WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "01:02:35.5300000"

NOTE recognizability:0.866

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.360826

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:05.369 Like. Well, good afternoon everyone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:05.370 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.526$ and thank you for joining us at

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}00{:}07.526 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}09.346$ a Cancer Center grand rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:09.350 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.050$ This is the annual Kingsbury Lecture ship.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:14.050 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.170$ In honor of breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:00:16.170 --> 00:00:18.430 I have the profound privilege today

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:00:18.430 --> 00:00:20.680 to introduce Doctor Lisa Newman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}00{:}20.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}23.010$ She is a surgical oncologist and someone

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:23.010 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.310$ that I have been in for much of my career.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}00{:}27.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}30.124$ She has a clinical and research practice

NOTE Confidence: 0.9759952333333333

 $00{:}00{:}30.124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}32.610$ dedicated to breast cancer management.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:32.610 \longrightarrow 00:00:34.682$ Her formal title is chief of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:34.682 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.266$ section of Breast Surgery at New York

00:00:37.266 --> 00:00:39.306 Presbyterian Weill Cornell Medical Center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.187$ and she leads a multidisciplinary breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:00:42.187 --> 00:00:44.686 program at the David H Koch Center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:00:44.690 --> 00:00:47.430 also at New York Presbyterian.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:47.430 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.223$ Doctor Newman is the new and founding

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:00:50.223 --> 00:00:52.834 medical director for the International Center

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:00:52.834 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.963$ for the Study of Breast Cancer Subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:00:55.970 --> 00:00:57.805 And this was recently headquartered

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}00{:}57.805 --> 00{:}01{:}00.184$ at Wild Cornell as part of

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:01:00.184 --> 00:01:01.630 Doctor Newman's recruitment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9759952333333333

 $00{:}01{:}01.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03.978$ she obtained her undergraduate

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:01:03.978 --> 00:01:06.913 education at Harvard University and

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:06.913 \longrightarrow 00:01:09.450$ attended medical school completing

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:09.450 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.743$ and general surgery residency at

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:01:11.743 --> 00:01:14.598 the State University of New York

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:14.598 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.583$ Downtown Medical Center in Brooklyn.

 $00:01:16.590 \longrightarrow 00:01:18.828$ She went on to pursue fellowship

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:18.828 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.031$ training and surgical oncology at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:01:21.031 --> 00:01:22.981 MD Anderson Cancer Center and joined

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:22.981 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.166$ the faculty there as an assistant

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:25.166 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.368$ professor before going back to Michigan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:27.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.855$ Doctor Newman has really been a trailblazer

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:29.855 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.730$ in both her research and clinical care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:32.730 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.052$ This is focused on ethnicity related

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:35.052 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.377$ variation of breast cancer risk and

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:37.377 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.513$ outcome and the evaluation and management

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:01:39.513 --> 00:01:42.029 of high risk patients including

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:42.029 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.345$ applications for neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}01{:}44.350 \to 00{:}01{:}47.096$ She has a very robust research program

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}01{:}47.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}49.083$ and disparities in breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:01:49.083 --> 00:01:51.195 risk and outcomes and has really

 $00:01:51.195 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.688$ been lifted up as a national leader.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00{:}01{:}53.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}56.970$ In this space, I think on a personal note,

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:01:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.194$ she is known as a generous and kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:00.194 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.928$ and gifted mentor and clinician.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:02.930 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.065$ And she shared a story with me

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:05.065 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.840$ earlier today about her willingness

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:06.840 \longrightarrow 00:02:09.723$ to give time in the ICU during COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:09.723 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.858$ to call families to update them

NOTE Confidence: 0.9759952333333333

 $00:02:11.858 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.406$ about their loved ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:13.410 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.198$ And I think this anecdote is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9759952333333333

 $00{:}02{:}15.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}17.090$ a testament to her character.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:17.090 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.298$ So we are very excited to hear from

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

 $00:02:19.298 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.148$ Doctor Newman today about oncologic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9759952333333333

 $00{:}02{:}21.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}23.690$ anthropology, anthropology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:02:23.690 --> 00:02:24.798 Breast cancer disparities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.975995233333333

00:02:24.798 --> 00:02:26.630 triple negative breast cancer

00:02:26.630 --> 00:02:28.940 and African ancestry welcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:02:35.830 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.593$ So it's a huge, huge honor to be talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}02{:}38.593 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42.115$ to all of you at such an incredible

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:02:42.115 --> 00:02:43.462 esteemed academic powerhouses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:02:43.470 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.994$ the Yale Cancer Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:02:44.994 --> 00:02:48.212 And I first have to express my very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:02:48.212 --> 00:02:50.249 deep appreciation to Eric, who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}02{:}50.249 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}52.283$ because you have such an incredible

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}02{:}52.283 \rightarrow 00{:}02{:}54.230$ leader of your Cancer Center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}02{:}54.230 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}02{:}56.379$ somebody who is a force of nature

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:02:56.379 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.229$ in and of himself and has been a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:02:59.229 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.546$ leader in the breast oncology world

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}03{:}01.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04.241$ for so many reasons and across so

