WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "01:06:30" NOTE recognizability: 0.858

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}00{:}00{:}00{.}000$ --> $00{:}00{:}02.786$ So I think we can get started.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:02.790 \longrightarrow 00:00:04.452$ So hello everyone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:04.452 \dashrightarrow 00:00:08.330$ welcome to one more YCC green Browns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:08.330 \longrightarrow 00:00:09.762$ I am Antonio Mora,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:09.762 --> 00:00:12.479 chief of neurology and today is my

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:12.479 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.425$ pleasure to introduce our wonderful speakers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:15.430 \longrightarrow 00:00:19.507$ both of whom from our very own Cancer Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:19.510 --> 00:00:21.568 The first speaker is Doctor Merrick,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:21.570 --> 00:00:24.636 Goshen, who is a professor of

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:24.636 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.974$ surgery within oncology and Deputy

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}00{:}26.974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}29.254$ Chief Medical Officer for surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:29.254 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.468$ services at Smilow Cancer Hospital.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:31.470 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.435$ Doctor Goshen earned his medical

 $00{:}00{:}33.435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.400$ degree from Case Western Reserve

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:35.464 --> 00:00:37.280 University School of Medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:37.280 --> 00:00:41.640 And he also pursued an MBA at MIT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.104$ As well as a fellowship in breast surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:44.104 --> 00:00:46.588 ecology at Northwestern Memorial Hospital,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:00:46.590 --> 00:00:48.588 doctor Goshen is an innovator in

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:48.588 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.290$ tailoring surgery and therapy for

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:50.290 \longrightarrow 00:00:52.174$ women with early stage breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}00{:}52.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}54.240$ With funding support from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:54.240 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.888$ breast Cancer Research Foundation

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}00{:}55.888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}58.208$ and National Institutes of Health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:58.210 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.390$ He is the principal investigator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:00:59.390 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.546$ Several phase two trials aiming to reduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:01.546 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.921$ the need for second surgeries or re

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:03.921 --> 00:01:06.009 excisions in women with breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:06.010 --> 00:01:08.710 one of which uses innovative image

00:01:08.710 --> 00:01:10.959 guided operating room capabilities to

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:10.959 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.227$ capture and remove all residual tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:13.227 --> 00:01:15.610 utilizing MRI and mass spectrometry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:15.610 --> 00:01:18.418 which is used at Yale's hybrid

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:18.418 --> 00:01:19.354 operating room.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:19.360 --> 00:01:20.844 Prior to joining nail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:20.844 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.632$ doctor Gosh spent 17 years in Boston

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}01{:}23.632 \rightarrow 00{:}01{:}26.428$ at the Dana Farber Cancer Institute,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:26.430 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.818$ where he was the inaugural and

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:28.818 \dashrightarrow 00:01:31.320$ incumbent Dr Abdul Mohsin and Susannah

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:31.320 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.415$ out to hearing the distinguished

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:33.415 --> 00:01:35.530 chair in Surg conchology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}01{:}35.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}37.510$ He also served as the director

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00{:}01{:}37.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.287$ of the Breast Surgical Quality

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:39.287 --> 00:01:41.257 Fellowship at the Dana Farber.

00:01:41.260 --> 00:01:43.324 And was an associate professor of

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

00:01:43.324 --> 00:01:45.160 surgery at Harvard Medical School.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:45.160 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.832$ So without further ado.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857

 $00:01:46.832 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.970$ Doctor Goshen, the foresters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960656157142857 00:01:49.970 --> 00:01:50.270 Thank

 $00:01:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.039$ you so much for that kind introduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:01:54.039 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.400$ and I'm excited to be here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:01:56.400 --> 00:01:58.432 I know we have one hour and we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}01{:}58.432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00.682$ going to try to go through two talks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:00.682 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.000$ so I will do my best to stay on time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:04.000 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.680$ And although you know in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:02:05.680 --> 00:02:06.800 introduction you talk about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:06.800 \longrightarrow 00:02:09.200$ you know, reducing the need for

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:09.200 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.800$ surgery and minimizing surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:10.800 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.579$ One interest of mine early on when

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:02:13.579 --> 00:02:16.840 I finished or was in training and

 $00:02:16.840 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.100$ fellowship was the role of surgery

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:19.100 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.860$ in stage four breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:20.860 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.302$ I'll kind of go through how the pendulum

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:02:24.302 --> 00:02:27.900 has really swung in actually two directions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:27.900 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.550$ so historically stage four breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:29.550 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.200$ cancer as a medium survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:31.200 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.976$ This is really older data before more modern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:33.980 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.157$ targeted the rapies of less than two years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:36.160 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.365$ and really treatment has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:38.365 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.129$ chemotherapy endocrine therapy more

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:40.129 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.419$ recently targeted or molecular therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:42.420 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.950$ There has been some radiation

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}02{:}43.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}45.480$ to sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:45.480 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.124$ and you know, interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:47.124 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.179$ when people started looking at

00:02:49.179 --> 00:02:51.070 whether local regional therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}02{:}51.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}52.474$ Was being done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:02:52.474 --> 00:02:55.282 That number was actually fairly high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}02{:}55.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}57.628$ 35 to 60% of women were undergoing

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:57.628 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.610$ local regional therapy in the United

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:02:59.610 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.745$ States when really it should have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}03{:}01.807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}03.919$ reserved for palliation at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:03.920 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.920$ And then there was a question of whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:05.920 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.255$ there is any survival benefit in doing this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:08.260 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.470$ This is United States data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:03:10.470 --> 00:03:13.386 certainly most women fortunately present with

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:13.386 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.308$ localized or regional disease on stage four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}03{:}16.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17.852$ breast cancer in the United States

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:17.852 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.479$ and this is very different when

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:19.479 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.844$ you look outside of EU.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125 00:03:20.850 --> 00:03:21.180 S.

 $00:03:21.180 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.756$ Is only about four to 6% of the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:03:24.756 --> 00:03:25.820 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:03:25.820 --> 00:03:28.445 when I was taking my surgery boards,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:03:28.450 --> 00:03:30.362 I would have really I I would have

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:30.362 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.456$ failed the room if I had suggested that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:32.456 \longrightarrow 00:03:34.299$ we should do surgery in this stage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:34.300 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.060$ Four setting outside of palliation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:37.060 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.010$ It was generally accepted that local

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:39.010 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.702$ therapy did not prolong survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}03{:}40.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}42.718$ and there was some earlier data

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:03:42.718 --> 00:03:44.825 suggesting that there may be some

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:44.825 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.217$ stimulation of metastatic growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:46.220 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.520$ However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:46.520 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.320$ we know that there are diseases

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:48.320 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.303$ in the stage for setting where

 $00:03:50.303 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.343$ resection of the primary and or

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}03{:}52.343 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}54.227$ metastatic tumor site could improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:54.227 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.082$ survival or does improve survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:56.090 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.830$ For example, in colorectal disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:57.830 \longrightarrow 00:03:59.870$ potentially with metastatic disease to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:03:59.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.000$ the liver or in renal cell carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:03.000 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.246$ and there are good reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:04.246 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.566$ to leave the primary alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:05.570 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.244$ and there may be reasons to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:07.244 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.360$ resect the primary tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:08.360 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.020$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:09.020 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.330$ it is very easy to measure disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:11.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.606$ as opposed to getting scans when

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}04{:}13.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.950$ you leave the primary tumor alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:04:15.950 --> 00:04:17.738 There is morbidity associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}04{:}17.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.420$ with resection in with even in

 $00:04:20.500 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.288$ a breast cancer surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.525$ certainly with mastectomy and more

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:24.525 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.313$ complex closures and reconstructions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:26.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.000$ With sometimes are required,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:28.000 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.520$ there was some early data suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:30.588 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.978$ sources of cytokines or angiogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

00:04:32.980 --> 00:04:34.652 Inhibitors which restrain growth

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:34.652 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.711$ could be released with metastasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:36.711 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.997$ And really you know a question

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}04{:}38.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}41.179$ on whether there is a survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:41.179 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.117$ benefit in this setting or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:43.120 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.112$ We did use surgery in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}04{:}45.112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}46.108$ palliation of symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:46.110 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.696$ Certainly fear of uncontrolled local disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00:04:48.700 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.130$ There was suggestion of reducing

 $00:04:51.130 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.560$ the shedding of metastatic cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.93560907125

 $00{:}04{:}53.635 --> 00{:}04{:}55.280$ and you know could it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:04:55.280 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.215$ Potentially if you respect the

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:04:57.215 --> 00:04:58.763 site provide more effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:04:58.770 --> 00:05:00.510 Systemic therapy. Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:00.510 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.990$ there was data and ovarian cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.420$ renal cell cancer and colorectal

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.850$ cancer setting about surgical debulking

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:08.926 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.086$ and surgical removal of disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:05:11.090 --> 00:05:15.194 and again, this was work that I started

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}05{:}15.194 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}17.708$ about 2/2 and a half decades ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:17.710 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.440$ So I say challenging the

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:19.440 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.824$ standard so Seema Khan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:20.830 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.828$ who was one of my attendings

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:22.828 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.820$ when I was a fellow,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:24.820 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.920$ presented in 2002 in a in in a

 $00:05:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.320$ not a major surgical society or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:05:31.320 --> 00:05:33.655 On Koleji society was called

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:05:33.655 --> 00:05:35.056 Central Surgical Society,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:35.060 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.108$ looking at the National Cancer Database

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:38.108 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.560$ for women with stage four disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.680$ You know about 4% of patients in EU?

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:42.680 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.934$ S presented with stage four breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.976$ This is again in the 1990s median

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:46.976 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.613$ age or mean age of 62,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:05:49.613 --> 00:05:51.664 which is really in line with our

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}05{:}51.664 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}53.558$ average age of breast cancer in

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:05:53.558 --> 00:05:55.424 the United States and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}05{:}55.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}58.615$ she looked at 16,000 women over a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:05:58.620 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.396$ I think it was a two or three

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:00.396 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.710$ year cohort period of time.

 $00:06:01.710 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.656$ And first you know the thing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}06{:}03.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05.482$ was surprising to us and to her

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:05.482 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.110$ and to others was that almost 60%

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:07.110 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.270$ of women underwent local therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:10.270 --> 00:06:12.862 About 60% underwent mastectomy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:12.862 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.328$ about 40% underwent breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:15.328 --> 00:06:18.248 conservation and and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:18.250 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.476$ you can see what the negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:20.476 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.709$ margin rates were at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:22.710 --> 00:06:23.648 Not surprisingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}06{:}23.648 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}26.462$ those that either did not undergo

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:26.462 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.243$ surgery or underwent mastectomy had

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:29.243 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.768$ larger burden of disease in terms of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:31.770 --> 00:06:33.842 Tumor size and you know she was

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:33.842 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.149$ the first to really present that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:36.150 --> 00:06:37.585 You know, if you didn't do surgery,

 $00:06:37.590 \longrightarrow 00:06:40.370$ Sir survival was twenty months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667 00:06:40.370 --> 00:06:41.357 If he did, NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:41.357 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.002$ breast conservation was 27 months

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:43.002 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.077$ and if you did a mastectomy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:45.080 --> 00:06:47.666 32 months and again suggesting that

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:47.666 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.968$ potentially there is a survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:49.968 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.448$ benefit in the surgical cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:52.450 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.794$ You know those that had bone or soft

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}06{:}54.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}56.588$ tissue disease tended to do better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:56.590 --> 00:06:58.055 Certainly if you had fewer

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:06:58.055 --> 00:06:59.227 sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:06:59.230 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.024$ your outcomes were better giving chemo

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}07{:}03.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}05.736$ and or endocrine or combination of

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:07:05.736 --> 00:07:08.327 therapy ended up being of benefit and

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:08.327 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.361$ this is something that seem Doctor

00:07:10.361 --> 00:07:12.668 Khan has spent a lot of time on as

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}07{:}12.668 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}14.748$ well and we'll get to the modern

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}07{:}14.748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}17.514$ era is on margin positive ITI and

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:17.514 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.574$ whether that would influence outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:20.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.530$ So independent predictors of survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:22.530 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.366$ Or the use of systemic therapy?

