translated to a clinical trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}15.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}18.105$  multi centre phase one trial that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:18.105 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.105$  conducted in collaboration with the UM

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:21.105 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.290$  one group under Pat Larosso with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}24.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.840$  theory again that adding Antinostat

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:25:25.840 --> 00:25:27.190 would suppress myeloid giraffe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:25:27.190 --> 00:25:28.875 suppress our cells and therefore

 $00{:}25{:}28.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}30.560$  allow pimprolismab to exert its

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}30.620 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{0}}} 00{:}25{:}32.148$  immune chip point inhibition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:32.150 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.868$  So that the trial has been presented by Anne,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:34.870 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.613$  I'm not going to go through the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:36.613 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.803$  results because again unfortunately

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:37.803 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.347$  it was clinically negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:39.350 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.630$  We are currently going through the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:41.630 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.966$  correlative data to understand what led

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:43.966 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.822$  to the failure of the clinical data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:25:46.830 --> 00:25:47.256 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}47.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}50.354$  I think there are more exciting agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:50.354 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.764$  One of them is sabatolimab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:25:52.770 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.795$  So sabatolimab is a novel

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}25{:}54.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}56.010$  immune checkpoint inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:25:56.010 --> 00:25:57.278 Sabatolimab targets term 3.

 $00:25:57.278 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.009$  So term 3 is not only expressed on T cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}26{:}01.009 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03.204$  and medias immune checkpoint inhibition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}26{:}03.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}05.723$  but it's also expressed in leukemia stem

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:05.723 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.088$  cells and leukemia plast and targeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:08.090 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.906$  Term 3IN.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:08.906 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.946$  Preclinical data has suggested a

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:26:10.946 --> 00:26:13.430 potential not only efficacy but a

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:26:13.430 --> 00:26:15.010 potential functional mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:15.010 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.035$  in which it can lead to immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:18.035 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.245$  checkpoint inhibition but also direct

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:20.245 \longrightarrow 00:26:22.760$  targeting of the leukemia stem cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:22.760 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.320$  So the stimulus MD's one trial was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:25.320 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.238$  first randomized trial with this drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:27.240 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.600$  This trial randomized patients to

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:29.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:32.488$  receive HMA versus HMA with sabatolimab

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:32.488 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.656$  and the primary endpoint was complete

 $00:26:35.656 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.320$  response and progression free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}26{:}38.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}40.960$  We presented this data in ASH last year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:26:43.325$  Currently the manuscript is under

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:43.325 \longrightarrow 00:26:45.050$  review and while the trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:26:45.050 --> 00:26:46.700 did not meet its end point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:46.700 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.960$  there was no significant statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:48.960 \longrightarrow 00:26:50.768$  improvement in complete remission

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:26:50.768 --> 00:26:52.859 or progression free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:52.860 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.316$  You can see that there was a late

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:26:55.316 --> 00:26:57.482 separation in the curve of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}26{:}57.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}59.332$  progression free survival and some

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:26:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.776$  trend toward improvement with the PFS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}27{:}01.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}03.852$  So we also sub analyse these data

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:03.852 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.309$  and what we have found is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:06.309 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.184$  patients who have lower disease

 $00:27:08.184 \longrightarrow 00:27:09.938$  burden seem to benefit more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:09.938 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.330$  However, of course this is ad hoc analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:13.330 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.076$  exploratory analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:14.076 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.314$  But what was also exciting is

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:16.314 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.077$  among the patients who achieved

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:27:18.077 --> 00:27:20.610 response as you can see in the red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:20.610 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.220$  patients who achieved The Who

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:22.220 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.213$  got the combination seems to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}27{:}24.213 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}25.848$  doubled the duration of response

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

00:27:25.848 --> 00:27:28.048 compared to those who have HMA alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00{:}27{:}28.050 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}27{:}30.440$  which again suggests that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26679423

 $00:27:30.440 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.830$  combination might deepen the response

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:32.901 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.750$  leading to longer duration of activity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:36.750 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.862$  So the stimulus MD's two is a large

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:39.862 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.670$  randomized phase three trial of Sabatolimab

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}27{:}42.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}45.136$  plus Aza versus Sabatolimab alone and

00:27:45.136 --> 00:27:48.094 this trial again is fully accrued more

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}27{:}48.094 \longrightarrow 00{:}27{:}51.270$  than 530 patients enrolled on this trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:51.270 \longrightarrow 00:27:53.180$  This trial is also expected

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:53.180 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.236$  to report by early 2024.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:55.236 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.866$  So between venetoclax and sabatolimab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:27:57.870 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.078$  hopefully one of those two at least will

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:00.078 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.365$  will be positive and change the landscape

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:02.365 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.249$  of how we treat patients with high risk MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}28{:}05.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}07.511$  So moving to the AML front where