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:04.241 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.346$ many different types of research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:06.346 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.998$ But because of his deep dedication

00:03:08.998 --> 00:03:11.649 to HealthEquity and disparity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:11.650 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.449$ simply because of who he is and his nature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}03{:}14.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17.362$ it's been a large part to accredit

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:17.362 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.610$ to him that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:18.610 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.425$ Disparities research is a field

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:20.425 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.830$ of study in and of itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:22.830 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.546$ And so young minds like Rachel and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:03:25.546 --> 00:03:28.429 Elios have been able to do wonderful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}03{:}28.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30.978$ very, very exciting work in this area

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:30.978 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.687$ because it was made possible by Eric.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}03{:}33.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35.580$ I really appreciate how you've stood

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:35.580 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.389$ by all of us overtime and made this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:38.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.126$ this, this field of research possible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:03:41.130 --> 00:03:43.911 So I am over the next few minutes going

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:03:43.911 --> 00:03:46.773 to talk to you about my work and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}03{:}46.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}49.608$ my team calls on cologic anthropology.

 $00:03:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.118$ Which is basically the intersection of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:52.118 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.649$ research trying to understand how African

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:54.649 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.013$ ancestry in and of itself predisposes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:03:57.013 --> 00:03:59.220 individuals to some of the high risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:03:59.220 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.828$ biologically more aggressive cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:01.828 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.740$ such as triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655 00:04:05.740 --> 00:04:06.181 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:06.181 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.386$ the World Health Organization defines

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:08.386 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.879$ social determinants of health as the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:04:10.879 --> 00:04:12.853 conditions in which people are born,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}04{:}12.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}14.128$ grow, live, work, age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}04{:}14.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}16.521$ and a broader set of forces that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}04{:}16.521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18.197$ shape daily life conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}04{:}18.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.972$ And no body would dispute the fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:20.972 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.123$ that poverty is clearly going to be

00:04:24.123 --> 00:04:26.553 a determinant of a poorer health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:26.560 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.595$ since the unequal dispute distribution

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:28.595 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.143$ of wealth in this country leaves

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:04:31.143 --> 00:04:32.478 communities of color,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:32.480 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.080$ such as African Americans and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.360$ the Hispanic Latin next.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:04:35.360 --> 00:04:39.007 Community with the higher rates of poverty,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:04:39.010 --> 00:04:41.224 it's not surprising that to these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:41.224 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.759$ issues will go hand in hand with other

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:04:44.759 --> 00:04:46.743 metrics of socioeconomic disadvantage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:46.750 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.446$ such as being uninsured and being unemployed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:04:50.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.545$ And then these socioeconomic disadvantages

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}04{:}53.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57.350$ have a downstream effect on health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:04:57.350 --> 00:04:58.910 And so communities of color,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00{:}04{:}58.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}01.262$ such as African Americans and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:05:01.262 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.330$ Latinx community also have higher

 $00:05:03.330 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.904$ prevalence of metrics of poorer health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:05:05.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.274$ including being obese and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:05:08.274 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.047$ poorly controlled hypertension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:05:10.050 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.024$ And then most recently we saw how

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

 $00:05:12.024 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.293$ this played out in terms of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8508865655

00:05:14.293 --> 00:05:15.649 consequences of COVID severity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

00:05:18.040 --> 00:05:21.490 However, the very unique history of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00{:}05{:}21.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}24.239$ individuals with African ancestry in

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:24.239 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.103$ this country has led to a very stark

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:27.103 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.952$ and quite large magnitude disparity

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:29.952 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.952$ in health outcomes for African

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:32.952 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.100$ Americans compared to white Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:35.100 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.256$ And of course, this dates back

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:37.256 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.916$ to the era of slavery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

00:05:38.920 --> 00:05:42.700 when African ancestry individuals had

 $00:05:42.700 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.082$ no autonomy over their own healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00{:}05{:}45.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}47.739$ or their healthcare of their families.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.490$ But even though slavery was

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:49.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.623$ abolished more than 150 years ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

00:05:51.623 --> 00:05:53.428 the consequence is the legacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:53.428 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.239$ of it stays with us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:55.240 \longrightarrow 00:05:57.424$ Over several decades that

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:05:57.424 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.154$ followed the abolition of slavery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00{:}06{:}00.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}01.326$ discriminatory banking

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

00:06:01.326 --> 00:06:03.658 practices such as redlining,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00{:}06{:}03.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05.676$ permitted the banking industry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:05.676 \longrightarrow 00:06:08.196$ To essentially leave many generations

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:08.196 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.255$ of African American families trapped in

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:11.255 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.195$ neighborhoods where they could not own

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:14.195 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.890$ their own businesses or their own homes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:16.890 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.610$ And this led to them living over many

 $00:06:19.610 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.534$ generations and communities featuring

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00{:}06{:}21.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.886$ more impoverished school systems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:23.890 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.767$ which ends up leaving them with fewer

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:26.767 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.690$ professional and educational prospects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:28.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.936$ And today we see these communities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

00:06:31.940 --> 00:06:34.070 Continuing to be characterized by

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:34.070 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.200$ other features that affect health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:36.200 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.440$ such as food deserts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92901948

 $00:06:39.440 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.680$ Less available healthcare resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:06:45.330 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.840$ And the mere accumulative experiences

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:06:47.840 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.760$ over a lifetime of discrimination and

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:06:50.760 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.084$ racism is now being studied in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00{:}06{:}53.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55.950$ field of research called Allostatic Rd.