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:24.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.470$ Certainly the location of metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:26.470 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.983$ The burden of disease and the type

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}07{:}28.983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}31.028$ of surgical resection that was done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:07:31.030 --> 00:07:32.948 And really for four or five years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}07{:}32.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}35.215$ this presented as central Surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:35.215 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.984$ and published in surgery really didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:37.984 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.983$ get much attention until 2006 to 2009.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:07:40.983 --> 00:07:44.000 So guilty barbiere at MD Anderson decided

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:44.079 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.447$ to look at their stage four breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:07:47.450 --> 00:07:49.214 The mean Age was a little bit

 $00:07:49.214 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.410$ younger in their cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:50.410 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.622$ They were, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}07{:}51.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}52.834$ somewhat surprised at about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:52.840 \longrightarrow 00:07:55.540 40\%$ of their patients underwent surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:07:55.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.424$ have had breast conservation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:07:57.424 --> 00:08:00.108 have had mastectomies, and you know what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:08:00.108 \longrightarrow 00:08:01.693$ We would probably expect is

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:08:01.693 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.689$ that the patients were younger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

00:08:03.690 --> 00:08:05.538 less likely to have nodal involvement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00{:}08{:}05.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}09.040$ fewer sites of metastatic disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.875365026666667

 $00:08:09.040 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.770$ in their cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:11.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.044$ And when they looked at their

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:14.044 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.560$ follow-up for 32 months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:15.560 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.158$ there was a trend towards better

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:18.158 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.049$ overall survival in the surgery group.

 $00:08:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.610$ And there was a benefit in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}08{:}24.610 \to 00{:}08{:}26.660$ metastatic progression free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:26.660 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.312$ Then in the GPIO and there

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:08:29.312 --> 00:08:31.080 was an accompanying editorial

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:08:31.161 --> 00:08:33.570 by Monica Morrow and 2006,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:33.570 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.555$ and I think it was something about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:35.560 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.318$ The horse out of the barn.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:37.320 \longrightarrow 00:08:38.920$ There were 300 patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:38.920 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.120$ with metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:08:40.120 --> 00:08:41.880 with the Geneva Tumor Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}08{:}41.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}44.124$ Registry on the use of local

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}08{:}44.124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}46.608$ therapy and again little over half

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:08:46.608 --> 00:08:48.820 the patients didn't have surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:48.820 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.064$ but 127 patients did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:08:51.064 --> 00:08:52.747 Most were mastectomies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:08:52.750 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.438$ They describe breast conservation as tumor,

 $00:08:55.440 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.765$ ectomy's negative margins and about half and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}08{:}58.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}02.144$ Nodal surgery in about 1/4 of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:02.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.363$ and this is just kind of a the diagram

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:05.363 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.960$ breaking that down in a schematic

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}09{:}07.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}10.966$ or graph form those that ended up

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:10.966 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.270$ undergoing surgery versus not were younger.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:13.270 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.699$ Lower burden of disease in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}09{:}15.699 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}18.599$ the size of tumor and nodal disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}09{:}18.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}21.379$ more likely again to have a single

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}09{:}21.379 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23.865$ site of metastatic disease or less

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:09:23.865 --> 00:09:26.190 likely to have visceral metastasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:09:26.190 --> 00:09:28.880 more likely to undergo radiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:28.880 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.770$ And then you can see what the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:30.770 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.281$ use of chemotherapy and endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:32.281 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.565$ therapy was the same.

00:09:33.570 --> 00:09:34.630 And again, this is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:34.630 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.160$ you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:35.160 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.210$ leads the thought of potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:37.210 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.030$ selection bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:38.030 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.773$ If you were able to resect the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:39.773 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.369$ tumor and get clear margins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:41.370 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.566$ there was a survival benefit as

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:43.566 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.342$ opposed to those that did not undergo

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}09{:}46.342 \to 00{:}09{:}48.826$ surgery or that have positive margins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:48.830 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.427$ And then Fields Group looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:09:51.427 --> 00:09:54.277 wash U data over almost a decade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:54.280 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.215$ again about half of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:09:56.215 --> 00:09:56.989 underwent surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}09{:}56.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}59.546$ This is a much longer median.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:09:59.550 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.601$ Follow up of 142 months and again there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:02.601 \longrightarrow 00:10:06.028$ a survival benefit for surgery versus not.

 $00:10:06.030 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.726$ And there there is a theme in in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:07.730 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.400$ In all this there was a 250

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:10:10.400 --> 00:10:12.840 institution review over almost

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.342$ a two decade period of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:10:15.342 --> 00:10:17.310 This was published in the Annals of Surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:17.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.080$ but Blanchard again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:19.080 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.328$ About 60% had surgery in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:22.328 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.913$ stage four setting and survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:24.913 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.117$ was 27 months versus 17 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.310$ So, as I alluded to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.510$ there is selection bias, potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:31.510 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.710$ younger woman with smaller tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:10:33.710 --> 00:10:35.066 less knodel involvement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:10:35.066 --> 00:10:37.326 fewer sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:37.330 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.850$ and this is kind of the differences

 $00:10:39.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.094$ between the studies from Seema Khan

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:42.094 \dashrightarrow 00:10:44.278$ and Repeate and guilty Barbie era.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:10:44.280 --> 00:10:46.164 And from the wash you and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:46.164 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.920$ the the other data again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:10:47.920 --> 00:10:49.780 Younger women with smaller tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:49.780 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.112$ less nodal involvement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:51.112 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.332$ and fewer sites of metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:53.332 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.840$ disease had surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:54.840 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.592$ And certainly there have been a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:10:57.592 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.051$ attempts statistically and in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}10{:}59.051 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}01.736$ of matching to be able to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:11:01.736 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.504$ whether that difference continued or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:11:05.510 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.561$ So this was a work that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:11:07.561 --> 00:11:09.340 previous resident of mine decided.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504 00:11:09.340 --> 00:11:09.610 Well, NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:11:09.610 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.770$ let's look at the Brigham and Farber and

00:11:11.770 --> 00:11:13.787 Mass general data and you know again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:11:13.790 \longrightarrow 00:11:16.086$ very similar to what everyone else did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:11:16.090 --> 00:11:18.057 You know we had a pretty small

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00{:}11{:}18.057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}19.599$ cohort of patients a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:11:19.599 --> 00:11:21.194 bit more modern era treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

00:11:21.200 --> 00:11:23.240 About 40% of our patients had

NOTE Confidence: 0.912928504

 $00:11:23.240 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.489$ surgery in the stage for setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}11{:}25.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}27.278$ and I found that actually pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}11{:}27.278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.320$ surprising to see it was that high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}11{:}29.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}31.306$ But we were actually the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:31.306 \longrightarrow 00:11:33.565$ group to look at whether the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:33.565 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.725$ timing of diagnosis or surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:11:35.730 --> 00:11:37.274 In relationship to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:37.274 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.818$ diagnosis of stage four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:38.820 \longrightarrow 00:11:41.418$ disease made a difference or not.

00:11:41.420 --> 00:11:44.572 About 25 out of those 61 patients had

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:44.572 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.408$ that surgery before stage 4 diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:47.410 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.965$ I'll go over why this is probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:11:49.965 --> 00:11:51.414 potentially important and 36

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:51.414 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.154$ after stage 4 diagnosis this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:11:53.154 --> 00:11:55.366 kind of hard to read, but again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:55.366 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.082$ those in the surgery group in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:11:58.082 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.666$ of sites of metastatic disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}12{:}00.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}03.306$ very similar to previous studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:03.310 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.280$ with the surgery group having

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:05.280 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.250$ fewer sites of metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:07.250 --> 00:12:10.970 Versus those that did not undergo surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:10.970 --> 00:12:12.776 And again, if you underwent surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:12.780 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.476$ you're more likely to get radiation therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:16.480 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.958$ So our median survival from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:18.958 --> 00:12:20.796 surgery group was 3.52 years

 $00:12:20.796 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.584$ and in the nose surgery group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:22.590 --> 00:12:24.262 just like everyone else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:24.262 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.098 2.36$ years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:25.100 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.112$ However, the timing of diagnosis of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:28.112 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.359$ stage four disease before after surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:31.360 \longrightarrow 00:12:33.480$ if it was done afterwards,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:33.480 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.005$ that survival was four years

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:36.005 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.439$ versus before a 2.4 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:38.439 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.276$ So you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:39.276 --> 00:12:41.279 we you know our group looked into

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:41.279 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.113$ this and could this be an example

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:43.113 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.040$ of the Will Rogers phenomenon?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:45.040 --> 00:12:46.664 Honestly two decades ago, if you ask me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:46.670 --> 00:12:49.510 But that was I didn't know the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:49.510 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.910$ example that that Will Rogers uses,

 $00:12:51.910 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.150$ that when the Okies left the state of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}12{:}54.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}56.110$ Oklahoma for the state of California,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:12:56.110 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.094$ they raised the average IQ of both states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:12:59.100 --> 00:13:01.134 So I'll let you guys ponder

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:01.134 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.488$ that as we as we move on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:03.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.602$ So this was the first paper to suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:05.602 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.016$ that the maybe it's there is no survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:08.016 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.233$ benefit in surgery and it's really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}13{:}10.233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}12.123$ timing of surgery in relationship to

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:12.123 \longrightarrow 00:13:14.950$ the diagnosis of stage four disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:14.950 \longrightarrow 00:13:16.362$ This shows the difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:16.362 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.774$ between surgery and not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:17.780 \longrightarrow 00:13:19.607$ But when we looked at the timing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:19.610 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.042$ that difference went away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:13:21.042 --> 00:13:23.601 So then I asked another colleague of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:23.601 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.695$ mine that we recruited Laura Dominici.

 $00{:}13{:}25.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}27.542$ We looked at the NCCN database

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:27.542 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.260$ of stage four breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:13:29.260 --> 00:13:31.198 Again a little bit more modern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:31.200 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.853$ era 1000 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:32.853 \longrightarrow 00:13:35.057$ a much larger group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:35.060 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.370$ And then we did a match analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:37.370 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.900$ of 236 non surgery patients to

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:13:39.900 --> 00:13:42.384 54 patients with that had surgery

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:42.384 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.886$ followed by drug therapy and again

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}13{:}44.886 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47.196$ that survival benefit that was being

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}13{:}47.196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.118$ seen in the surgery group versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:50.118 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.190$ non surgery actually disappeared.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:52.190 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.136$ Survival is 3 1/2 versus 3.4 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:55.136 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.108$ We matched her age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:13:56.110 \longrightarrow 00:13:57.706$ number of sites of metastatic disease,

00:13:57.710 --> 00:14:01.084 ER, her two sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}14{:}01.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}04.190$ and again I and my there was a very few

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:14:04.270 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.329$ of us who actually came out strongly

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:14:07.329 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.469$ against surgery in the stage for setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:14:10.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.724$ And all I've been talking about is

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:14:12.724 --> 00:14:14.132 retrospective data, and obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:14:14.132 --> 00:14:16.192 you know with this you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:14:16.192 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.788$ anything in the world of oncology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:14:17.790 --> 00:14:19.125 Want prospective data?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:14:19.125 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.240$ So the world of prospective data came

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}14{:}22.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}25.275$ from really a couple of brilliant folks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:14:25.280 --> 00:14:26.600 One is Raj Way bad way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00{:}14{:}26.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}29.585$ Who's runs the breast service

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:14:29.585 --> 00:14:32.552 at Tata Memorial in Mumbai,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

00:14:32.552 --> 00:14:33.138 India?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92932328

 $00:14:33.138 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.240$ They ran the first randomized trial of

00:14:37.352 --> 00:14:39.968 surgical removal of primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:14:39.968 --> 00:14:42.584 tumor with lymph node.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:14:42.590 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.646$ Surgery in the metastatic setting there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:14:46.650 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.855$ Endpoints where primary endpoint was

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:14:48.855 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.096$ looking at removal of the primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}14{:}51.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}53.130$ tumor and actually nodes on overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:14:53.191 --> 00:14:55.179 survival and progression survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:14:55.180 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.990$ and we're going to go over a couple of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:14:57.038 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.676$ randomized trials that have been done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:14:58.680 --> 00:15:00.595 That again, the Tata Group

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:00.595 --> 00:15:02.127 and Roger Roger Broadway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:02.130 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.266$ where there's a first looked at 350 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}15{:}05.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}08.780$ They were randomizing early to surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:08.780 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.433$ will go over to next to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:11.433 --> 00:15:13.540 the Turkish Medical Federation,

00:15:13.540 --> 00:15:15.260 which did drug therapy first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:15.260 \longrightarrow 00:15:17.190$ followed by surgery and finally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:17.190 --> 00:15:18.878 We're going to get to the E kog

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:18.878 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.490$ trial in the United States that

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:20.490 --> 00:15:22.194 I helped with with semakan drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:22.256 --> 00:15:24.046 therapy first followed by surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:24.050 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.430$ So the group in India looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:26.430 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.627$ randomizing woman with stage four breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}15{:}28.627 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}15{:}31.224$ cancer to local regional therapy to none.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:31.230 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.615$ They underwent local regional therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}15{:}33.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}36.673$ and then if indicated anti estrogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:36.673 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.106$ therapy in the no local regional therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:39.110 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.210$ they were followed by when

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:41.210 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.890$ indicated anti estrogen therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:42.890 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.011$ Note it's important to know that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}15{:}45.011 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47.499$ were in the time of her two positive.