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:07.511 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.530$  we have also tried to move

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:09.530 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.530$  some of those concepts forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}28{:}11.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}14.378$  So the plus AML one is a randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}28{:}14.378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}17.620$  phase two trial an IAT that is also

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:17.620 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.530$  running through the UM 1 mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:20.530 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.722$  with Pat Larosso Rory has been doctor

 $00:28:23.722 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.675$  Shalis has been working on this with me

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:26.675 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.670$  and this trial is actively enrolling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:28:28.670 --> 00:28:31.400 We have more than 40 patients right

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:31.400 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.565$  now where patients are getting 7 +

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:33.565 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.865$  3 versus 7 + 3 with pemprolizumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:28:35.865 --> 00:28:40.730 The primary endpoint is MRD negative CR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:40.730 \longrightarrow 00:28:42.555$  another randomized phase two trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:42.555 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.044$  that we are working through the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}28{:}45.044 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}47.144$  mechanism as last ML2 and this trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:47.144 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.159$  looks at older patients where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}28{:}49.159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}51.482$  combination is is a citedine with

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:28:51.482 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.170$  venetoclax plus minus Pemprolizumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}28{:}54.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}58.010$  This trial is also through the UM 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:28:58.010 --> 00:29:00.280 mechanism and through both of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:00.280 --> 00:29:02.450 trials and in collaboration with CMAC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:02.450 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.650$  which is a cancer immunotherapy

00:29:04.650 --> 00:29:05.453 monitoring group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:05.453 --> 00:29:06.542 Within C Tib,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:06.542 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.720$  we are conducting an extensive set

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:08.789 \longrightarrow 00:29:11.441$  of correlative studies who are also

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:11.441 --> 00:29:13.209 collaborating with Doctor Jerry

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:13.280 --> 00:29:16.308 Radic from the Hajj to look at MRD

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:16.308 --> 00:29:18.940 negativity through different more

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:18.940 --> 00:29:20.914 sensitive techniques including

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}29{:}20.914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}23.450$  circulating tumor DNA and at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:23.450 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.946$  level of the stem cells and looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:25.946 \longrightarrow 00:29:29.432$  at as I mentioned that other leukaemia

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}29{:}29.432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}31.997$  specific T cell activation and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}29{:}31.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}35.590$  number of other I think important studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:35.590 --> 00:29:37.872 Finally on the same front we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:37.872 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.363$  the plasty ML3 trial which is a

 $00:29:40.363 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.523$  phase two trial looking at combining

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}29{:}42.597 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}44.907$  IDH inhibitors with pimprolism AB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}29{:}44.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}47.316$  This is based on preclinical data

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:29:47.316 --> 00:29:50.022 suggesting that patients who have IDH

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:50.022 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.090$  mutations also have immunosuppressed

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:52.090 \longrightarrow 00:29:53.124$  micro environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.608$  So Doctor Lourdes Mendez and Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:29:55.610 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.418$  Max Stoll at Hutch who I forgot to

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}29{:}58.418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}01.403$  put his picture sorry are working on

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:01.403 \longrightarrow 00:30:03.564$  this trial and hopefully this trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}30{:}03.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}05.586$  is approved by Merck and hopefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:30:05.586 --> 00:30:07.409 it's going to open next year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:30:07.410 --> 00:30:08.690 And lastly on that front,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:08.690 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.610$  we also have another trial with

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:30:10.610 --> 00:30:12.374 the triplet is Evan Sabatolimab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:12.374 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.025$  This is a phase two trial which

 $00:30:15.025 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.085$  enrolled more than 80 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}30{:}17.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}20.408$  We presented the data lost ash and

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:20.410 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.685$  for the only for the safety cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:22.690 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.090$  the full set of data has not been

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:25.090 \dashrightarrow 00:30:28.198$  presented and I think we have shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:28.198 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.122$  extensively that immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:30.122 \longrightarrow 00:30:33.182$  inhibition while can be difficult in

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:33.182 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.605$  patients with leukaemia is difficult

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:35.605 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.930$  to administer for multiple reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:37.930 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.826$  For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:30:38.826 --> 00:30:41.066 our patients are often have

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

00:30:41.066 --> 00:30:41.962 deep thrombocytopenia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:41.970 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.170$  so we cannot biopsy them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:43.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.414$  If the patient has

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:44.414 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.658$  inflammation in their lung,

00:30:45.660 --> 00:30:47.430 sometimes it's difficult to know

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:47.430 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.896$  is this a fungal infection or is

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00{:}30{:}49.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}51.486$  this pneumonitis And in solid

NOTE Confidence: 0.66074306

 $00:30:51.486 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.860$  tumours it's easy or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:30:52.860 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.860$  at least easier to go and get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:30:54.860 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.629$  biopsy out of the of the lung.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:30:56.629 --> 00:30:58.327 But in our patients it's very