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:06:55.950 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.984$ where we are learning that these

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:06:57.984 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.729$ types of experiences not only

00:06:59.729 --> 00:07:01.667 have an adverse impact on health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:07:01.670 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.968$ but they also seem to impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.849424319583333

 $00:07:03.968 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.500$ on inherent cancer burden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:07.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.974$ When you look at the specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:09.974 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.390$ problem of breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

00:07:11.390 --> 00:07:13.430 it's not surprising that these

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.062$ socioeconomic disadvantages that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

00:07:15.062 --> 00:07:17.333 so highly prevalent in the African

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}07{:}17.333 \to 00{:}07{:}19.538$ American community is going to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

00:07:19.538 --> 00:07:21.904 an impact on the higher breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:21.904 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.335$ mortality rates that we see in African

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}07{:}24.335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}26.561$ Americans played out because of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:26.561 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.149$ advanced stage distribution that

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:28.149 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.973$ we see for breast cancer related to

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:30.973 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.277$ impaired access to a breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

00:07:33.277 --> 00:07:37.040 diagnosis and proper treatment.

 $00:07:37.040 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.946$ So this very close correlation between

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}07{:}40.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}43.550$ socioeconomic disadvantage and African

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:43.639 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.554$ American identity leads many people

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:46.554 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.469$ to question whether racial ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:49.562 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.195$ identity has any biologic relevance at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:53.200 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.310$ or is it purely and simply

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:57.310 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.365$ a sociopolitical construct?

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:07:59.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.681$ Well, the answer of course is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:02.681 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.087$ both defining components of racial

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

00:08:05.087 --> 00:08:07.332 identity are present and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}08{:}07.332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}09.570$ are not mutually exclusive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}08{:}09.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}11.873$ How we self identify as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}08{:}11.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}13.946$ how society labels us will very

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:13.946 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.968$ definitely impact on how we live,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:15.970 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.394$ on where we live,

00:08:17.394 --> 00:08:19.530 and on how we access healthcare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

00:08:19.530 --> 00:08:19.982 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:19.982 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.694$ there are also features of racial

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:22.694 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.103$ identity that are very closely

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:25.103 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.548$ linked to our ancestral heritage

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:27.548 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.700$ and these ancestral genetic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00{:}08{:}29.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}33.445$ Factors will also have an impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.940095541

 $00:08:33.445 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.010$ health metrics and on cancer burden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:38.210 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.818$ And we've actually known for many

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:39.818 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.439$ decades now that when it comes

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:08:41.439 --> 00:08:42.933 to a diagnosis of breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:42.940 \longrightarrow 00:08:45.394$ there are indeed other factors aside

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:45.394 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.487$ from socioeconomics that are impacting

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:47.487 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.189$ on the outcome disparities that we see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:50.190 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.014$ This slide is now nearly 20 years old

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:52.014 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.157$ and comes from a study that I and some

 $00:08:54.157 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.786$ colleagues from the Harvard School of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:55.786 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.538$ Public Health it conducted where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:08:57.538 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.774$ simply pulled together all of the data

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:08:59.774 --> 00:09:01.482 in the published literature looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}01.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}03.594$ at breast cancer survival rates for

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:03.594 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.530$ black women compared to white women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:05.530 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.346$ After accounting for some

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:09:07.346 --> 00:09:08.708 measure of socioeconomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:08.710 \dashrightarrow 00:09:10.636$ and as you see here from the forest plot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:10.640 \dashrightarrow 00:09:12.965$ the African American breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}12.965 \to 00{:}09{:}15.290$ patients have a statistically significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}15.357 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}17.434$ nearly 30% higher mortality hazard.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:17.434 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.974$ And again, this is after accounting

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:20.974 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.897$ for socioeconomic status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:22.900 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.253$ Furthermore,

 $00:09:23.253 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.371$ there are several features of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}25.371 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}27.486$ breast cancer burden in the African

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:27.486 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.146$ American community that can't easily

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:29.146 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.820$ be ascribed to socioeconomics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:30.820 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.514$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:31.514 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.249$ the younger age distribution and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:33.249 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.159$ depending on which study you read,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:35.160 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.092$ up to 40% of African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}37.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}38.751$ breast cancer patients are diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:38.751 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.575$ younger than the age of 50,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:40.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.100$ compared to only about 1/5 of white

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:43.100 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.126$ American breast cancer patients being

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:45.126 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.778$ diagnosed in this premenopausal age range.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:47.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.566$ African Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:48.566 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.317$ as we will be discussing in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:51.317 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.710$ presentation.