 $00:15:47.500 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.216$ Breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:48.216 --> 00:15:50.006 None of the patients receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:50.006 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.660$ anti her two therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:51.660 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.648$ so that's a criticism of the trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:15:53.650 \longrightarrow 00:15:54.910$ But again this was done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667 00:15:54.910 --> 00:15:55.710 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:15:55.710 --> 00:15:58.110 deck started decades ago where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}15{:}58.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}00.837$ know anti her two therapy was just.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}16{:}00.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}02.465$ You know getting approved in

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}16{:}02.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}04.090$ the United States and certainly

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:04.151 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.779$ in resource limited countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:16:05.780 --> 00:16:07.570 It's not something that was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667 00:16:07.570 --> 00:16:08.486 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:08.486 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.776$ automatically approved and paid for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.028$ This is the matching.

 $00:16:12.028 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.900$ They matched the you know their

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}16{:}13.959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}15.954$ patient population very well and

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:15.954 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.550$ looking at overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:17.550 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.180$ There was actually no difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:20.180 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.284$ between the two groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:16:24.225$ They tried breaking it down

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:24.225 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.773$ by menopausal status numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:25.780 \longrightarrow 00:16:27.440$ the sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}16{:}27.440 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}16{:}28.938$ a number of sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:28.940 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.548$ like with that were done like

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:16:30.548 --> 00:16:31.352 the previous trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:31.360 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.867$ and you can see really no difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:34.870 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.366$ Interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:16:35.366 --> 00:16:37.350 distant progression free survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:37.350 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.283$ was actually lower in the local

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:40.283 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.193$ regional therapy group as opposed

 $00:16:42.193 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.060$ to those that did not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667 00:16:44.060 --> 00:16:44.596 And again, NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:44.596 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.070$ this is different than what will get to this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:16:47.070 --> 00:16:49.604 The Turkish and the US trial they

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:49.604 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.195$ were diagnosed with stage four breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:16:52.195 --> 00:16:54.107 cancer underwent surgery first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:16:54.110 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.780$ then followed by Agilent therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:16:57.780 --> 00:16:58.902 So Attila Saran,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}16{:}58.902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}01.146$ who's add Pittsburgh but helped run

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}17{:}01.146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}03.696$ on behalf of the Turkish Federation

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:03.696 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.801$ of Society of Breast Disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}17{:}05.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}07.830$ On randomized trial of evaluating

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}17{:}07.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}09.446$ resection of primary breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:17:09.446 --> 00:17:11.549 tumor with women with stage four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:11.550 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.546$ breast cancer,

 $00:17:12.546 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.036$ and these were actually simultaneous

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}17{:}15.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}17.436$ same day presentations at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}17{:}17.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}19.096$ San Antonio Breast Conference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:19.100 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.815$ Their early presentation in 2013

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:17:20.815 --> 00:17:22.969 is actually ends up being different

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00{:}17{:}22.969 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}25.249$ than what they ended up publishing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:25.250 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.466$ Will spend a moment or two on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:27.470 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.120$ Their primary goal is assessive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:17:29.120 --> 00:17:30.505 Early surgical treatment of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:17:30.505 --> 00:17:31.890 primary tumor and stage four

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:31.936 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.460$ disease effects overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:33.460 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.095$ They also looked at progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:17:35.095 --> 00:17:36.626 free survival, quality, life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:36.626 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.816$ and morbidity different than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:38.816 \longrightarrow 00:17:41.498$ Tata group stage four breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:41.500 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.828$ That presentation was randomized

 $00:17:43.828 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.574$ as systemic therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:45.580 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.742$ Then local therapy for local progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:48.742 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.850$ versus initial local therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

00:17:50.850 --> 00:17:51.510 Uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795473466666667

 $00:17:51.510 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.150$ then a systemic therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:17:54.150 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.676$ and then looking at overall survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:17:56.680 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.708$ chemotherapy was given to all patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}17{:}58.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.830$ either immediately or after randomization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}18{:}00.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}03.745$ All hormone receptor positive patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:03.745 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.077$ received anti estrogen therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:06.077 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.210$ different than the Tata Group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:08.210 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.098$ The her two positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}18{:}11.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15.160$ over expressed received trastuzumab therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}18{:}15.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}17.720$ Most patients if they underwent

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:17.720 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.802$ local therapy, underwent mastectomy.

 $00:18:19.802 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.958$ Radiation was given to some patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}18{:}22.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}26.260$ with with sites of metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:18:26.260 --> 00:18:28.390 And early on, looking at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:28.390 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.293$ difference between surgery and those

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:18:30.293 --> 00:18:32.398 that just received systemic therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}18{:}32.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}34.600$ there was no statistical difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:34.600 \longrightarrow 00:18:38.555$ Overall, when they broke it down by

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:18:38.560 --> 00:18:40.816 numbers of sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9140447933333333

 $00:18:40.820 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.724$ and if there was just a single site

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:43.724 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.200$ versus multiple sites in the Solitaire

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:46.200 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.295$ E or oligo metastatic setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:48.300 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.108$ there was a suggestion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:18:50.108 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.916$ potentially of survival benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9140447933333333

 $00:18:51.916 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.380$ and this is what they ended up

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:18:54.380 --> 00:18:58.120 presenting at San Antonio in 2013.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:18:58.120 --> 00:18:59.800 This wasn't actually published

00:18:59.800 --> 00:19:02.400 until five or six years later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.200$ and we'll go over that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:03.200 --> 00:19:04.424 While the Tata group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333 00:19:04.424 --> 00:19:05.036 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.099$ pretty rapidly published in Lancet on Koleji,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.236$ so they had suggested the Atilius

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:10.236 --> 00:19:12.556 Group surrounds group in the Turkish

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}19{:}12.556 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}15.058$ Federation that there was no statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:15.058 --> 00:19:17.314 difference or difference in overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:17.314 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.574$ survival survival in early follow-up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:19.580 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.111$ Potentially those with limited numbers

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:23.111 --> 00:19:24.616 of sites of metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}19{:}24.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}26.600$ and I know that's of interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:26.600 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.661$ of people here at Yale and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:28.661 --> 00:19:30.947 Around the country of maybe not.

00:19:30.950 --> 00:19:33.934 Group behaves differently than

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:33.934 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.220$ others with metastatic breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:38.220 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.390$ These are the randomized trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:40.390 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.560$ that were or were underway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:42.560 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.684$ and their primary endpoints are either

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:44.684 --> 00:19:46.900 survival or time to progression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:19:46.900 --> 00:19:49.098 So we've seen what happened in India,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:49.100 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.440$ what happened in Turkey?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9140447933333333

 $00:19:50.440 \longrightarrow 00:19:52.819$ We're going to talk about the COG

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:52.819 \longrightarrow 00:19:54.947$ in the next one that will actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9140447933333333

00:19:54.947 --> 00:19:56.819 report out will be the Japanese

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:19:56.819 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.459$ jade COG 10710 seventeen trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:00.460 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.557$ So this kind of circles back to you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9140447933333333

00:20:02.560 --> 00:20:04.704 I think maybe if there's anyone who's in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:20:04.704 --> 00:20:06.538 training that's watching is that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}20{:}06.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}08.640$ two decades ago I started as a

 $00:20:08.640 \longrightarrow 00:20:10.548$ fellow of SEMA Konzum and watched

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}20{:}10.548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}13.346$ the work that she did in the central

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:13.346 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.206$ surgical challenging the standards

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:15.206 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.416$ of and providing local therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:20:17.420 --> 00:20:19.030 A suggestion that local therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:19.030 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.318$ would be of survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.792$ But then watching the retrospective data

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}20{:}22.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}25.448$ come out, then the prospective data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:25.448 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.276$ and then the usdata.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:27.280 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.196$ So I was the KVB rap,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:30.200 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.168$ which is now part of alliance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:32.170 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.057$ For E card 22108,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}20{:}35.057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}37.993$ this was presented at 2020 in San Antonio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}20{:}38.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}39.904$ The publication honestly will be coming out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:39.910 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.170$ hopefully in the next month,

 $00:20:41.170 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.686$ but until then you know it

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:20:44.686 --> 00:20:46.444 isn't published presented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:20:46.450 --> 00:20:48.648 but it will be published very soon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:20:48.650 --> 00:20:51.154 so we know that from the Tata Group

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:51.154 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.924$ that there was no survival with early

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:53.924 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.999$ local regional recurrence and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:20:56.070 --> 00:20:58.518 again I said that Alisa ran in 2018,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:20:58.520 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.330$ presented that there was no

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:21:01.330 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.016$ difference also in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:21:03.020 --> 00:21:05.883 Come in local regional therapy in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00{:}21{:}05.883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}08.819$ of survival but with longer follow-up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:21:08.820 --> 00:21:10.660 Their group actually suggested that

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:21:10.660 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.020$ there was an overall survival benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:21:13.020 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.323$ There is a lot of issues with

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

00:21:15.323 --> 00:21:17.898 this paper and publication and I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914044793333333

 $00:21:17.898 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.306$ II and others wrote an editorial that

00:21:20.306 --> 00:21:23.239 was simultaneously published with this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:23.240 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.416$ but and we can discuss this in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}21{:}25.416 \to 00{:}21{:}27.937$ in in the question answer session.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:27.940 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.350$ But there was a suggestion that

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:29.350 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.700$ there was a survival benefit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:30.700 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.131$ so there's conflicting data equals 2108.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:21:34.131 --> 00:21:37.017 Started in 2011 with its last

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:21:37.017 --> 00:21:39.478 patients enrolled in 2015 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:39.478 \longrightarrow 00:21:41.808$ 2013 because of slow accrual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:41.810 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.144$ they did amend their their overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:45.144 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.046$ goal and the and the randomization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:21:47.050 --> 00:21:48.666 but basically in EU,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:21:48.666 --> 00:21:50.686 S or North America stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:50.690 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.722$ four denovo breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:52.722 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.754$ Optimal systemic therapy including

 $00:21:54.754 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.926$ obviously anti her two therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}21{:}56.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}59.092$ if there was no progression of

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:21:59.092 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.647$ distant disease followed by 4 to 8

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:01.647 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.423$ months of optimal systemic therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:03.423 --> 00:22:04.835 They either continued down

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:04.835 \longrightarrow 00:22:06.247$ the route of systemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:06.250 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.338$ Therapy versus local early

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:08.338 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.904$ local regional therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:09.910 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.824$ And again, this is something that

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:11.824 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.569$ Doctor Khan focuses a lot on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:13.570 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.770$ Is the complete resection with free margins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:17.770 --> 00:22:19.738 Overall survival, just like I showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:19.738 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.229$ you with all the randomized trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:22.230 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.600$ This is the breakdown in

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:24.600 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.801$ terms of the patient cohorts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:26.801 --> 00:22:28.886 For those that were registered,

00:22:28.890 --> 00:22:30.702 not randomized and randomized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:30.702 --> 00:22:33.906 again anti her two therapy was given

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:33.906 --> 00:22:36.324 when they were her two positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:36.330 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.994$ certainly anti estrogen therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:37.994 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.310$ when he R and or PR positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:41.310 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.759$ Uhm, the dropout,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:42.759 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.174$ which is really not surprising

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:45.174 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.369$ as those that had more,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714 00:22:47.369 --> 00:22:48.287 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:48.287 --> 00:22:51.041 advanced local disease was ended up

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:51.041 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.790$ being higher in the initial systemic

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:22:53.790 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.009$ therapy as opposed to or the group

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}22{:}57.009 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}59.309$ that was stable or responding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:22:59.310 --> 00:23:01.752 Uhm, median age a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:23:01.752 --> 00:23:03.910 younger than CMAS earlier study.

00:23:03.910 --> 00:23:04.712 Looking at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:23:04.712 --> 00:23:06.717 you know the NCDB database

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:06.717 \longrightarrow 00:23:09.190$ by about six or seven years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:09.190 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.444$ And then when you looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:10.444 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.280$ those that were randomized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:11.280 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.230$ early local therapy 109 received surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}23{:}16.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}18.755$ 87 achieved surgical free margins

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:18.755 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.763$ and and local regional therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:21.763 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.682$ was at 74 of those patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:24.682 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.347$ The reasons why no surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}23{:}27.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}29.648$ some ended up refusing some progress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:23:29.650 --> 00:23:33.010 some was made by MD decision.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714 00:23:33.010 --> 00:23:33.277 Finally, NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:33.277 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.680$ we were able in the US to go back

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:23:35.749 --> 00:23:37.543 to what SEMA started in saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:37.543 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.889$ that there was a survival benefit.