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:30:58.327 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.538$  difficult to get biopsies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}30{:}59.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01.430$  We're also he sitant to give steroids

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:01.430 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.422$  many times because of fungal infections

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}31{:}03.422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}05.456$  that are common in our patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:31:05.460 --> 00:31:07.828 So conducting immune checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:31:07.828 --> 00:31:09.758 inhibition trials in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:09.758 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.084$  with MD's is a bit challenging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:12.084 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.964$  However it is it can be done and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:14.964 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.350$  is retrospective analysis that was done

00:31:17.350 --> 00:31:20.068 by Doctor Shalas in you're looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:31:20.068 --> 00:31:22.420 our own data showing that the number

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}31{:}22.491 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}24.771$  of immune related adverse events was

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:24.771 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.313$  somewhat similar to what is seen in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:27.313 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.221$  patients with solid tumors when they

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:29.221 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.821$  get immune checkpoint inhibition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:31:30.821 --> 00:31:34.280 But also importantly that we are not seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:34.280 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.059$  excess mortality when we use these agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:37.060 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.500$  So I think it's certainly feasible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:38.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.786$  I think it's certainly has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:31:40.786 --> 00:31:43.820 way to kind of move forward and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:43.820 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.885$  one of those agents I have deep

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}31{:}45.885 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47.698$  confidence is going to be positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}31{:}47.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}49.685$  But I think another important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:49.685 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.771$  concept that we need to apply is

00:31:52.771 --> 00:31:54.819 biomarker selection of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.630$  because currently we are unrolling all

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:31:58.630 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.930$  newcomers regardless of their susceptibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:01.930 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.710$  to immune checkpoint inhibition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:04.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.118$  And I keep making the analogy of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:32:07.118 --> 00:32:09.488 like trying to treat patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}32{:}09.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11.524$  IDH or all patients with an IDH

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:11.524 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.170$  inhibitor when you only should treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:32:13.170 --> 00:32:14.948 the ones with the IDH 1 mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:14.948 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.785$  or the same thing with the EGFR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}32{:}16.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}18.848$  So we really should select patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:18.848 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.935$  who are more likely to respond

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:20.935 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.268$  to the specific pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}32{:}22.268 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}25.132$  This is an example of I think a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:32:25.132 --> 00:32:27.382 nice effort looking at an immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}32{:}27.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}29.047$  effector signature to try to

00:32:29.047 --> 00:32:30.568 define subset of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:30.570 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.774$  This is clearly retrospective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:31.774 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.922$  but I think this is what should

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:33.922 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.327$  be applied in clinical trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:35.327 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.540$  in a prospective fashion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:36.540 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.490$  so we can select patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:38.490 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.320$  are more likely to respond.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:40.320 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.085$  So and I'd like to thank the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}32{:}43.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}45.375$  our colleagues in the leukemia

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:32:45.375 --> 00:32:47.203 and myeloid malignancy program,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:32:47.210 --> 00:32:52.096 including our wonderful MPs and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:52.096 \dashrightarrow 00:32:54.726$  fellows and mentors and collaborators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

00:32:54.730 --> 00:32:55.970 All of them have been working with us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:55.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:57.975$  but also importantly our clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:32:57.975 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.458$  research team who has been fundamental

 $00:33:00.458 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.906$  to all those clinical trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:02.906 \dashrightarrow 00:33:05.801$  I've just shown you and have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:05.801 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.405$  extremely productive even during

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:07.405 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.778$  COVID and all the staffing shortages

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:09.778 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.130$  that we had over the years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:12.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:14.137$  And at the end I'd like to thank all

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:14.137 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.312$  the organizations that helped fund my

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00:33:16.312 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.207$  research and all the collaborators

NOTE Confidence: 0.7563334

 $00{:}33{:}18.265 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}20.047$  and happy to take any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:33:27.400 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.688$  Have a great time and let me apologize

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00{:}33{:}29.688 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}33{:}31.639$  for not being here yesterday.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00{:}33{:}31.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}35.180$  I realized I was supposed to notice

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00{:}33{:}35.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}38.212$ I heard you again well on your

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00{:}33{:}38.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41.350$ own It's it's a pretty impressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:33:41.350 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.398$  body of work that that we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00{:}33{:}45.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}49.154$  seen over these past few years.