 $00:09:51.710 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.398$ We also have a higher risk of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}54.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}55.901$ biologically aggressive patterns of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:09:55.901 --> 00:09:57.930 breast tumors, the high grade tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:09:57.930 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.190$ the hormone receptor negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}09{:}59.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}01.089$ and the triple negative tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:01.090 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.136$ We have a higher population based

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:03.136 --> 00:10:04.997 incidence of a primary inflammatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:04.997 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.132$ breast cancer and there's also

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:07.132 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.283$ the very poorly understood higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:09.283 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.173$ population based incidence of male

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:11.173 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.874$ breast cancer in the African Community,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:13.874 --> 00:10:15.650 African American community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:15.650 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.386$ And so we definitely,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:17.386 --> 00:10:19.556 definitely need to be exploring

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:19.556 --> 00:10:21.610 tumor biology and genetics.

00:10:21.610 --> 00:10:24.795 If we're going to try to comprehensively

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}10{:}24.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.160$ understand disparities and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:26.234 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.728$ breast cancer outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:27.730 --> 00:10:28.104 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:28.104 --> 00:10:30.348 you might assume that looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:30.348 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.090$ clinical trials data would be the near

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:33.090 --> 00:10:35.025 perfect way of disentangling racial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:35.030 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.655$ ethnic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}10{:}35.655 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}10{:}37.530$ identity and socioeconomics

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:37.530 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.405$ from cancer outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:39.410 --> 00:10:41.750 And this was the background,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:41.750 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.495$ the motivation for a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:43.495 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.240$ important study that was conducted

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:45.304 --> 00:10:47.296 several years ago by Kathy Albain

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:47.296 --> 00:10:49.056 and colleagues looking at data

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:49.056 --> 00:10:50.886 from the Southwest Oncology group.

00:10:50.890 --> 00:10:52.358 And in this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:52.358 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.038$ they pulled together the outcomes for a

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:55.038 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.456$ whole variety of adjuvant therapy trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:10:57.460 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.170$ For different types of cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:10:59.170 --> 00:11:01.718 and they wanted to see if equal

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:01.718 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.040$ outcomes were achieved in the context

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:04.040 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.161$ of delivering equal care through

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}11{:}06.161 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08.296$ participation in a clinical trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:08.300 --> 00:11:09.002 Now happily,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:09.002 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.459$ they did show that for the cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:11.459 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.899$ that they looked at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:12.900 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.310$ outcomes did equalize given equal

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}11{:}15.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}17.238$ treatments regardless of racial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:17.240 --> 00:11:18.128 ethnic identity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:18.128 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.236$ except when it came to specific cancers.

00:11:21.240 --> 00:11:23.184 And for the hormonally driven cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:23.184 --> 00:11:25.638 such as breast cancer and prostate cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}11{:}25.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}28.180$ the African-American clinical trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:28.180 --> 00:11:30.720 Participants continue to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:30.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:33.100$ statistically significant worse outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:33.100 --> 00:11:34.906 So many of us that have dedicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:34.906 --> 00:11:36.869 our careers to disparities research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

00:11:36.870 --> 00:11:38.970 we're really excited about Kathy study

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}11{:}38.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}41.272$ because we felt that it was going

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:41.272 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.225$ to usher in a whole new generation

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}11{:}43.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}45.218$ of young people interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00{:}11{:}45.218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47.148$ studying tumor biology and genetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.90780939

 $00:11:47.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.890$ and looking at cancer outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:11:49.890 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.914$ We were there for a little dismayed

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:11:52.914 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.391$ at the factthattime.com reviewed her

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:11:54.391 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.820$ study and called it an example of

 $00:11:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.830$ racial profiling in medical research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}11{:}58.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}01.179$ So this we were happy that her study was

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:01.179 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.202$ getting a lot of publicity, of course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:03.202 --> 00:12:05.554 But this title was a little dismaying,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:05.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.468$ because of course, racial profiling has

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:07.468 --> 00:12:10.129 a lot of very negative connotations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:10.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.246$ and appropriately so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:11.246 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.850$ When it comes to racial profiling and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:13.850 --> 00:12:16.250 for example, the criminal justice system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:16.250 --> 00:12:19.547 but when it comes to cancer biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:19.547 --> 00:12:21.820 and studying cancer outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:21.820 --> 00:12:23.330 racial profiling, if you will,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}12{:}23.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}25.850$ is really just an example of epidemiology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:25.850 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.734$ And we absolutely have an obligation

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:27.734 \longrightarrow 00:12:29.864$ to study all of the characteristics

 $00:12:29.864 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.699$ of our patients when we're trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}12{:}32.699 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}34.825$ understand why some cancer patients have

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:34.825 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.468$ a better or worse outcome than others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:37.468 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.402$ And this does include characterizing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:40.402 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.279$ racial ethnic identity of our patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:43.280 --> 00:12:46.058 An example of how important this

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:12:46.058 --> 00:12:47.910 racial characterization of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:47.986 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.506$ cancer patients is is shown on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:50.506 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.059$ graphic to the left on this slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.184$ where we're looking at the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:55.184 \longrightarrow 00:12:56.600$ basic of epidemiologic statistics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:56.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:58.625$ population based incidence rates of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:12:58.625 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.650$ breast cancer and population based