 $00:23:39.890 \longrightarrow 00:23:41.983$ Now we come to the point of

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:41.983 \longrightarrow 00:23:43.542$ having randomized data from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}23{:}43.542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}45.635$ US and suggested that there is no

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:23:45.635 --> 00:23:47.513 overall survival benefit for women

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}23{:}47.513 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}49.408$ with stage four breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}23{:}49.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}53.526$ This is with a median follow-up of

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:23:53.530 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.190$ 5353 months progression free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:23:57.190 --> 00:23:58.675 Similarly, no difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}23{:}58.675 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02.140$ something that you know we saw a

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:02.234 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.970$ suggestion of in the Tata Group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:04.970 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.502$ Is that potentially and there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:07.502 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.314$ certain subtypes of breast cancer that

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}24{:}10.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}12.204$ actually operating may actually be

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:24:12.204 --> 00:24:14.850 a more of a detriment to not operating,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:24:14.850 --> 00:24:16.368 so it's not necessarily been equivalent,

00:24:16.370 --> 00:24:17.567 but potentially worse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:24:17.567 --> 00:24:19.961 and maybe that's seen in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:24:19.961 --> 00:24:23.350 triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

00:24:23.350 --> 00:24:25.096 One thing again that you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:25.096 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.091$ will be focused on a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:27.091 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.876$ in the paper is that there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:28.938 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.206$ some benefit in terms of local

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:31.206 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.910$ regional progression free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:32.910 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.900$ That's how useful that is of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:36.900 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.979$ endpoint is worth discussing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}24{:}39.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}42.430$ So kind of coming to conclusion is

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:42.430 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.955$ that early local therapy does not

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:44.955 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.290$ improve survival in patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:47.290 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.190$ denovo metastatic breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00:24:49.190 \longrightarrow 00:24:51.854$ that there was actually a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.856758129285714

 $00{:}24{:}51.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53.630$ local regional progression when

 $00:24:53.706 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.926$ local regional therapy was used,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:24:55.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:58.026$ the primary site. Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:24:58.026 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.838$ there is a suggestion of progression free,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:01.838 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.808$ you know, some local regional

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.190$ therapy response in the stage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

00:25:07.190 --> 00:25:09.042 Four breast cancer setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:09.042 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.357$ and again the JAYCOB trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:11.360 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.104$ Is still pending and at least in my,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

00:25:14.110 --> 00:25:16.518 in my conclusions were that like in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:16.518 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.168$ almost two and a half decades, we went.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

00:25:19.168 --> 00:25:22.022 The pendulum was swung from, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:22.022 \longrightarrow 00:25:25.350$ no surgery to surgery to maybe surgery or

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00{:}25{:}25.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}28.614$ no surgery to hopefully now no surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

00:25:28.620 --> 00:25:31.160 You know, outside of palliation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:31.160 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.570$ although there is interest in,

 $00:25:33.570 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.598$ you know in the those with

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:35.598 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.950$ limited numbers of metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00{:}25{:}37.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}39.010$ site or oligo metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:39.010 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.341$ I don't think the randomized data from

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:41.341 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.852$ Tata or the Turkish group supports this

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:43.852 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.559$ and the card data that was presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:46.559 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.949$ ASCO doesn't support this either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:48.950 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.235$ Over the publication is still

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00{:}25{:}50.235 \to 00{:}25{:}52.037$ pending and once that's out then you

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

00:25:52.037 --> 00:25:53.423 guys can make your own judgment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:53.430 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.195$ So with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

00:25:54.195 --> 00:25:56.390 I'd like to thank you for the provision

NOTE Confidence: 0.869006688888889

 $00:25:56.390 \longrightarrow 00:25:59.134$ of the podium and look forward to talking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00{:}26{:}01.410 --> 00{:}26{:}02.930$ Thank you very much, Mary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:02.930 \longrightarrow 00:26:06.745$ Uh, we have a few questions here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:06.750 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.808$ so for everyone, if you have questions,

 $00:26:08.810 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.438$ please post them in the chat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:11.440 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.266$ So let me read some of the questions here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

00:26:14.270 --> 00:26:18.500 A question from Doctor Caring, Addison.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:18.500 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.614$ She points out that there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

00:26:20.614 --> 00:26:22.384 national trend toward doing more

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

00:26:22.384 --> 00:26:24.379 local therapy for metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:24.380 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.040$ which is calling a metastasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:27.040 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.636$ sectomy I guess.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:28.640 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.386$ So, does this data provide some

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

 $00:26:30.386 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.949$ warning for adoption of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.902277358

00:26:31.949 --> 00:26:33.669 trend outside of research studies?

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

00:26:35.120 --> 00:26:37.220 Honestly, I think it it does,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00{:}26{:}37.220 \to 00{:}26{:}40.128$ at least in breast cancer, that we really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00{:}26{:}40.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}42.420$ you know, we may have an idea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:26:42.420 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.660$ We may have antidotes of when it works,

 $00:26:44.660 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.795$ and you know when you we looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

00:26:46.795 --> 00:26:48.920 at our data institutionally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:26:48.920 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.290$ Or many others did as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

00:26:51.290 --> 00:26:54.860 You know you have to really be, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:26:54.860 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.380$ Careful for selection bias is

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

00:26:57.380 --> 00:26:59.900 that you know are unintended,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:26:59.900 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.456$ but certainly part of this and I am really

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00{:}27{:}02.456 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}04.730$ outside of the clinical trial or research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00{:}27{:}04.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}08.060$ Sending as Doctor Edelson suggested.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:08.060 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.391$ Really not a big fan of even

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

00:27:10.391 --> 00:27:12.020 certainly not local therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:12.020 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.828$ but even metastatic disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:13.828 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.088$ in that setting as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:16.090 \longrightarrow 00:27:17.924$ And I know this is different than

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:17.924 \longrightarrow 00:27:19.719$ some other solid tumor types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:19.719 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.680$ but in the world of breast cancer,

 $00:27:22.680 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.110$ yeah, there was retrospective data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:25.110 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.450$ There was conflict on that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.046$ then we waited for prospective data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:28.050 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.450$ There was conflict on that on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00{:}27{:}30.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}33.222$ Well it's not U S data or European data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.064$ Finally we get the usdata and we're,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667 00:27:35.070 --> 00:27:35.964 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:35.964 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.646$ on the border of getting the

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:38.646 \longrightarrow 00:27:40.949$ publication out on that as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829690901666667

 $00:27:40.950 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.678$ And then I thought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82834904

 $00:27:43.160 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.410$ Another question from Doctor Peters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82834904

00:27:46.410 --> 00:27:48.942 So did the EKACH trial allow

NOTE Confidence: 0.82834904

 $00:27:48.942 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.630$ any number of metastasis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.82834904

00:27:50.630 --> 00:27:52.130 It seems like the general

NOTE Confidence: 0.82834904

 $00:27:52.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.019$ thought was that this may be

00:27:54.019 --> 00:27:56.090 helpful in low volume disease, so

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:27:56.570 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.085$ it did allow for multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:27:59.085 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.097$ sites of metastatic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:01.100 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.844$ I think the only real from what I

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00{:}28{:}03.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06.247$ remember and I actually enrolled a

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00{:}28{:}06.247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}08.707$ couple of patients to this trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.638$ Patients that couldn't wear those with

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:11.638 \longrightarrow 00:28:14.041$ like leptomeningeal disease that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:14.041 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.687$ excluded and maybe a handful of others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

00:28:16.690 --> 00:28:18.538 And again, I think this points to the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:18.540 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.812$ you know is low volume or oligo metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

00:28:21.812 --> 00:28:23.884 disease different than those with

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:23.884 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.248$ higher volumes or burden of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9021808044444445

 $00:28:26.250 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.450$ And again a lot of people try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9021808044444445

 $00:28:28.450 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.702$ address those selection biases

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

00:28:29.702 --> 00:28:31.628 of like you know you know,

00:28:31.630 --> 00:28:33.979 is visceral Mets or lung Mets going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:33.979 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.829$ different than soft tissue or bone Mets?

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:35.830 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.277$ I again outside of the research setting I am.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:39.280 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.856$ Really cautious of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

00:28:40.856 --> 00:28:43.685 I'm glad that in my two decades

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:43.685 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.600$ I've seen a a trend,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

 $00:28:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.392$ hopefully away from from

NOTE Confidence: 0.902180804444445

00:28:47.392 --> 00:28:49.184 from local regional therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

00:28:49.860 --> 00:28:54.066 Thank you and Doctor David Rim.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

 $00:28:54.070 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.646$ It's asking is it even possible to

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

 $00{:}28{:}56.646 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}58.529$ study cancer presented stage four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

 $00:28:58.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.570$ since in this modern era discovery

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

 $00{:}29{:}00.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}03.170$ of the cancer at stage 4 classifieds

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

 $00{:}29{:}03.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}05.394$ the patients as having received

NOTE Confidence: 0.819593883333333

 $00:29:05.394 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.556$ below is the standard of care.

00:29:08.560 --> 00:29:10.369 Any comment meaning

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:11.260 --> 00:29:14.767 maybe. I don't understand the question 100,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:14.770 --> 00:29:19.029 so the. Bing diagnosis stage four is

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:19.029 --> 00:29:21.351 below the standard of care. Well, I mean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:21.351 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.870$ we're obviously in the United States I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:22.870 --> 00:29:23.848 I would say that you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:23.850 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.027$ because we have such a well screened

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:26.027 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.705$ population that that number is

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00{:}29{:}27.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}29.950$ relatively low, but it still is about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:29.950 --> 00:29:31.992 you know again, 4 to 6% depending

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:31.992 --> 00:29:33.288 on whether you look at Sierra,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:33.290 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.190$ NCDB or whatever data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:35.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.801$ But I really like thinking of things

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:37.801 --> 00:29:40.460 well outside of EU S borders and

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:40.460 --> 00:29:42.656 certainly in Sub Saharan Africa or

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.530$ Asia and many other parts of the world.

 $00:29:45.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.618$ You know there are a lot of women who

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:47.618 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.442$ are presenting with stage four breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00{:}29{:}49.442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}51.809$ cancer and are a lot more patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:51.809 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.143$ presenting with stage four breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:54.150 --> 00:29:56.390 And you know, should different

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:29:56.390 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.310$ options be considered in that setting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:29:59.310 --> 00:30:01.308 You know it was nice that at least and

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:30:01.308 \longrightarrow 00:30:03.226$ you know in the work on stage four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:30:03.230 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.606$ breast cancer and local regional therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:30:05.606 \longrightarrow 00:30:08.408$ that we had counterparts in India in Turkey,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:30:08.410 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.710$ in Japan and others that

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:30:09.710 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.750$ were looking at this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:30:10.750 --> 00:30:13.912 And it wasn't just run by EU

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

00:30:13.912 --> 00:30:15.604 S and Europeans in terms of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731204395714286

 $00:30:15.610 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.460$ Helping us answer those questions.

00:30:18.610 --> 00:30:23.468 OK, and that well, how about the?

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

 $00:30:23.470 \dashrightarrow 00:30:27.166$ Role of the Disney Cetera Ginnetti and

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

 $00:30:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.080$ the different phenotypes and molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

 $00:30:30.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:33.104$ phenotypes and treatment available and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

 $00:30:33.104 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.468$ what does that do to despair? Diamond?

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

00:30:35.468 --> 00:30:37.692 In other words, I was wondering if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

00:30:37.692 --> 00:30:39.640 know if you have a great treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

 $00:30:39.640 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.904$ is it good to have surgery or not?

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

00:30:41.910 --> 00:30:44.246 Or maybe if you guys have a great

NOTE Confidence: 0.765823885714286

00:30:44.246 --> 00:30:46.260 treatment it doesn't matter? Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:30:46.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:47.936$ so that's that's such a great question

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:30:47.936 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.767$ and you know you get those you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:30:49.770 --> 00:30:51.846 You know, there's this young patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:30:51.850 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.650$ you know she's got like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:30:53.650 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.466$ A couple of sites that maybe liver disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:30:55.470 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.186$ You get anti her two therapy.

 $00:30:57.190 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.862$ Everything disappears.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:30:57.862 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.550$ You know maybe she has a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:00.608 --> 00:31:02.642 of a lump or mass in the breast but

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:02.642 --> 00:31:04.774 you know you know you get the story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.974$ You know she has young kids

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:05.974 --> 00:31:07.230 and a family and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:07.230 --> 00:31:08.910 let's just, you know it's easy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:08.910 \longrightarrow 00:31:11.346$ Just take it out, you know I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00{:}31{:}11.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}13.590$ I really think that's you know the you

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:13.590 --> 00:31:16.046 know she's going to likely do well anyways,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:16.050 --> 00:31:18.549 whether I do the lumpectomy or mastectomy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:18.550 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.699$ remove the lymph nodes, yes or no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:20.700 \longrightarrow 00:31:23.916$ And again, there's this, you know, making.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00{:}31{:}23.916 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}26.652$ US or the patient feel better

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:26.652 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.518$ versus are we actually, you know,

 $00:31:29.518 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.312$ doing a benefit in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:31.312 --> 00:31:32.750 keeping them alive longer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:32.750 --> 00:31:34.090 And certainly you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.765$ breast surgery may not be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:35.770 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.226$ you know, as morbid as you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:37.230 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.090$ very large thoracic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:39.090 --> 00:31:40.485 intra abdominal surgeries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:40.490 --> 00:31:42.008 but you know in this society

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:42.008 --> 00:31:44.382 we put a lot of emphasis on on

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:44.382 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.997$ breasts in the breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:46.000 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.827$ And, you know, removal of the breast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:47.830 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.503$ And then the question becomes in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:49.503 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.290$ stage for setting if you do a mastectomy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:31:51.290 --> 00:31:52.318 How about doing reconstruction

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:52.318 \longrightarrow 00:31:54.210$ yes or no and kind of where?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:54.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.002$ Where does that end?