00:33:49.160 --> 00:33:51.788 What do we know about and I thought this

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:33:51.788 \longrightarrow 00:33:54.157$  team eventually was when I was here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:33:54.160 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.795$  but is there any fundamental

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

00:33:56.795 --> 00:33:59.600 difference in MD's in younger

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:33:59.600 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.202$  individuals than those who are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

00:34:02.202 --> 00:34:03.266 you know, more typically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:34:03.270 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.990$  yes, age, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00{:}34{:}05.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}08.750$  so the occasional 40 or 50 year old person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:34:08.750 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.304$  you see it because this heavy year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31525552

 $00:34:10.310 \longrightarrow 00:34:11.870$  80 year old. Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}34{:}11.870 \longrightarrow 00{:}34{:}13.788$  this is actually a very important question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:13.790 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.610$  So the majority of MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:15.610 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.430$  patients are older than 65,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:17.430 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.838$  around 85% of patients are older than 65.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:20.840 \longrightarrow 00:34:22.758$  We do see MD's in younger patients,

 $00:34:22.760 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.497$  but generally tend to be two big areas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}34{:}26.497 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}28.291$  One of them is previous exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

00:34:28.291 --> 00:34:30.191 to chemotherapy or radiation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:30.191 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.116$  the context of solid tumours,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:32.120 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.812$  usually breast cancer actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:33.812 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.640$  is 1 common setting where we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:36.640 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.095$  patients who have received radiation

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}34{:}38.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}39.920$  or chemo and have secondary cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}34{:}39.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}42.560$  But the second big area is

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:42.560 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.270$  genomic predisposition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:43.270 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.110$  So there are a number of patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:46.177 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.850$  have for example underlying Franconia's

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}34{:}47.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.010$ anemia or plastic anemia or some

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}34{:}50.063 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51.887$  kind of hereditary predisposition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:34:51.890 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.210$  The number of those predisposition

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

00:34:56.210 --> 00:34:58.050 genes actually has been increasing

 $00:34:58.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.617$  or we are discovering more and more

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:00.617 \dashrightarrow 00:35:02.609$  of them and it's quite fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:02.610 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.850$  For example, there is one called DDX 4,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:04.850 \longrightarrow 00:35:07.034$  one that we did not for know about

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}07.034 \longrightarrow 00{:}35{:}09.250$ until you know a few years ago and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:09.250 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.310$  it turned out that 10% of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:11.310 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.530$  with AML and MD's have that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}13.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}16.452$  And those are I think important

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}16.452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}18.381$  because they underlie different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}18.381 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}19.764$  different clinical behaviour.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:19.764 \dashrightarrow 00:35:22.069$  Those patients for example tend

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:22.069 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.638$  to be more indolent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}23.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}26.376$  I have a 96 year old patient with

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}26.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}28.716$  AML who has DDX 41 germline and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:28.716 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.690$  it's just just mind boggling to

 $00:35:30.757 \longrightarrow 00:35:33.001$  me that you think that someone

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}33.001 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}35.191$  carried this mutation until she was

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

00:35:35.191 --> 00:35:36.756 95 to develop finally AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:36.760 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.280$  So those tend to happen in older patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:39.280 \longrightarrow 00:35:40.732$  There are other ones that tend

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:40.732 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.410$  to happen at a younger age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

00:35:42.410 --> 00:35:44.370 But I think the biggest message usually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984 00:35:44.370 --> 00:35:44.657 I, NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}44.657 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}46.092$  I usually say regarding younger

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:46.092 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.097$  patients the MD's is you have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}48.097 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}49.693$  look for other things because there

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00{:}35{:}49.693 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}51.274$  are many things that mimic MD's

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:51.274 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.054$  and you want to make sure what

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:53.054 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.626$  you are dealing with is indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:54.626 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.050$  MD's because the treatment is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29407984

 $00:35:56.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.208$  is is different.

 $00:35:59.650 \longrightarrow 00:36:00.010$  Yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}36{:}12.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}14.405$  Yeah, this is a very good question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:14.410 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.363$  And actually this has always come up

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:36:16.363 --> 00:36:17.969 in our discussions with you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:17.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.450$  with IR, BS and regulators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:19.450 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.970$  And there's actually a large chunk

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:21.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.410$  of evidence based on as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:24.410 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.432$  the problems that most of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:26.432 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.650$  trials that we have done in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}36{:}28.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}30.210$  field have been single arm trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:30.210 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.674$  So most of what we have right

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:32.674 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.650$  now is an ecdotal experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:34.650 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.450$  We are not seeing overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:36.450 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.650$  if you look at the entirety of data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:38.650 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.218$  we're not seeing an increased incidence

 $00:36:41.218 \longrightarrow 00:36:45.450$  of GVHD that is that is of high severity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}36{:}45.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}48.264$  However, we have never had a randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:48.264 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.820$  trial that would look at this in both

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:50.820 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.777$  in both arms and This is why I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:52.777 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.809$  our tube last trials are going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:36:54.809 --> 00:36:56.663 very important because we have two

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:36:56.663 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.878$  arms and patients from both arms are