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:00.709 --> 00:13:02.589 mortality rates from breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}13{:}02.589 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.469$ over the last several decades.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:04.470 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.970$ As documented by the surveillance,

 $00:13:05.970 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.270$ epidemiology and end results program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:08.270 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.790$ And what we see here is that over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:10.790 --> 00:13:12.430 incidence rates of breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:12.430 \longrightarrow 00:13:14.070$ historically have been lower for

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:14.129 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.947$ black women compared to white women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:15.950 \longrightarrow 00:13:18.505$ But the rates typically changed in parallel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:18.510 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.622$ indicating comparable effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:20.622 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.206$ different environmental factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:22.210 --> 00:13:23.378 But for mortality rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:23.378 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.482$ shown by the two curves at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:25.482 --> 00:13:26.630 bottom of this slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:26.630 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.286$ the mortality rates from breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:28.286 --> 00:13:30.166 were equal for black women and white

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:30.166 --> 00:13:31.867 women until we reach the early nine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:31.870 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.570$ eight, 1980s and at that point.

 $00{:}13{:}34.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}35.923$ Mortality curves separate

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:35.923 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.727$ predominantly because of declining

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:37.727 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.859$ death rates and white women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:39.860 --> 00:13:42.856 but largely unchanging rates in black women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.758$ and this is probably because the advent

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:45.758 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.629$ of tamoxifen as our first endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:48.629 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.214$ targeted therapy for breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}13{:}51.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}53.285$ The effects of tamoxifen become

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:53.285 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.273$ apparent by the early 1980s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:13:55.273 \longrightarrow 00:13:57.604$ but as shown by the bar grift

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:57.604 --> 00:13:59.898 to the right of this slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:13:59.900 --> 00:14:02.965 since African American women have

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}14{:}02.965 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}04.804$ significantly lower frequencies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.775$ Of the estrogen receptor positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:06.775 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.289$ cancers and higher rates of estrogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:09.289 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.197$ receptor negative to tumors.

 $00:14:11.200 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.564$ We are just not benefiting from

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}14{:}13.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}15.607$ the advantages of terrific systemic

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:14:15.607 --> 00:14:17.971 therapies such as tamoxifen to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:14:17.971 --> 00:14:20.655 same degree as our sisters from

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:20.655 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.559$ other racial ethnic backgrounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:22.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.422$ So we basically by the early 1980s are

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:25.422 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.528$ seeing the unmasking of differences in

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}14{:}27.528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}29.550$ tumor biology between African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}14{:}29.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}32.076$ and white American breast cancer patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:32.080 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.453$ So now of course we've gone far

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:14:34.453 --> 00:14:35.470 beyond simply characterizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:35.530 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.590$ breast cancer as the dichotomous

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}14{:}37.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}39.238$ hormone receptor positive versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:39.238 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.129$ hormone receptor negative tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:14:41.130 --> 00:14:43.727 And we know that breast cancer isn't

 $00:14:43.727 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.855$ comprised of an entire spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:45.855 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.210$ of intrinsic tumor subtypes with

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:48.210 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.916$ the basal subtype being one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:50.916 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.544$ the more virulent subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:14:52.550 --> 00:14:54.923 The the patients that we see everyday

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

00:14:54.923 --> 00:14:56.847 in clinic are not necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:56.847 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.942$ going to get complete genomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:14:58.942 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.129$ profiling done on their tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00{:}15{:}01.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02.730$ So we use immunohistochemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.86922849375

 $00:15:02.730 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.730$ to look at estrogen receptor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:04.730 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.515$ progesterone receptor and hormone and

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:15:06.515 --> 00:15:09.023 her two new expression as a convenient

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:09.023 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.354$ way to have a surrogate for identifying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:11.360 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.976$ The most aggressive of these tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:13.980 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.940$ And the triple negative breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:15.940 \longrightarrow 00:15:18.362$ cancers do tend to correlate with

 $00:15:18.362 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.322$ identifying a patient that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}15{:}20.322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}22.360$ an intrinsic basal type tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}15{:}22.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}24.220$ It's not a perfect correlation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.660$ but it is pretty close.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:25.660 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.774$ And as shown by the curves on

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:27.774 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.739$ the top right of this slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:29.740 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.954$ women that have the triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}15{:}31.954 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}34.704$ breast cancers at every stage of breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:34.704 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.709$ cancer diagnosis have worse outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}15{:}36.709 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}39.390$ compared to the women who have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:39.390 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.205$ non triple negative breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:41.210 \longrightarrow 00:15:43.306$ And we now know from many studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}15{:}43.306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}45.326$ have been done that African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:45.326 \longrightarrow 00:15:47.486$ women have higher frequencies of triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:47.544 \longrightarrow 00:15:49.234$ negative breast cancers regardless of

 $00:15:49.234 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.371$ the age at which they're diagnosed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:51.371 \longrightarrow 00:15:54.458$ And we have higher frequencies of triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:54.458 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.889$ negative breast cancer regardless of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:56.889 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.830$ stage that the breast cancer is diagnosed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:15:59.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.815$ Now there's been an interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:01.815 --> 00:16:04.268 phenomenon over the past couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:04.268 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.253$ decades where the population based