00:31:55.002 --> 00:31:56.630 Or why don't you move the opposite?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:56.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.575$ The rest as well, and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:57.580 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.952$ I've had those discussions

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:31:58.952 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.324$ time and time again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:32:00.330 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.098$ and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:32:01.098 --> 00:32:03.257 I would hope we're making some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:32:03.257 --> 00:32:05.448 decisions based on data and the science,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:32:05.450 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.830$ and not what like you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00{:}32{:}06.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}08.811$ feels good or or maybe the right

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:32:08.811 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.668$ thing to say at that moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:32:10.670 --> 00:32:12.710 So I do think heterogeneity does

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:32:12.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.730$ make a difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

00:32:13.730 --> 00:32:15.025 but I think it's probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00{:}32{:}15.025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}16.581$ going to do well regardless of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871062266666667

 $00:32:16.581 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.799$ what I do with my scalpel.

00:32:19.220 --> 00:32:21.159 Thank you and Doctor Lustberg is pointing

NOTE Confidence: 0.766362593157895

 $00{:}32{:}21.159 \to 00{:}32{:}23.057$ out that they are very aggressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.766362593157895

 $00:32:23.057 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.737$ tumors that present biological stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.766362593157895

00:32:24.737 --> 00:32:27.256 for particularly in younger women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.766362593157895

 $00:32:27.256 \longrightarrow 00:32:30.402$ So it's not necessarily substandard care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.766362593157895

 $00:32:30.402 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.090$ This bad biology rim.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921376678333333

 $00:32:32.740 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.426$ That's great, that's a great comment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:35.120 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.698$ Yes, wonderful thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:36.700 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.639$ So I mean there's interest of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:38.640 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.377$ We're going to move on to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:41.377 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.720$ next talk for the next talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:43.720 \longrightarrow 00:32:46.612$ We have our very own doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:32:46.612 --> 00:32:49.430 Anita Hutner Dr Hutner is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:32:49.430 --> 00:32:51.190 associate professor of pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:51.190 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.902$ who specialize in identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:52.902 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.470$ diseases and cancers in the brain.

 $00:32:55.470 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.558$ She has received her medical degree from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:32:58.558 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.338$ University of Ehrlinger Nurburg in Germany.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:33:01.340 --> 00:33:03.674 And a completely fellowship at Harvard

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:33:03.674 --> 00:33:06.598 Medical School at the Brig and and her

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:06.598 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.200$ residency here at the Ionia Haven Hospital.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:09.200 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.635$ So in addition to her

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:33:11.635 --> 00:33:13.096 specialty in neuropathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00{:}33{:}13.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.560$ Dr Hutton has stated molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:33:15.560 --> 00:33:16.544 diagnostic pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:16.550 \longrightarrow 00:33:17.822$ so in her research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:17.822 \longrightarrow 00:33:20.185$ Dr Hutner uses stem cells to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00{:}33{:}20.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22.115$ to recreate the brain disorders

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00{:}33{:}22.120 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}33{:}24.095$ founding diseases like epilepsy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:24.095 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.520$ Alzheimer's disease and hopes to find

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:26.520 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.455$ better treatments for brain tumors.

 $00:33:28.460 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.078$ So today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:33:29.078 --> 00:33:30.623 Doctor Hutner will talk to

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:30.623 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.610$ us about a very important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:32.610 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.442$ Update in the WHL classification of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:35.442 \longrightarrow 00:33:37.602$ brain tumors that will pretty much

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

00:33:37.602 --> 00:33:39.887 append the way we are calling these

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:39.887 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.907$ diseases and classifying disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:41.907 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.540$ enrolling the patients in clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:44.540 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.312$ So we're very fortunate to have her

NOTE Confidence: 0.908401221666667

 $00:33:47.312 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.900$ here to educate us on that hardener.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:33:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.360$ Thank you, Antonio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:33:53.360 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.240$ Thank you for this kind introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:33:56.240 \longrightarrow 00:33:58.200$ Thank you. It's a it's a real

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:33:58.200 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.434$ pleasure to be here and have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:00.434 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.420$ opportunity to share with you some

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}34{:}02.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}05.855$ insights into the upcoming 2021 W

 $00:34:05.855 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.710$ 2 classification of CNS tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.376$ It's now the 5th and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:12.380 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.636$ talk more about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:34:14.636 --> 00:34:18.040 Uhm, in general, you might wonder, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:18.040 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.480$ why shall we even deal with brain tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:21.480 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.488$ Yeah, they're relatively rare

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:23.488 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.496$ compared to other cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}34{:}25.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}27.516$ and when you look at the numbers in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:34:27.516 --> 00:34:29.999 a bit more detail, you realize that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:29.999 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.164$ Yes, well they are relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}34{:}32.164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}34.528$ rare compared to let's say breast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:34.530 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.658$ lung and other entities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:37.658 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.890$ UM, the outcome is rather devastating,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.843$ so roughly estimated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:42.843 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.324$ We will find about 24,000

 $00:34:46.324 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.820$ patients with malignant glioma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:49.820 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.028$ The 85 year survival rate is rather low,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:55.030 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.422$ it's 36% anti survivability

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:34:57.422 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.245$ rate for those two suffer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:00.245 \longrightarrow 00:35:03.220$ With a clear blastoma is really low,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:03.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:06.320$ so it's it begs for innovation

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:06.320 \longrightarrow 00:35:07.880$ this entire field.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:07.880 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.480$ The costs of treating patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:10.480 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.160$ with brain tumors or tremendous

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:13.160 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.860$ in in in simplified terms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.420$ But also we are illustrative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:18.420 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.000$ is this graph here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:35:20.000 --> 00:35:22.940 When you look at the survival rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}35{:}22.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25.196$ the five years or survival rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:35:25.196 --> 00:35:26.700 of children with leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:26.700 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.305$ Right now, nine out of 10 surviving.

 $00:35:30.310 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.902$ Patients with breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667 00:35:31.902 --> 00:35:32.300 Similarly, NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:32.300 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.494$ nine out of 10 survive when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:35.494 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.366$ look at patients with brain cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:37.370 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.314$ Now you're down to two per ten surviving.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:41.320 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.216$ And then with glioblastoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:35:43.216 --> 00:35:46.450 you're down to one pretend so you

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:46.450 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.378$ can see even in 2021 the field

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:50.378 \dashrightarrow 00:35:53.108$ is begging for innovation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:35:53.108 --> 00:35:56.420 new approaches to handle this

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}35{:}56.420 {\: --> \:} 00{:}35{:}58.547$ absolutely devastating disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:35:58.550 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.160$ And so we this year there is a new W

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:02.261 \dashrightarrow 00:36:06.678$ classification of brain tumors coming out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:06.678 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.263$ which is dramatically significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:09.263 --> 00:36:10.682 different from before,

 $00:36:10.682 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.574$ and so I felt.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:12.580 --> 00:36:14.940 Since we have a very large and active

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:14.940 --> 00:36:17.180 neuro clinical neuroscience community here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:17.180 --> 00:36:21.014 it would be good to discuss a few of

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:21.014 --> 00:36:23.600 those new changes because they will

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:23.690 --> 00:36:27.008 affect how we all practice and interact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:27.010 --> 00:36:29.368 and so for today I thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:29.368 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.338$ I'll show you a few.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}36{:}31.338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}33.308$ Some of the general changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:33.308 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.096$ and recommendations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:34.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.865$ then go into tumor specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}36{:}35.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}38.310$ changes and at the end I'd like

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}36{:}38.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}40.690$ to conclude with one of our own

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:40.690 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.809$ cases and methodone analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:42.810 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.220$ For brain tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}36{:}44.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}46.570$ which is now also recommended.

 $00:36:46.570 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.442$ And so. NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:47.442 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.494$ Why is it overall so important to

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:36:50.494 --> 00:36:53.367 accurately classify tumor samples well?

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:53.370 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.666$ The multiple aspects personalized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:56.666 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.138$ individualized patient care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:36:59.140 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.768$ It contributes to prognosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:37:01.768 --> 00:37:04.396 AIDS in the apeutic guidance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:04.400 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.540$ It's click current critical for

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:06.540 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.252$ clinical trial enrollment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:08.252 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.970$ also then we sent it for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:10.970 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.840$ interpretation of clinical trials data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.285$ The enrollment in experimental studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}37{:}15.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}18.737$ and here also data and analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}37{:}18.737 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}21.622$ interpretation the evaluation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:21.622 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.238$ population based disease trends.

 $00:37:24.240 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.360$ Are aided by accurate classification

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:26.360 \dashrightarrow 00:37:29.038$ system and also you know affected

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:29.038 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.468$ is allocation of resources by

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:31.468 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.412$ governments and health insurers

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:33.490 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.346$ to support health care and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:37:36.346 --> 00:37:39.661 UW now publishes periodic revisions

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:37:39.661 --> 00:37:41.650 of tumor classifications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:41.650 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.278$ and these have therefore very diverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00{:}37{:}44.278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}47.131$ and important effects on many aspects

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:37:47.131 --> 00:37:50.203 actually of individual and population health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667 00:37:50.210 --> 00:37:50.627 however, NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

00:37:50.627 --> 00:37:52.295 and David Luiz emphasize

NOTE Confidence: 0.906106616666667

 $00:37:52.295 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.380$ this at the last meeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:37:54.380 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.940$ All classifications are somewhat imperfect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:37:58.940 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.952$ They are imperfect representations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:01.952 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.864$ and represent of.

 $00:38:03.864 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.288$ Come off in this state and

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:06.288 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.049$ the representative state of

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:08.049 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.379$ understanding at a particular time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:10.380 \longrightarrow 00:38:12.144$ And the interpretations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:12.144 \dashrightarrow 00:38:16.660$ Of a limited number of experts and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:16.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:18.148$ You see their limitations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00:38:18.148 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.636$ their works in progress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858850258

 $00{:}38{:}19.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}22.210$ yet they're still extremely needed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:25.880 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.288$ Just to shed light on the 5th.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:28.290 \longrightarrow 00:38:30.656$ So the when you look at how

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:30.656 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.100$ the classification emerged,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:32.100 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.817$ the first one was published in 17-9.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}38{:}35.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}38.319$ The first edition then evolved over

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:38.319 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.323$ the years that the time gaps are

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:41.323 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.924$ at times quite considerable from

 $00:38:43.924 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.284$ the from 20 from 2007 to 2016 there

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:49.284 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.340$ was an almost 10 year time span,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:52.340 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.254$ however the 2016.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:54.254 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.876$ In addition, was a more or less a

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:38:57.876 \longrightarrow 00:39:00.629$ revised edition of the 4th edition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.442$ which received 2007 version,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:03.442 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.514$ and here for the first time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:06.514 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.594$ Definitions were now based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:08.594 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.256$ the combination of morphologic

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:11.256 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.416$ and genetic characteristics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}39{:}13.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}16.988$ This was a huge shift in the field.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.790$ And I feel that was celebrated by one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:20.790 \longrightarrow 00:39:24.532$ By some there's a paper in Kansas, L.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:24.532 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.626$ Which caused the fall of the optical

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:27.626 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.452$ wall freedom from the tyranny of

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}39{:}30.452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}33.442$ the microscope and the molecular

 $00:39:33.442 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.432$ changes stand could demonstrate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:37.432 \longrightarrow 00:39:40.560$ improves humor risk stratification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.018$ Uhm, the from 2016 to now to 2021.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286 00:39:46.018 --> 00:39:46.616 Again, NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:39:46.616 --> 00:39:51.400 you know time passed and but now with

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:51.521 \longrightarrow 00:39:54.724$ the advents in molecular technology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:39:54.724 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.279$ Information is gathered as lightspeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}39{:}58.279 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}03.190$ and so in order to bridge these gaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:03.190 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.470$ between WTO classifications, the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:40:07.470 --> 00:40:08.916 Consortium was formed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:40:08.916 --> 00:40:11.326 They see impact now consortium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:11.330 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.342$ which is a consortium to inform

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}40{:}14.342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}16.350$ molecular and practical approaches

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:40:16.427 --> 00:40:18.099 to CNS tumor taxonomy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:18.100 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.360$ The goal here is to.