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:36:58.878 --> 00:37:01.216 going to transplant and I think this

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:01.216 \dashrightarrow 00:37:04.442$  is going to give us a good sense of of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:04.442 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.188$  The, the other argument I always

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}37{:}06.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}08.726$  say is that while there could be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:08.726 --> 00:37:10.847 potential that you could increase GVHD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:10.847 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.382$  there's also a potential that

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:12.382 --> 00:37:13.860 you could actually increase GVL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:13.860 --> 00:37:14.180 right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:14.180 --> 00:37:16.420 because the way GVL is a graft

 $00:37:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.376$  versus leukemia effect and this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:18.376 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.260$  how we think transplant can work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:20.260 --> 00:37:22.412 So I think it's always a risk benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:22.412 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.762$  and I don't think you can answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}37{:}24.762 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}26.597$  that without a randomized data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}37{:}26.597 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}28.871$  This is something we are certainly

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:28.871 --> 00:37:30.924 keeping a very close eye on in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}37{:}30.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32.515$  different trials and the regulators

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:32.515 --> 00:37:34.413 have been also kind of keeping

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:34.413 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.688$  a close eye on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:35.690 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.488$  And I have to say in in our practice

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:39.488 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.622$  we usually try to say stop the

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}37{:}42.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}44.252$ immune checkpoint inhibitor like you

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:44.252 --> 00:37:46.505 know in the last six weeks before

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:46.505 --> 00:37:48.750 transplant 6 to 8 weeks ideally just

 $00:37:48.750 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.850$  because of that theoretical concern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00{:}37{:}50.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}53.127$  I would say at the end is that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.050$  immune checkpoint inhibitors are

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:37:55.050 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.682$  approved in in in some in substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:37:58.682 --> 00:38:01.490 of lymphoma and in that setting

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:38:01.490 \dashrightarrow 00:38:03.200$ like Hodgkin's disease and generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:38:03.267 --> 00:38:05.220 there has not they have not seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:38:05.220 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.579$  that that issue as much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:38:06.580 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.672$  So I guess we'll,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

00:38:07.672 --> 00:38:08.218 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102

 $00:38:08.220 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.460$  we'll have to wait and see for AML and MD's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46399102 00:38:11.460 --> 00:38:11.700 Yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:38:29.390 --> 00:38:31.126 Yeah, this is a great question And

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:31.126 \dashrightarrow 00:38:33.087$  part of why I did not divulge and

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:33.087 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.190$  like go too much into this is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}38{:}35.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}36.670$  this methylation business has been

00:38:36.670 --> 00:38:39.125 I think one of the most challenging

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:38:39.125 --> 00:38:40.850 aspect of you know Steve Gorwin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:40.850 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.440$  he used to be like he used to hate

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:43.440 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.848$  calling these hypomethylating agents

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:38:44.848 --> 00:38:47.135 because we we are not even 100% sure

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:47.135 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.710$  that this is how they actually work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:48.710 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.940$  You know, we always like to

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:38:49.940 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.990$  call them DN MT3 inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:38:52.990 --> 00:38:56.340 I guess the big answer is that in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}38{:}56.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}58.970$  trials that I presented they did not

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}38{:}58.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}00.720$  do like site specific methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:00.720 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.934$  But we still don't fully understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:02.934 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.851$  what because you are seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:04.851 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.716$  a mix of hyper methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:06.720 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.240$  hyper methylation depending on where

 $00:39:08.240 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.318$  you are looking within the genome and

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:10.318 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.271$  until now we don't fully understand the

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:12.271 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.757$  mechanism of action of these drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:13.760 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.672$  I did not go into this because of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:39:16.672 --> 00:39:17.800 of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:17.800 \longrightarrow 00:39:19.396$  the nature of of the audience here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}39{:}19.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}21.710$  But I think one of the biggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:39:21.710 --> 00:39:23.676 challenges in my own view about why

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:23.676 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.696$  we could not go beyond HMAS is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}39{:}25.696 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}27.190$  we are stuck with this schedule

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:27.190 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.265$  that is at the approved seven days

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:29.265 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.780$  of azacitidine in every single

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:30.780 \longrightarrow 00:39:32.272$  trial that we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:32.272 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.137$  And this is a myelosuppressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:39:34.140 --> 00:39:35.766 combination and trying to add things

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:35.766 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.859$  to it has been quite challenging.