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:06.253 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.397$ incidence rates of breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}16{:}08.397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}10.333$ have been rising disproportionately

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:10.333 --> 00:16:12.269 in African American women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:12.270 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.042$ And now over the last ten years or so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:15.050 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.354$ breast cancer incidence rates are pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:17.354 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.350$ much equal for black women and white women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:20.350 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.925$ But those rising incidence rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:21.925 --> 00:16:23.890 of breast cancer in black women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:23.890 \longrightarrow 00:16:26.176$ coupled with our higher incidence of

 $00:16:26.176 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.434$ the triple negative breast cancer has

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:28.434 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.098$ resulted in a widening of the mortality gap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:31.100 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.789$ And today we see about 40% higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:33.789 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.363$ breast cancer mortality rates in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:36.363 --> 00:16:38.134 African American community compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:38.134 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.229$ to the White American community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:40.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.750$ And it's impossible to have a discussion

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}16{:}42.750 \longrightarrow 00{:}16{:}44.812$ about triple negative breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:44.812 --> 00:16:46.648 and disparities without making

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:46.648 --> 00:16:48.484 some comment regarding mammography

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:48.548 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.060$ screening recommendations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:50.060 --> 00:16:51.950 And as I'm sure all of you are aware,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}16{:}51.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}54.135$ the United States Preventive Services

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:16:54.135 \longrightarrow 00:16:56.844$ Task Force has been advocating pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:16:56.844 --> 00:16:59.124 aggressively for average risk American

 $00:16:59.124 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.805$ women to delay initiation of screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:01.805 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.163$ mammography until they reach age 50.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.698$ Many of us that are dedicating our careers

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:06.698 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.672$ to studying breast cancer disparities

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:08.672 --> 00:17:10.797 are really concerned about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:10.800 --> 00:17:12.088 Broad recommendation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:12.088 --> 00:17:15.952 because waiting until age 50 for

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:15.952 --> 00:17:18.239 mammography screening can result in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}17{:}18.239 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}20.570$ an even worsening of the delays in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:20.643 --> 00:17:23.559 diagnosing biologically aggressive tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:25.450$ such as triple negative breast cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:25.450 --> 00:17:26.658 in African American women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:26.658 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.219$ who are already at higher risk for getting

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:29.219 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.289$ these aggressive tumors at younger ages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.560$ And so this screening recommendation

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:33.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.376$ will likely worsen the

 $00:17:35.376 \longrightarrow 00:17:37.110$ disparities that already exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:37.110 --> 00:17:37.434 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:37.434 \longrightarrow 00:17:39.054$ the critics of screening mammography

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:39.054 --> 00:17:41.188 are always quick to point out that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:41.188 --> 00:17:43.440 mammography is not going to be the be all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:43.440 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.385$ end all answer to addressing

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:17:45.385 --> 00:17:47.866 disparities because it it is true

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}17{:}47.866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}50.196$ that triple negative breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:50.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.534$ Are more challenging to detect on

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:52.534 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.090$ screening mammography and they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:54.153 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.512$ more likely to present it as the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:17:56.512 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.336$ palpable interval cancers and women

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}17{:}58.336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.221$ that are getting their screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

00:18:00.221 --> 00:18:01.352 mammograms every year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368 00:18:01.360 --> 00:18:01.750 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368 $00:18:01.750 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.480$ we do have very strong data showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00{:}18{:}04.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}07.032$ that early detection of triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:18:07.032 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.440$ breast cancer does still make a difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:18:10.440 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.624$ And an example of those data are shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:18:12.624 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.571$ in the two tables on this slide where

NOTE Confidence: 0.859376928947368

 $00:18:15.571 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.127$ investigators from Memorial Sloan

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:18:17.190 --> 00:18:19.505 Kettering and from the National

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:18:19.505 --> 00:18:20.894 Comprehensive Cancer Network.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:20.900 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.845$ Have both demonstrated that triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:22.845 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.790$ negative breast cancer when it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}18{:}24.851 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}27.084$ diagnosed at a small size no larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:27.084 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.569$ than one centimeter in size.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:28.570 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.166$ And with nodes negative and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}18{:}30.166 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}32.683$ are by and large going to be screen

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:32.683 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.428$ detected triple negative breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:34.430 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.926$ These tumors have very good outcomes

 $00:18:36.926 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.175$ regardless of whether the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:39.175 \longrightarrow 00:18:41.745$ receive adjuvant chemotherapy or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:18:41.750 --> 00:18:43.436 Now those two studies that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:43.436 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.950$ showed on the previous slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:44.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.270$ we're looking at early detection

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:18:46.270 --> 00:18:47.590 of triple negative breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:47.590 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.302$ but they weren't necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:18:49.302 --> 00:18:50.586 looking at mammography,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:50.590 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.189$ screen detected triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:52.189 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.788$ negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}18{:}53.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}56.678$ And so to address the question of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:18:56.678 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.351$ effective screening mammography is