00:40:21.360 --> 00:40:23.860 Publish new developments in

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}40{:}23.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.360$ molecular diagnostics and inform

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:26.360 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.476$ the clinical world so this could

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:29.476 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.146$ be implemented along the way and

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:32.233 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.285$ there wouldn't be a long gap until

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:35.285 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.924$ new changes were implemented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:36.924 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.516$ If you wonder what the now stands for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:39.520 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.070$ it means not officially who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:42.070 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.698$ because this consortium was

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:43.698 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.733$ established in 2016 and basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}40{:}45.733 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}48.137$ the authors of all these C impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:40:48.137 --> 00:40:50.530 papers are also authors and editors

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}40{:}50.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}52.600$ of the new double classification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:40:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.860$ So it's a very.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:40:53.860 --> 00:40:56.092 It's a very homogeneous group that works

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:40:56.092 --> 00:41:00.035 on this the the expert editorial group

 $00:41:00.035 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.430$ is composed of international group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:03.430 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.166$ Unfortunately the Blue Book

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:05.166 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.336$ is not yet published there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:07.340 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.122$ I was told by David Lewis there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:11.122 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.488$ production issues related to the pandemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286 00:41:14.490 --> 00:41:15.137 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:41:15.137 --> 00:41:19.019 in the meantime I review paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:41:19.020 --> 00:41:20.855 came out in neuro Oncology

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:20.855 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.970$ which is available and can be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}41{:}22.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}25.760$ Teen and so I quickly would like to go

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:25.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.048$ through a few general changes before I

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:28.048 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.010$ go into too much specific changes and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}41{:}33.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}36.810$ The significant change is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:36.810 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.610$ related to the report structure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:40.610 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.422$ and here we have now a so-called integrated

00:41:45.422 --> 00:41:48.646 histo molecular classification system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:41:48.650 --> 00:41:50.858 It's already in place at Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:50.860 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.389$ and this is what one of our reports looks

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:53.389 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.806$ like and so you have four layers there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:55.806 \longrightarrow 00:41:57.936$ Two is the histopathological diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:57.940 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.804$ which would be here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:58.804 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.236$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:41:59.240 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.584$ glioblastoma layers 3 then defines the

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:03.584 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.132$ grade would be here for and then layer

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:08.132 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.516$ 4 forms the molecular information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}42{:}10.516 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}13.756$ which would be a list of molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:13.756 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.972$ data here and in order to make sense

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00{:}42{:}16.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}19.799$ out of this different components.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:42:19.800 --> 00:42:23.744 A layer one is added which forms

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:23.744 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.029$ the integrated diagnosis and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:26.029 \longrightarrow 00:42:28.722$ is the combined tissue based

 $00:42:28.722 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.218$ histological and molecular diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:31.220 \longrightarrow 00:42:33.135$ And so this is continuously

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:33.135 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.050$ expanding with the addition of

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

00:42:35.121 --> 00:42:37.266 additional newer markers and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.819954185714286

 $00:42:37.266 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.411$ integrated diagnosis is really a

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:42:39.484 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.230$ collaborative, team based effort where we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:42:42.230 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.235$ as neuropathologists from surface as

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:42:45.235 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.200$ central role for the integration component.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:42:49.200 --> 00:42:51.370 We closely work with neurosurgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:42:51.370 --> 00:42:53.872 neurology, neuro oncology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:42:53.872 --> 00:42:57.208 genetics, and new radiology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:42:57.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.814$ and then integrate from

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}42{:}59.814 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}01.767$ this integrated diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:01.770 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.032$ Which then is used by neurooncology in

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:05.032 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.559$ radiation oncology foot for treatment.

 $00:43:07.560 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.698$ So it's a very intimately integrated process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:12.700 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.120$ A few words to just a few nomenclature

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:17.120 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.381$ issues, so when a diagnosis cannot

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:20.381 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.600$ be made and the term Nos is used,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:43:24.600 --> 00:43:27.270 meaning non not otherwise specified,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.030$ this just means that molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}43{:}29.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}30.790$ information is not available and

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}43{:}30.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}32.527$ there could be multiple reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:32.527 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.490$ it's either not available or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:34.490 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.282$ The test was not performed or simply was

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}43{:}37.282 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}41.584$ not successful, whereas the NEC term.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:43:41.584 --> 00:43:44.287 Not elsewhere classified,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:44.290 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.525$ just indicates that the test

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:46.525 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.866$ was successfully performed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:47.870 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.535$ However, the test results simply

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:43:50.535 --> 00:43:54.910 do not fit into a known category,

 $00:43:54.910 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.551$ so further on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:43:56.551 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.286$ Now, in this new version,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:43:59.290 --> 00:44:01.750 we're now distinguishing our

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:01.750 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.210$ grading from other classifications

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:04.210 \longrightarrow 00:44:07.128$ by adding the Hoos TNS grade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:07.130 --> 00:44:10.088 because this is meant to emphasize

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:10.088 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.049$ that the way the neuro Neuro.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}44{:}13.049 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}15.443$ Who grades tumors is different from

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:15.443 --> 00:44:18.427 how it's done and you and your breast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:18.430 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.464$ for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:20.464 --> 00:44:24.272 Further from the now we research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:24.272 \longrightarrow 00:44:26.930$ this might sound trivial using Arabic

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}44{:}27.007 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}29.677$ numerals instead of Roman numerals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714 00:44:29.680 --> 00:44:30.548 And lastly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:30.548 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.586$ now is also grading within tumor types,

 $00:44:33.590 \longrightarrow 00:44:36.474$ and this is a bit more substantial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:36.480 \longrightarrow 00:44:39.203$ This is meant to provide more flexibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:39.203 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.038$ in using grade relative to tumor type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:42.040 --> 00:44:44.036 It should emphasize biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:44.036 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.531$ similarities within tumor types rather

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:46.531 --> 00:44:49.470 than just approximate clinical behavior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:49.470 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.325$ and it should.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:50.325 \longrightarrow 00:44:51.750$ It conforms with who grading

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:51.750 --> 00:44:53.300 in non CNS tumor types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714 00:44:53.300 --> 00:44:54.350 For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}44{:}54.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57.500$ we used to say astrocytoma IDH

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:44:57.500 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.986$ Mutant who's seen as great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:44:59.986 --> 00:45:04.729 Two or three or form when you have before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:45:04.730 --> 00:45:06.210 you could say, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.278$ I had a trim anaplastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}45{:}09.278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}10.846$ astrocytoma who creates three.

 $00:45:10.850 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.390$ This is now obsolete.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:13.390 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.188$ Now it's replaced and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}45{:}16.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}17.220$ nomenclature now would indicate

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:45:17.220 --> 00:45:19.110 that you have to say astrocytoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}45{:}19.110 --> 00{:}45{:}20.456 \ \mathrm{IDH \ Mutant},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:20.456 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.148$ who CNS great three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:23.150 \longrightarrow 00:45:25.337$ I think it will take a bit of time

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:25.337 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.340$ to get used to this overtime and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}45{:}28.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}30.965$ term glioblastoma now is exclusively.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:30.970 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.354$ Served for the adult IDH wild type tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}45{:}35.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}39.002$ so the the stratification is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:39.002 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.549$ based on IDH status and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}45{:}42.549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}44.041$ The humerus specific changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:45:44.041 --> 00:45:45.600 now go into this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:45:50.110$ so when you look at the 2016 WO list of

 $00:45:50.110 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.064$ tumors it has a wide range of entities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:53.064 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.962$ Terms like Mr Citic astrocytoma or here

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:45:55.962 --> 00:45:59.763 to use sarcoma epithelioid, do you blastoma?

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:45:59.763 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.118$ All these have been removed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:02.120 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.512$ Everything has been streamlined

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:04.512 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.100$ and reduced to three main groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.996$ and these are the adult type diffuse gliomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:46:11.000 --> 00:46:13.718 pediatric type diffuse, low grade glioma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:46:13.720 --> 00:46:16.004 Sandy Patrick type diffuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:16.004 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.717$ high grade lumas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:17.720 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.429$ The pediatric type does not mean these

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:46:20.429 --> 00:46:22.409 are exclusively present in pediatric

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:46:22.409 --> 00:46:24.659 patients but they're often or more

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}46{:}24.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}27.160$ more readily seen in pediatric patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:27.160 \longrightarrow 00:46:29.952$ We now when we look at this more

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00{:}46{:}29.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}32.358$ closely so the astrocytoma now.

00:46:32.360 --> 00:46:35.048 We're talking now specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:35.048 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.064$ about diffuse gliomas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:37.070 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.220$ There now is, it is the idea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

00:46:40.220 --> 00:46:42.460 Mutant status matters most,

NOTE Confidence: 0.830618144285714

 $00:46:42.460 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.820$ and the certification is based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:46:45.914 --> 00:46:48.944 astrocytoma IDH mutant and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:46:48.944 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.296$ grading is based on grade 2-3 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}46{:}52.296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}54.285$ four for the OLIGODENDROGLIOMAS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}46{:}54.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}57.960$ Again, IDH mutant status is very relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:46:57.960 --> 00:47:00.440 In addition to that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:00.440 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.120$ the 1P19 Q correlation status again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:04.120 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.810$ he DCNS grade goes up to two to three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}47{:}07.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10.834$ And a glass stoma is exclusively

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:10.834 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.069$ reserved for IDH wild type tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.598$ And these are automatically

 $00:47:15.598 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.126$ who create 4 tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}47{:}17.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}19.570$ D pediatric type diffuse Low

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:19.570 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.268$ Bradley almost are now in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.838$ Now include diffuse astrocytomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}47{:}25.838 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}30.262$ with milk and milk LA mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:30.262 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.040$ the angiocentric Luma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:47:33.040 --> 00:47:34.648 The polymorphous low grade

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:47:34.648 --> 00:47:36.658 neuroepithelial tumor of the young

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}47{:}36.658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}38.950$ and then diffuse low grade lum as

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:38.950 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.172$ with MAP kinase alterations so you

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}47{:}41.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}43.176$ see it's very different group of

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:47:43.176 --> 00:47:45.395 tumors that's now front and center

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:45.395 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.825$ stage within a diffuse cleoma group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:47.830 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.294$ and then lastly high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333 00:47:49.294 --> 00:47:49.660 Correctly, NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:47:49.660 --> 00:47:55.550 Omar Group includes H3K27 and altered 2 must,

 $00:47:55.550 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.360$ a new entity DH3G34 Mutant

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:47:59.360 \longrightarrow 00:48:01.680$ Group is now included.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:01.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.916$ And also a new group deep diffuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:48:06.916 --> 00:48:09.970 pediatric type hydrate guma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:09.970 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.884$ Which is H3 wild type in wild type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:48:12.884 --> 00:48:16.020 Now with a high great great forward and

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:48:16.108 --> 00:48:19.188 nomenclature is part of it and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:19.188 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.981$ last city infant type hemispherically

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}48{:}21.981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.006$ Omaha for the adult type tumor tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}48{:}25.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}27.170$ There were also significant changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:48:27.170 --> 00:48:30.245 so the diffusely infiltrative Astro

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}48{:}30.245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}34.200$ City humor with an IDH mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}48{:}34.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}37.075$ is morphologically in general well

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:37.075 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.486$ differentiated, lacks features of anaplasia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:39.486 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.706$ My target of activity is not detected

00:48:42.706 --> 00:48:45.794 or very low and what is absent and

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:45.794 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.438$ this is diagnostically relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:48:48.440 --> 00:48:51.820 Is microvascular proliferation and necrosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:51.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.655$ and also there cannot be a city

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:54.655 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.700$ into a homozygous deletion?

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:56.700 \longrightarrow 00:48:58.930$ For the intermediate type here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:48:58.930 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.140$ formally called anaplastic as just cytoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:02.140 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.164$ this is now the astrocytoma IDH

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:05.164 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.900$ mutant and now who CNS grade three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:49:08.900 --> 00:49:11.075 You have similar features except

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}49{:}11.075 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}14.080$ that now you find focalor dispersed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:49:14.080 --> 00:49:16.904 Anaplasia significant mitotic activity

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:49:16.904 --> 00:49:20.434 but still no faster proliferation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:20.440 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.208$ only crosses and no city can to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:24.208 \longrightarrow 00:49:27.858$ deletion rest for the highest grade now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}49{:}27.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}30.158$ Which is no longer called glioblastoma,

 $00:49:30.160 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.836$ but this is the astrocytoma IDH mutant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}49{:}34.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}38.578$ Suppose CNS great for you have features

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:49:38.580 --> 00:49:40.910 of a diffusely infiltrative Astro,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:40.910 \longrightarrow 00:49:43.500$ static new class and with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:49:43.500 --> 00:49:47.310 And IDH mutation that exhibits

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}49{:}47.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}49.596$ also microvascular proliferation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333 00:49:49.600 --> 00:49:50.036 necrosis, NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:50.036 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.088$ and in this case also sitting case

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}49{:}53.088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}56.647$ IDK and to a homozygous deletion or

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:56.647 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.247$ any combination of these features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:49:59.250 \longrightarrow 00:50:03.060$ So overall. Do they drive home?