 $00{:}39{:}37.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}39.876$  But currently it's not

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}39{:}39.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}41.748$  considered ethical to randomize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:39:41.748 --> 00:39:42.660 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:39:42.660 --> 00:39:45.089 without including the seven days of HMA

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:45.089 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.341$  because it's the only drug that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:47.341 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.670$  been want to improve our all survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

00:39:49.670 --> 00:39:50.243 But you're right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:50.243 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.389$  I mean there could be trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:51.390 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.718$  there could be agents that could

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:53.718 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.520$  antagonize that methylation or it could

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:55.520 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.768$  be the other way around where this

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:57.768 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.708$  methylation is negatively impacting it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00:39:59.710 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.548$  So that has been a big,

NOTE Confidence: 0.55645

 $00{:}40{:}02.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}04.590$  I think, problem, Nathaniel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

00:40:17.650 --> 00:40:21.290 Like those seven the therapy,

 $00:40:21.290 \longrightarrow 00:40:24.022$  we know that those therapies

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

 $00:40:24.022 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.803$  result in quite profound immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

00:40:26.803 --> 00:40:28.968 suppression and not only they,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

 $00:40:28.970 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.727$  they're also quite lymphopenic when you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

 $00:40:32.850 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.954$  0.1. So does it make sense to

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

00:40:36.954 --> 00:40:38.864 give them concurrently? I mean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26580712

 $00:40:38.864 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.586$  you're trying to mount some different

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.870$  response at the same time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}40{:}44.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}47.110$  completely suppressing their chemo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:47.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.190$  so it doesn't make sense

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:49.190 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.478$  to get them concurrently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:50.478 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.050$  Or would you have a more clever way

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:53.050 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.966$  where you perhaps cumulate the marrow,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:54.966 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.476$  allow them to recover,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:40:56.476 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.310$  have some given or reconstitution and

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:41:01.766$  then, you know, yeah.

 $00:41:01.766 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.110$  So there are people working on

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:03.154 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.546$  concepts like this where they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:04.546 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.391$  giving it around the time of immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:06.391 --> 00:41:07.547 reconstitution as you mentioned.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:07.550 --> 00:41:09.660 I think 2 points on this front is that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:09.709 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.719$  actually have combined and solid tumours.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:11.720 --> 00:41:13.676 They have multiple and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:13.680 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.228$  Barbara and others know more about

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:15.228 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.786$  this like solid tumours where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:16.786 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.202$  are giving chemo with immune therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:18.202 --> 00:41:19.839 and it seems like it has worked,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:19.840 --> 00:41:20.599 but they're, yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:20.599 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.117$  their drugs are not as lymph,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:22.120 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.520$  you know, lymphodepleting as ours.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:24.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.654$  But the other thing we actually

00:41:25.654 --> 00:41:27.080 have tried to do on these trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}41{:}27.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}29.050$  I did not go into this into detail is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:29.097 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.127$  we moved the initiation of the immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:31.127 --> 00:41:32.519 checkpoint inhibition to day eight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.448$  So rather than waiting until day 21 when

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}41{:}35.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}36.970$  you know all the cells have have died.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:36.970 \longrightarrow 00:41:38.214$  So around the aid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:38.214 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.450$  the idea of doing it early is

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:40.450 --> 00:41:41.710 similar to that you have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:41.710 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.050$  This is when you have all the antigens being,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:44.050 --> 00:41:44.708 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:44.708 --> 00:41:46.682 from the dying cells coming out

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:46.682 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.504$  and trying to activate lymphocytes

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:48.504 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.324$  at that at that point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:50.330 --> 00:41:51.074 But you're right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}41{:}51.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}53.104$  I mean this is another I think big

00:41:53.104 --> 00:41:54.798 challenge of when what is the exact

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:41:54.798 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.494$  time to to use these drugs has

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:41:58.494 --> 00:42:00.114 been somewhat kind of frustrating

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

00:42:00.114 --> 00:42:02.688 I have to say with with both PD1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}42{:}02.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}05.210$  PDL 1 so far and because multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:05.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.613$  trials have been negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:06.613 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.197$  So it might be that none of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:09.197 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.350$  pathways are you know what really

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}42{:}11.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}13.734$  is important in the MLN MD's and

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:13.734 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.342$  maybe the Sabatoli map that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:15.342 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.090$  just showed or some other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:17.090 \longrightarrow 00:42:18.890$  You know there are other,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00{:}42{:}18.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.010$  I did not go on to this as well in detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:21.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.222$  but they are lag three, they are Lil RP4.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:23.222 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.486$  There are a number of other immune

 $00:42:25.486 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.716$  checkpoint pathways that are also

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

 $00:42:27.716 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.159$  being tested in MD's and AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2740477600:42:30.160 --> 00:42:30.340 Yes,

 $00:42:30.340 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.520$  with

NOTE Confidence: 0.27404776

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:42:50.680 \longrightarrow 00:42:52.718$  the the actually TM3 without the PD one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00{:}42{:}52.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}55.492$  Yeah, so I did not go through that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:42:55.492 --> 00:42:57.740 solid tumor literature with TM3 but

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:42:57.740 --> 00:43:00.341 they actually had a big trial combined

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00{:}43{:}00.341 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}03.580$  TM3 and PD1 and that has not led to

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:03.580 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.805$  clinical improvement in solid tumours.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00{:}43{:}05.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}07.630$  So the development has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00{:}43{:}07.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}10.018$  largely focused on the MD's space.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:10.018 --> 00:43:13.346 They have a, the company has sponsored

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:13.346 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.238$  trials where they are combining different

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:16.238 --> 00:43:18.110 immune checkpoint inhibitors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:18.110 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.450$  actually sabatorimab with other drugs.