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}18{:}58.351 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}19{:}00.566$ and outcomes in improving outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:00.566 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.849$ from triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:02.850 \longrightarrow 00:19:04.998$ Our group pulled together the data

00:19:04.998 --> 00:19:06.873 on triple negative breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:06.873 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.783$ patients from the Metropolitan Detroit

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:08.783 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.157$ area and the Henry Ford Healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:11.157 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.908$ system and the while Cornell New York

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:13.908 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.816$ Presbyterian Hospital network triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:19:15.816 --> 00:19:17.824 negative breast cancer patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:17.830 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.948$ And we looked specifically at outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:19:19.948 --> 00:19:22.378 from for these patients if with triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:22.378 \longrightarrow 00:19:24.292$ negative tumors based upon whether it

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:24.292 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.549$ was screened detected disease or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:26.550 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.335$ And we looked at a whole bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:19:28.335 --> 00:19:29.781 of different factors that might

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:19:29.781 --> 00:19:31.336 also impact on outcomes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:31.336 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.670$ triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:32.670 \longrightarrow 00:19:34.770$ For both the white and the African

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:19:34.770 --> 00:19:36.439 American triple negative breast cancer,

 $00:19:36.440 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.850$ having a mammography screen detected

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}19{:}38.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}41.260$ tumor was the strongest predictor

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:41.329 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.063$ of a patient that was going

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:43.063 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.840$ to have a good outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:44.840 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.178$ So we do indeed have data that

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:19:47.178 --> 00:19:48.639 mammography screening is effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:48.639 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.009$ at early detection of triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}19{:}51.009 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53.663$ breast cancer and it does yield some

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:53.663 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.775$ benefits in terms of improving outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}19{:}55.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}58.408$ and that benefit was actually strongest

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:19:58.408 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.640$ for the African American women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}00.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}02.620$ We've also been looking at whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}02.620 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}20{:}05.172$ or not there might be some precursor

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}05.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07.117$ lesions in benign breast tissue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:07.120 --> 00:20:09.244 identifying women that are at higher

00:20:09.244 --> 00:20:11.487 risk for getting a triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:11.487 --> 00:20:14.147 breast cancer and whether or not the

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:14.147 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.159$ benign breast patients who require

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:16.159 --> 00:20:18.511 biopsies will still have a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:18.520 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.728$ rate of triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:20.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.240$ Correlating with racial ethnic identity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:23.240 --> 00:20:24.716 As all of you are aware,

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:24.720 --> 00:20:26.813 the number of benign breast pie oopsies

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:26.813 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.854$ that a patient has does correlate with

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:28.854 \longrightarrow 00:20:31.320$ a higher risk of a future breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}31.320 \rightarrow 00{:}20{:}32.900$ Probably because it's identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:32.900 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.480$ hyperproliferative changes in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.662$ breast and This is why number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:36.662 --> 00:20:38.002 biopsies and so integrated into

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:38.057 --> 00:20:39.575 many of our risk prediction tools

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:39.575 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.008$ such as the Gale model.

00:20:41.008 --> 00:20:43.516 But by and large multiple biopsies

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:43.516 \longrightarrow 00:20:46.868$ is a predictor of having an estrogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}46.868 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}20{:}48.884$ receptor positive breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:48.890 --> 00:20:51.368 So we utilize the Henry Ford Health

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}51.368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}53.398$ system benign breast disease cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:20:53.398 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.092$ to look at whether fibrocystic breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:20:56.092 --> 00:20:58.371 biopsies predicted for higher rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}20{:}58.371 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}00.556$ of triple negative versus hormone

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:21:00.556 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.430$ receptor positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}21{:}01.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}03.494$ Disease in our black compared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:21:03.494 --> 00:21:05.834 white patients and we had a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:21:05.834 \longrightarrow 00:21:07.927$ large cohort of more than 6000 women

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}21{:}07.998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}10.254$ who had had benign breast biopsies

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00{:}21{:}10.254 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}12.512$ with robust follow-up of more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:21:12.512 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.144$ 10 years and in as evidence that

 $00:21:15.144 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.801$ these women were receiving equitable

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:21:17.801 --> 00:21:19.997 treatment over the years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

00:21:20.000 --> 00:21:22.364 We actually saw comparable rates of

NOTE Confidence: 0.895282159285714

 $00:21:22.364 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.940$ subsequent subsequent breast cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:24.004 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.869$ in these women with fibrocystic

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:25.869 \longrightarrow 00:21:27.361$ breast changes regardless of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:27.361 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.159$ whether they were black or white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:29.160 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.890$ And we saw comparable stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:30.890 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.620$ distribution for the cancers that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:32.678 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.378$ did develop in these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}21{:}34.380 \to 00{:}21{:}36.948$ However, as shown by this curve by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}21{:}36.948 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}39.380$ curve graphic at the bottom of this slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}21{:}39.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41.080$ the African American women with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:41.080 \longrightarrow 00:21:43.110$ benign breast biopsies had about a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:21:43.110 --> 00:21:44.766 four fold higher risk of getting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}21{:}44.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}46.394$ a triple negative breast cancer