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}50{:}03.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05.935$ Point is the diagnosis anaplastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}50{:}05.935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}08.810$ astrocytoma IDH mutant and glioblastoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:08.893 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.725$ IDH mutant are no longer recommended

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:50:16.010$ and the city KN 2A and B homozygous

 $00:50:16.010 \longrightarrow 00:50:19.165$ deletions are molecular markers of whose

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}50{:}19.165 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}25.029$ in S grade 4 in an idea mutant astrocytoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:25.030 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.430$ Uhm, the criteria for Clyde Blastoma now are

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:50:33.930$ limited to exclusively IDH wild type tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:33.930 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.596$ And here you find diffuse associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:37.596 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.040$ tumors with microvascular proliferation

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:40.129 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.423$ or in the past it used to be an end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:42.430 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.822$ Now it's just or you need

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:43.822 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.750$ one of those features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:44.750 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.509$ or you have a molecular defined tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00{:}50{:}48.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}51.306$ Third promoter mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:50:51.306 --> 00:50:54.340 EGFR gene F receptor gene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333 00:50:54.340 --> 00:50:55.120 and if. NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

 $00:50:55.120 \longrightarrow 00:50:58.378$ Amplification or plus 7 -- 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.834308963333333

00:50:58.378 --> 00:51:00.130 chromosome copy number changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

00:51:02.170 --> 00:51:04.938 DIDID H1 type diffuse kioma with any of

 $00:51:04.938 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.308$ these features is called a glioblastoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:07.310 \longrightarrow 00:51:10.910$ Who CNS Grade 4.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:10.910 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.179$ So the question arises, how do you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

00:51:14.180 --> 00:51:16.068 you know, handle you plus two more now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:16.070 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.640$ So there are two options.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

00:51:19.640 --> 00:51:21.986 And this is not necessarily trivial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:21.990 \longrightarrow 00:51:25.686$ so the case with diffuse kiyama without

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00{:}51{:}25.686 {\:--}{>}\ 00{:}51{:}28.030$ microvascular proliferation or necrosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:28.030 \longrightarrow 00:51:31.318$ So without anaplastic features it is

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:31.318 \longrightarrow 00:51:35.189$ logically not really a hit glioblastoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

00:51:35.190 --> 00:51:39.460 but it is a glioblastoma when it is IDH,

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:39.460 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.660$ wild type and displays each Fr amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00{:}51{:}43.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}47.738$ Third promote imitation or plus 7 -- 10 E 10.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:47.738 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.650$ Whereas when you have a true histological

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:50.742 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.854$ glioblastoma where you see morphologic

 $00:51:53.854 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.644$ features of anaplasia like Vasco preparation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

00:51:58.644 --> 00:51:59.658 Only crosses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:51:59.658 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.686$ it's not ugly blastoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:52:01.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.169$ It's then a he still logically blows,

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00{:}52{:}05.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}07.948$ not clear plus stoma with IDH

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00{:}52{:}07.948 \to 00{:}52{:}10.960$ mutation would then be an astrocytoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:52:10.960 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.996$ IDH mutant grade four so the

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:52:13.996 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.684$ term glioblastoma is not used its

NOTE Confidence: 0.708575286428571

 $00:52:16.684 \dashrightarrow 00:52:19.500$ astrocytoma IDH mutant who created for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:21.820 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.676$ For the pediatric group, then we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:24.676 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.399$ the entities I already mentioned.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:27.400 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.568$ I just wanted to point out the diffuse low

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:30.568 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.638$ grade leoma with the map kinase pathway

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:33.638 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.791$ alterations where you have several entities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:52:36.791 --> 00:52:41.410 Now within the FGF receptor category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:41.410 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.460$ where you have duplications mutations,

 $00:52:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.228$ be roughest involved or again into a D pad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:49.228 \longrightarrow 00:52:51.276$ Pediatric type diffuse tactically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:51.280 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.930$ Almost this is a relatively.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:52:52.930 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.834$ Unusual entity in here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}52{:}54.834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}57.214$ You have some involvement of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:52:57.214 --> 00:52:59.790 PDGF receptor amplifications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:52:59.790 --> 00:53:04.780 or EGFR amplifications or milk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:53:07.258$ Others, when you then go beyond the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:53:07.258 --> 00:53:09.250 diffuse gliomas, you look at Leo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}09.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}10.569$ neuronal, and neuronal tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:10.569 \longrightarrow 00:53:12.900$ I just want to point out there

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:12.965 \longrightarrow 00:53:15.120$ were few additional tumors added,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}15.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}17.652$ like the high grade astrocytoma with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}17.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}20.030$ pilot features within the glue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:53:20.030 --> 00:53:22.070 neuronal and neuronal tumors,

 $00:53:22.070 \longrightarrow 00:53:23.965$ and unusual tumor diffuse clonal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}23.965 \to 00{:}53{:}26.344$ tumor with oligo dentro cleoma like

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}26.344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}28.028$ features and nuclear clusters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:28.030 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.556$ Myxoid Cleo neuronal tumors and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:31.556 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.260$ multinodular backlighting neuronal tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225 00:53:34.260 --> 00:53:35.870 Uhm? NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}35.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}38.000$ Major changes were also seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:53:38.000 --> 00:53:40.130 added to the EPENDYMAL tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}53{:}40.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}43.400$ Appendable tumors are those with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:43.400 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.160$ relatively isomorphic appearance which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.440$ form pseudorosettes around vasculature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:51.440 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.330$ They're linked to the ventricular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:53.330 \longrightarrow 00:53:54.086$ system mostly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:54.090 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.162$ and so this was the original

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:53:57.162 --> 00:53:58.698 classification in 2016.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:53:58.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.640$ Now this is abolished and the

 $00:54:01.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.004$ classification is now based on location

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:05.004 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.640$ Histology and genetic alterations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:54:07.640 --> 00:54:11.666 And here we have location based

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:11.666 \longrightarrow 00:54:14.568$ Supratentorial intro tutorial spinal and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:14.568 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.676$ then lastly a few added two additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:17.676 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.265$ entities to MC so popular in Panama.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:20.270 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.870$ And these soccer pending normal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:21.870 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.790$ And when we look at those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:23.790 \longrightarrow 00:54:26.942$ In in greater detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:26.942 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.609$ the supratentorial ependymoma's used to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:29.609 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.800$ be known with a real or fusion partner.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:32.800 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.796$ This has been changed now the C 11 open

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}54{:}36.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}39.975$ reading frame 95 now is dedicated as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:39.980 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.448$ CFTA and has multiple fusion partners.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:43.450 \longrightarrow 00:54:47.090$ These are usually hemispheric extra

00:54:47.090 --> 00:54:51.334 ventricular tumors in adults and children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:51.334 \longrightarrow 00:54:54.366$ and another option is also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:54.366 \longrightarrow 00:54:58.400$ Yup, one fused to positive tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:54:58.400 \longrightarrow 00:55:01.280$ The interesting to introspect the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:01.280 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.584$ info tutorial appending moments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:03.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:06.000$ Are the posterior fossa pantomima

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:55:06.000 --> 00:55:08.410 a Group A or B,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:08.410 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.558$ and these are primarily in infants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}55{:}10.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}12.880$ Have an extremely poor prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}55{:}12.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}16.624$ Unknown to have H3K27M metalation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:16.624 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.503$ Loss whereas here you have our attention

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:55:21.503 --> 00:55:24.674 of the HTK 27 M in the B once and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:24.674 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.868$ they have a bit better prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:26.870 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.045$ This panel Panama must show

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:30.045 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.950$ often mxi amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:31.950 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.508$ They are they're very malignant now.

 $00:55:35.510 \longrightarrow 00:55:38.268$ The mix of popular Panama was upgraded

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:38.268 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.307$ now to Grade 2 used to be grade one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:55:41.310 --> 00:55:44.470 There's no additional molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:55:44.470 --> 00:55:46.910 data to change anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:46.910 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.810$ and similarly for this update

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:55:48.810 --> 00:55:51.110 pending more marks stays the same,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:51.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:53.978$ the embryonal tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}55{:}53.980 \to 00{:}55{:}58.098$ I have seen also significant changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:55:58.098 \dashrightarrow 00:56:02.490$ These are as you can see in the image,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:02.490 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.055$ very aggressive appearing blue cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:05.055 \longrightarrow 00:56:08.708$ tumors with high mitotic rate and here

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}56{:}08.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}11.972$ we have now molecular defined and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:11.972 \dashrightarrow 00:56:15.238$ histologically defined tumors in 2016.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:15.238 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.416$ There were four.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:17.420 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.950$ Subgroups and demolished the middle

 $00:56:20.950 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.774$ stomachs were stratified according

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:23.774 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.016$ to pathways which involved wind

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:56:27.016 --> 00:56:30.186 pathway Sonic hedgehog pathway and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:30.186 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.528$ then non wind non Sonic hedgehog.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:33.530 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.079$ The wind pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:37.080 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.012$ Middle of last time I had a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

00:56:39.012 --> 00:56:39.840 relatively good prognosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00:56:39.840 \longrightarrow 00:56:41.872$ whereas the Sonic hedgehog

NOTE Confidence: 0.8318853225

 $00{:}56{:}41.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}44.520$ activated ones with up TP with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

00:56:44.520 --> 00:56:46.140 P53 mutation in addition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

00:56:46.140 --> 00:56:48.165 had a very poor prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

00:56:48.170 --> 00:56:52.528 Now in in 2021 the Sonic Hedgehog

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00{:}56{:}52.528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}55.088$ Pathway Group went from 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.8563391722222222

00:56:55.088 --> 00:56:57.258 subgroups to four subgroups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00:56:57.260 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.564$ so those on the editorial board that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00:57:01.564 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.089$ splitters one rather than the lumpers,

 $00:57:05.090 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.806$ and so we have now more subgroups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

00:57:07.810 --> 00:57:13.022 Lastly, whenever you have MC involved or P53,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

00:57:13.022 --> 00:57:18.100 these survival goes down the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00:57:18.100 \longrightarrow 00:57:21.718$ The non wind non the groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00:57:21.718 \longrightarrow 00:57:25.580$ three and four now went from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

00:57:25.580 --> 00:57:28.550 You know, to eight subgroups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00:57:28.550 \longrightarrow 00:57:30.920$ which is now a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.856339172222222

 $00:57:30.920 \longrightarrow 00:57:32.340$ almost hairsplitting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00{:}57{:}34.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}36.836$ Attempt and you also have C or

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00{:}57{:}36.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}38.659$ wherever you have mic involved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:38.660 \longrightarrow 00:57:41.060$ You have lower survival time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:57:44.010$ We will see whether this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00{:}57{:}44.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}46.270$ Splitting major plus Thomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:46.270 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.095$ UP will hold over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:49.100 \longrightarrow 00:57:52.568$ The molecular defined middle class Thomas,

00:57:52.570 --> 00:57:54.751 however, demonstrate distinct

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:54.751 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.659$ associations with morphologic patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:57.660 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.658$ and here for all wind tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:57:59.658 \longrightarrow 00:58:01.410$ you see the classic type,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:01.410 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.846$ which is a blue cell tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

00:58:03.850 --> 00:58:07.390 The Sonic Hedgehog group shows this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:07.390 \longrightarrow 00:58:09.750$ decimal plastic nodular arrangement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:09.750 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.876$ And also you have a similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:12.876 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.400$ feature called in middle class.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

00:58:15.400 --> 00:58:17.320 Tomorrow is extensive nodularity

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:17.320 \longrightarrow 00:58:19.870$ and the the group three and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:19.870 \longrightarrow 00:58:22.090$ four are usually large cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:22.090 \longrightarrow 00:58:25.800$ very anaplastic appearing middle blastomas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:25.800 \longrightarrow 00:58:27.066$ So for the middle class stoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:27.070 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.142$ Overall it's more complex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7465423925

 $00:58:29.142 \longrightarrow 00:58:31.214$ Now it's more split.