 $00{:}43{:}20.450 \longrightarrow 00{:}43{:}24.794$  So those I think could give you know an idea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:24.794 --> 00:43:26.524 but from a regulatory path,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:26.530 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.041$  you know you're as I was saying a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:29.041 --> 00:43:31.477 bit earlier is you have to combine with

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:31.477 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.370$  HMA to kind of get your first approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:34.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.334$  and then I think you know contagion, hago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:37.334 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.080$  Contagion also said like the real

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:39.130 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.027$  research starts once a drug is approved

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:41.027 --> 00:43:43.010 like you really need to get like

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:43.010 --> 00:43:44.405 something like once it's approved,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:44.410 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.471$  I think you can do all kinds of concepts

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

00:43:46.471 --> 00:43:48.433 but the initial focus is always on

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:48.433 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.537$  trying to kind of get the trial that

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:50.537 \longrightarrow 00:43:52.478$  leads to approval and then you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:52.478 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.730$  do all these kind of bigger concepts.

 $00:43:54.730 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.170$  You can do them now in a small phase

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00{:}43{:}56.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}59.370$  one study, but not in a large setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4381587

 $00:43:59.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.890 \text{ Yes, Sir.}$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.04401749 00:44:17.120 --> 00:44:17.160 I NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:44:51.290 --> 00:44:53.126 Again, I think this is a very good question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:44:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.853$  Clearly the post transplant setting is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:44:55.853 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.907$  very important development area because

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:44:57.907 --> 00:44:59.967 most of our patients unfortunately

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:44:59.967 \longrightarrow 00:45:01.956$  despite transplant they they relapse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:01.956 --> 00:45:05.250 So I think with the epilogue map, the trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00{:}45{:}05.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}07.970$  the New England Journal paper I showed you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:07.970 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.806$  people have had a very tough

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:09.806 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.724$  time replicating these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:10.730 --> 00:45:14.666 I would say outside of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:14.666 --> 00:45:15.532 occasional responses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:15.532 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.603$  So most people are not using Epilomab

 $00:45:18.603 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.995$  of kind of label to to give it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00{:}45{:}21.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}23.191$  And most of those responses by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:23.191 --> 00:45:25.127 way happened in the extramedullary

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:25.127 --> 00:45:27.166 relapses like skin disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00{:}45{:}27.166 \to 00{:}45{:}28.781$  probably that speaks to different

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:28.781 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.320$  microenvironment between the bone marrow,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:30.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.571$  between the extramedullary

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:31.571 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.664$  versus the bone marrow relapse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:33.664 --> 00:45:36.208 In terms of your other questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:36.208 \longrightarrow 00:45:37.840$  specific about the TM3,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00{:}45{:}37.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}40.360$  there's actually a trial giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00{:}45{:}40.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}41.400$  TM3 inhibitor post transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00{:}45{:}41.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}42.960$  I didn't go into this one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

00:45:42.960 --> 00:45:45.025 but this one is ongoing and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:45.025 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.676$  believe there could be presentations

 $00:45:46.676 \longrightarrow 00:45:48.794$  in the near future about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.290338

 $00:45:48.800 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.958$  I'm. I'm not involved in it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46746305

00:46:07.150 --> 00:46:09.214 Yeah. No. I I think again, like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46746305

00:46:09.214 --> 00:46:10.318 you know, I think it's like

NOTE Confidence: 0.46746305

 $00:46:10.318 \longrightarrow 00:46:11.269$  we're getting out like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46746305

00:46:11.270 --> 00:46:12.188 Sit right. Sitting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46746305

 $00:46:23.180 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.580 \text{ Yes},$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

00:46:41.910 --> 00:46:43.308 sorry, Could you phrase your hand?

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

 $00:46:50.710 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.790$  Is there any evidence that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

00:46:54.790 --> 00:46:57.390 prevents basically the development

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

 $00:46:57.390 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.190$  of an MPs or weighted MPs or AFL?