00:58:33.240 --> 00:58:35.874 The tumor types I'm just pointing

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00{:}58{:}35.874 \longrightarrow 00{:}58{:}39.069$ out a change in red in grading.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:58:39.070 --> 00:58:41.740 Uhm, their overall to just

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:58:41.740 \longrightarrow 00:58:45.738$ summarize the 222 new entities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00{:}58{:}45.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}47.180$ Within different subtypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:58:47.180 --> 00:58:50.060 clue Mas que neuronal and ependymal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:58:50.060 --> 00:58:53.780 UM Brian has seen 4 sarcomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:58:53.780 \longrightarrow 00:58:58.034$ so he added and there are several changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:58:58.034 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.580$ I will not go through those just to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:01.668 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.706$ there is quite a bit of modification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:04.710 \longrightarrow 00:59:07.914$ Last feed I just wanted to make close with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:07.914 \longrightarrow 00:59:10.460$ the case we had and we are out of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00{:}59{:}10.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}12.344$ Almost the methylome analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:12.344 \longrightarrow 00:59:13.757$ for brain tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:13.760 \longrightarrow 00:59:17.488$ In 2018, this paper came out by

00:59:17.488 --> 00:59:19.869 the German group on David Capper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:19.870 \longrightarrow 00:59:22.780$ where Metalation based classification of

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:22.780 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.920$ central nervous system team was really dumb.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:59:26.920 --> 00:59:29.560 Breakthrough in certain ways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:29.560 \longrightarrow 00:59:31.785$ The cancer methylome is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:59:31.785 --> 00:59:33.565 a combination of SOMATICALLY

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:33.565 \longrightarrow 00:59:35.650$ acquired in a metalation changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:59:35.650 --> 00:59:37.566 And characteristics that reflect

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

00:59:37.566 --> 00:59:40.908 this cell of origin so you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:40.908 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.603$ trace the cell back to its origin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00{:}59{:}43.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}45.997$ It also has been shown that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00{:}59{:}45.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}47.857$ technology is highly robust and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:47.857 \longrightarrow 00:59:50.173$ reproducible even when you use very

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:50.173 \longrightarrow 00:59:52.800$ small samples and you have only poor

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:52.800 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.738$ quality material and this profiles

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $00:59:54.738 \longrightarrow 00:59:57.174$ have been widely used to classify

 $00{:}59{:}57.174 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}00.014$ CNS tumors and this Disney plot here

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:00.014 \longrightarrow 01:00:02.985$ shows that there has been really a

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:00:02.985 --> 01:00:05.643 discovery of several new tumor entities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:00:05.650 --> 01:00:06.247 Secondly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:06.247 \longrightarrow 01:00:09.829$ it's very straightforward to use where

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:00:09.829 --> 01:00:13.531 you use a paraffin embedded section,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:13.531 \longrightarrow 01:00:14.168$ microdissected,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:14.168 \longrightarrow 01:00:16.079$ run the array,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:16.080 \longrightarrow 01:00:19.296$ and then generate a report which

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:19.296 \longrightarrow 01:00:22.100$ is then based on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:22.100 \longrightarrow 01:00:26.210$ And pattern here and the these

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:26.210 \longrightarrow 01:00:28.265$ new classification recommends

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}00{:}28.265 \mathrel{--}{>} 01{:}00{:}31.500$ DNA metalation studies done

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:31.500 \longrightarrow 01:00:34.528$ explicitly for several tumor types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:34.528 \longrightarrow 01:00:35.460$ For example,

01:00:35.460 --> 01:00:38.620 the pediatric high grade gliomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}00{:}38.620 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}40.780$ the extra ventricular neurosci,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:00:40.780 --> 01:00:42.332 Thomas Appending Momus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}00{:}42.332 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}44.356$ and also embryonal tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:44.360 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.660$ It's mandatory now for high grade

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:47.660 \longrightarrow 01:00:49.502$ astrocytomas with highlighted features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:49.502 \longrightarrow 01:00:51.728$ it's the only way to really

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:00:51.728 \longrightarrow 01:00:52.890$ diagnose this tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}00{:}52.890 \to 01{:}00{:}55.956$ And for the diffuse general tumors with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:00:55.956 --> 01:00:58.369 liquid entropy human like features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}00{:}58.370 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}02.624$ UM case election should follow cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:02.624 \longrightarrow 01:01:05.460$ with ambiguous tumor classification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:05.460 \longrightarrow 01:01:08.250$ Which are some I mentioned already.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:08.250 --> 01:01:09.066 For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:09.066 \longrightarrow 01:01:11.922$ in a young adult with a malignant

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:11.922 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.947$ IDH wild type glioma is suspicious.

 $01:01:14.950 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.842$ That should be looked at by methylome

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:18.842 --> 01:01:21.254 analysis diffuse wildtype lumas

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:21.254 \longrightarrow 01:01:23.693$ without necrosis and so forth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:23.693 \longrightarrow 01:01:25.598$ And brown tumors in general.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:25.600 --> 01:01:27.550 Ependymoma as the higher grade

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:27.550 --> 01:01:29.770 many tumors will benefit from it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:29.770 \longrightarrow 01:01:33.166$ and patients with putative tumor syndromes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:33.170 \longrightarrow 01:01:35.852$ It also it aids in additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:35.852 --> 01:01:37.640 testing in complex cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:37.640 --> 01:01:39.320 and there I wanted to briefly show

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:39.320 \longrightarrow 01:01:41.218$ one of the cases we had at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:41.220 \longrightarrow 01:01:42.884$ We are metal lumen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}01{:}42.884 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}44.964$ Alesis actually resolved this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:44.970 \longrightarrow 01:01:47.170$ So it was a 9 year old female

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:47.170 \longrightarrow 01:01:49.637$ with a very complex heterogeneous

01:01:49.637 --> 01:01:52.096 tumor with enhancement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:52.096 \longrightarrow 01:01:55.788$ cystic degeneration, midline shift.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:01:55.790 \longrightarrow 01:01:58.226$ No one was sure was that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:01:58.226 --> 01:02:00.110 is on the benign side of things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:02:00.110 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.205$ or somewhat malignant and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}02{:}02.205 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}04.831$ biopsied and or a resection shows

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:02:04.831 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.627$ a very peculiar picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:02:06.630 --> 01:02:07.160 Also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01{:}02{:}07.160 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}10.870$ where we have fields with embryonal type

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:02:10.870 --> 01:02:13.760 morphology areas with pseudo rosette forming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:02:13.760 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.748$ this is almost Astro Astro blastoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:02:16.748 --> 01:02:19.818 like fields with sclerosis and there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:02:19.818 \longrightarrow 01:02:22.288$ more pleasure there is nothing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

01:02:22.290 --> 01:02:25.854 In our current WTO that would

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:02:25.854 \longrightarrow 01:02:29.978$ fit this features and so the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79489987

 $01:02:29.978 \longrightarrow 01:02:32.330$ immunohistochemistry was not helpful

 $01:02:32.426 \longrightarrow 01:02:35.760$ at all. We ran I enormously wide

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:02:35.760 --> 01:02:38.460 piano or without any conclusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:02:38.460 --> 01:02:44.118 UM, lastly sent it to end to end

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:02:44.118 --> 01:02:47.592 value for DNA metalation studies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:02:47.592 --> 01:02:51.709 here it came back to our surprise

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:02:51.710 \longrightarrow 01:02:55.476$ as a tumor which matches a neural

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:02:55.476 --> 01:02:57.880 epithelial tumor with Eminem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:02:57.880 \longrightarrow 01:02:59.440$ Eminem, one alteration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:02:59.440 \longrightarrow 01:03:03.810$ This was confirmed with a fish he choose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:03.810 \longrightarrow 01:03:06.631$ Helped us out and here we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:06.631 \longrightarrow 01:03:09.332$ now a probe that confirmed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:09.332 \longrightarrow 01:03:13.190$ the emanon arrangement is really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:03:13.190 --> 01:03:17.124 truly the driving factor here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:17.124 \longrightarrow 01:03:21.220$ and so the high grade new rapidly tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:03:21.317 --> 01:03:23.708 M1 is defined as one rearrangement

 $01:03:23.708 \longrightarrow 01:03:26.570$ is a very new or relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:26.661 \longrightarrow 01:03:29.217$ new entity recently described.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:03:29.220 --> 01:03:31.638 It has several bank binding partners,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:31.640 \longrightarrow 01:03:33.605$ including Band 2.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:33.605 \longrightarrow 01:03:38.190$ Uhm it be metalation profiling shows it

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:38.312 \longrightarrow 01:03:43.303$ really splits off as a separate entity

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:43.303 \longrightarrow 01:03:46.940$ is distinctly different from others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:46.940 \longrightarrow 01:03:49.607$ so most of this high grades CNS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:49.610 \longrightarrow 01:03:52.098$ Peanuts are grouped clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:52.098 \longrightarrow 01:03:54.586$ within the reference group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:03:54.590 --> 01:03:58.090 Here, 24% form 4 clusters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:03:58.090 \longrightarrow 01:04:01.888$ and the I mean one is one of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:01.890 \longrightarrow 01:04:05.028$ And so in in general this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:05.030 \longrightarrow 01:04:08.789$ Worked a sort of false between Astroplus

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:04:08.789 --> 01:04:12.370 stoma, but also somewhat high grade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:12.370 \longrightarrow 01:04:13.810$ He was unsure morphologically

01:04:13.810 --> 01:04:15.510 what to do with it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:15.510 \longrightarrow 01:04:19.968$ but this now really helped us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667 01:04:19.970 --> 01:04:20.690 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:04:20.690 --> 01:04:21.770 stratified this tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:21.770 \longrightarrow 01:04:24.736$ and so it was initially reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:24.736 \longrightarrow 01:04:26.620$ in in a minute you mop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:04:26.620 --> 01:04:29.464 In other tumors it has been seen in AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:04:29.470 --> 01:04:32.610 It's actually it's improved survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:32.610 \longrightarrow 01:04:36.506$ but I think there's not enough data to

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:36.506 \longrightarrow 01:04:39.146$ properly judge this rearrangement here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:39.146 \longrightarrow 01:04:43.970$ And so where do we go from here?

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667 01:04:43.970 --> 01:04:44.257 Uhm, NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01{:}04{:}44{.}257 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}46{.}266$ the goal is to build and expand

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:46.266 \longrightarrow 01:04:47.982$ on a molecular neuropathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:47.982 \longrightarrow 01:04:50.126$ service here at Yale.

01:04:50.130 --> 01:04:53.958 Embrace new developments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:04:53.960 --> 01:04:57.140 Embrace state of the art technology

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:04:57.140 --> 01:04:59.870 molecular markers and so forth

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:04:59.870 \longrightarrow 01:05:02.445$ to improve on the statistics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:02.450 \longrightarrow 01:05:04.522$ The image I showed you at the beginning

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:04.522 \longrightarrow 01:05:06.819$ of the talk and continue to work very

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:06.819 \longrightarrow 01:05:09.040$ closely with all our clinical partners.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:09.040 \longrightarrow 01:05:10.624$ And here we are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:10.624 \longrightarrow 01:05:14.108$ I'd like to acknowledge and thank a wide

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:14.108 \longrightarrow 01:05:16.658$ range of colleagues from neurosurgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01{:}05{:}16.660 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{0}}}1{:}05{:}19.730$ Neuroon cology my own group is

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:19.730 \longrightarrow 01:05:22.186$ fantastic group of neuropathologists

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:22.190 \longrightarrow 01:05:24.322$ Neuro radiology medical genetics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:24.322 \longrightarrow 01:05:26.987$ Molecular genetic pathology also again

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

01:05:26.987 --> 01:05:29.364 in my department radiation oncology

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:29.364 \longrightarrow 01:05:32.397$ and then many who work behind the

 $01:05:32.397 \longrightarrow 01:05:35.618$ scenes and help us along the way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:35.620 \longrightarrow 01:05:36.304$ And with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667 01:05:36.304 --> 01:05:36.760 thank you, NOTE Confidence: 0.801978871666667

 $01:05:36.760 \longrightarrow 01:05:38.610$ I'm sorry I'll reign over.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474375225

 $01:05:40.950 \longrightarrow 01:05:41.978$ Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:05:44.380 \longrightarrow 01:05:45.696$ Thank you very much. I need to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:05:45.700 \longrightarrow 01:05:48.300$ So I think we are running over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01{:}05{:}48.300 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}50.267$ So I think questions will need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

01:05:50.267 --> 01:05:51.838 be addressed through email to you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01{:}05{:}51.840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}56.026$ So I think this is fantastic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

01:05:56.030 --> 01:05:57.982 I think it is one more example of

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:05:57.982 \longrightarrow 01:06:00.008$ where the oncology field is heading.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01{:}06{:}00.010 --> 01{:}06{:}01.381 \ Usually \ bring \ tumors,$

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:01.381 \longrightarrow 01:06:04.123$ lead the way in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:04.123 \longrightarrow 01:06:05.723$ incorporating molecular studies

 $01:06:05.723 \longrightarrow 01:06:08.388$ and then other diseases follow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01{:}06{:}08.390 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}11.421$ So it seems like we're getting more

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:11.421 \longrightarrow 01:06:14.387$ complex and more sliced and if even.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:14.390 \longrightarrow 01:06:18.506$ Rarer diseases so big challenges ahead,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01{:}06{:}18.510 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}20.898$ so thank everyone for attending and

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01{:}06{:}20.898 \to 01{:}06{:}23.587$ once again thank you for our wonderful

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:23.587 \longrightarrow 01:06:26.759$ speakers and I hope to see you next week.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:26.760 \longrightarrow 01:06:28.184$ Our next grand rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428

 $01:06:28.184 \longrightarrow 01:06:29.608$ Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904115058571428 01:06:29.610 --> 01:06:30.000 Bye bye.