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

00:47:02.190 --> 00:47:04.050 Just thinking of like ways to

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

 $00:47:04.050 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.101$  sort of look at that rather

NOTE Confidence: 0.26404873

00:47:06.101 --> 00:47:07.710 than a code reading with like

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

00:47:10.790 --> 00:47:14.070 yeah, I think inhibiting development of

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00{:}47{:}14.070 --> 00{:}47{:}17.534$  MD's. This is actually an area

 $00:47:17.534 \longrightarrow 00:47:19.358$  that is getting more attention now

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:19.358 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.501$  because of what I showed at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:21.501 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.259$  beginning like this chip slash seeker

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:23.318 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.310$  spectrum where clonal hematopoiesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:25.310 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.582$  We are seeing some of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:26.582 \longrightarrow 00:47:27.430$  actually in solid tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

00:47:27.430 --> 00:47:30.348 For example a breast cancer patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

00:47:30.348 --> 00:47:34.454 under you know underlying more and

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:34.454 \longrightarrow 00:47:35.973$  more people are doing these next Gen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:35.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.624$  sequencing and then the patient turned

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00{:}47{:}37.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}40.014$  out to have TP 53 mutation chip like

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:40.014 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.564$  the blood counts are completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00{:}47{:}41.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}43.136$  normal but she has TP53 mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:43.136 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.044$  And one of the increasing questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:45.044 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.218$  that are being asked like you know

00:47:47.218 --> 00:47:49.165 the oncologists are afraid to give

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:49.165 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.122$  chemotherapy because that TP53 clone

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00{:}47{:}51.122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}54.500$  could expand and lead to MD's or or AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:54.500 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.858$  So I would say this is an evolving area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:47:56.860 \longrightarrow 00:47:58.415$  Currently we don't think immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00{:}47{:}58.415 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}59.659$  checkpoint inhibition would work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

00:47:59.660 --> 00:48:01.800 Most of the trials that are looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:48:01.800 \longrightarrow 00:48:03.480$  at agents are looking at things

NOTE Confidence: 0.5107637

 $00:48:03.480 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.320$  that are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:06.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.094$  non-toxic. Let me put it this way

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:08.094 \longrightarrow 00:48:09.807$  because those are patients with good

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:09.807 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.673$  counts generally and normal bone marrow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:11.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.840$  So they are like they are trials of

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

00:48:13.840 --> 00:48:16.000 vitamin C and you know inflammation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:16.000 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.319$  anti-inflammatory agents etcetera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:18.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:20.756$  However those drugs can be given together.

00:48:20.760 --> 00:48:22.888 One of the things actually we benefited

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}48{:}22.888 \to 00{:}48{:}24.983$  from doing these trials is that I have

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:24.983 \longrightarrow 00:48:26.908$  a number of patients I share with

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:26.908 \longrightarrow 00:48:28.780$  our colleagues here that need some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:28.780 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.340$  you know that that need immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:30.340 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.860$  checkpoint inhibition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

00:48:30.860 --> 00:48:32.860 I have multiple patients including

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}48{:}32.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}35.138$  with Barbara where they are on some

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:35.138 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.709$  kind of immune checkpoint inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}48{:}36.709 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}39.022$  and they have MD's now and I need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

00:48:39.084 --> 00:48:40.649 give them azacitidine because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:40.649 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.848$  have MD's and we have been doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}48{:}42.848 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}45.046$  this in a number of patients and

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:45.046 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.966$  for the most part is pretty safe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:46.966 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.597$  So this in the past used to

 $00:48:48.597 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.138$  be a horrendous situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

00:48:50.140 --> 00:48:51.260 It's still a horrendous situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:51.260 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.860$  You have two active tumours,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:52.860 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.104$  MD's and solid tumour,

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:48:54.104 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.676$  but many of those patients used to get

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

00:48:56.676 --> 00:48:58.620 only supportive care and nothing else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}48{:}58.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}00.924$  But now we for the most part because

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

00:49:00.924 --> 00:49:02.259 immune checkpoint inhibitors generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}49{:}02.259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}04.377$  will not lower your blood count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:49:04.380 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.580$  So they are able to give them even

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}49{:}06.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}08.296$  with patients with MD's and I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:49:08.296 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.946$  able to treat the patient with

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}49{:}10.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}11.817$ azacitidine because it does not

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}49{:}11.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}12.840$  worsen their immunosuppression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:49:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.340$  You can give it safely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:49:14.340 \longrightarrow 00:49:15.114$  But again,

00:49:15.114 --> 00:49:17.436 this I think how to prevent

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00{:}49{:}17.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}19.535$  clonal evolution is I think is

NOTE Confidence: 0.66263217

 $00:49:19.535 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.100$  an important area as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88644993

 $00{:}49{:}25.200 \to 00{:}49{:}28.040$  OK. Thank you so much my e-mail

NOTE Confidence: 0.88644993

 $00{:}49{:}28.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}29.480$  if any body has any questions then.