 $00:21:46.394 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.626$ compared to the white American breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:21:48.626 --> 00:21:50.052 fibrocystic change at patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:50.052 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.416$ And so there does,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:51.420 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.236$ at least from our experience seem to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:54.236 \longrightarrow 00:21:55.841$ something inherently different about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:55.841 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.343$ the mammary tissue of African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:21:58.343 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.754$ women increasing the susceptibility for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:00.754 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.770$ these biologically aggressive tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}02.770 \longrightarrow 00{:}22{:}04.554$ Another interesting question to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:04.554 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.230$ ask is whether or not outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:07.307 --> 00:22:09.907 disparities will persist after you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:09.907 --> 00:22:11.987 stratify for tumor phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}11.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}13.579$ And I'm not going to be labor the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:13.579 --> 00:22:15.130 data on this very busy slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:15.130 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.230$ but suffice it to say there are

 $00:22:17.230 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.928$ actually a number of studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:18.928 --> 00:22:20.396 suggesting that when you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:20.400 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.566$ Adjust for stage and treatment that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:22.566 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.502$ the outcomes from triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:24.502 --> 00:22:26.210 breast cancer patients might

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:26.210 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.345$ actually be fairly comparable for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:28.413 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.098$ black women and white women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:30.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.482$ However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}30.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}33.156$ there are numerous studies showing that for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:33.156 --> 00:22:35.248 hormone receptor positive breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}35.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36.417$ the disparities persist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704 00:22:36.417 --> 00:22:36.806 Now, NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:36.806 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.140$ whether or not these disparities and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}39.208 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}22{:}41.303$ outcome in hormone receptor positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:41.303 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.398$ disease are related to differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}43.461 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}45.759$ in tumor biology or difference in

00:22:45.759 --> 00:22:47.291 response to endocrine treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}22{:}47.300 \longrightarrow 00{:}22{:}49.140$ or just variation in compliance

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:49.140 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.510$ with the several years that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:51.510 --> 00:22:53.358 recommend for endocrine therapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:53.360 \longrightarrow 00:22:55.705$ these are all questions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:22:55.705 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.670$ are continue to be under study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:22:58.670 --> 00:23:01.043 But now we are starting to generate

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:01.043 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.713$ some answers to those questions because

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:03.713 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.343$ a brilliant researchers who've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}23{:}06.343 \longrightarrow 00{:}23{:}08.398$ conducting terrific studies about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}23{:}08.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}10.728$ gene expression profiling in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:10.728 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.579$ with hormone receptor positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:23:12.579 --> 00:23:15.273 her two negative breast cancers are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:23:15.273 --> 00:23:18.580 now starting to look at their data

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:18.580 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.406$ based upon stratification for race ethnicity.

 $00:23:21.410 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.730$ The TELERX investigators have recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:23.730 \longrightarrow 00:23:26.050$ shown that for women undergoing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}23{:}26.117 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}28.502$ Oncotype 21 gene recurrence score

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:28.502 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.887$ testing for hormone receptor positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:30.890 \longrightarrow 00:23:33.128$ her two negative and no negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:33.128 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.168$ breast cancers that in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:23:35.168 --> 00:23:37.068 with the intermediate scores,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:23:37.070 --> 00:23:39.680 the African American women have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:39.680 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.290$ notably higher rates of recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:23:42.370 --> 00:23:44.855 and mortality even after adjusting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:44.855 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.078$ for these intermediate range scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:49.080 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.618$ And then very recently the investigators

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:51.618 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.795$ for the responder trial reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:53.795 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.291$ and the San Antonio Breast Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:56.291 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.404$ Symposium that among women looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:23:58.404 \longrightarrow 00:24:00.780$ at these 21 gene recurrence scores

 $00:24:00.780 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.095$ and whether or not they predict for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:24:03.095 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.610$ benefit from chemotherapy in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:24:04.666 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.934$ setting of women with no positive disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:24:06.940 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.875$ They similarly showed that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}24{:}08.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}10.810$ outcomes for the African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:24:10.873 --> 00:24:12.469 patients were significantly worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:24:12.469 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.464$ compared to the outcomes for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00:24:14.464 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.380$ the White American patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

00:24:16.380 --> 00:24:18.960 And again this is after stratifying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9073601704

 $00{:}24{:}18.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.540$ For the 21 gene expression score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:24.630 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.530$ Many investigators have been looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00{:}24{:}26.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}29.077$ at data from the Cancer Genome Atlas

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:29.077 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.405$ to try to get take a deeper dive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:24:31.410 --> 00:24:33.595 basically into looking at tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:24:33.595 --> 00:24:35.780 biology between black women and

 $00:24:35.856 \longrightarrow 00:24:38.006$ white women with breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:24:38.010 --> 00:24:40.747 And I'm summarizing just a few of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:40.747 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.293$ the studies that have been published

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:43.293 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.303$ utilizing TCG a data on this table.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:46.310 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.473$ But all of these studies are basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:48.473 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.279$ looking at the same group of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:24:50.280 --> 00:24:52.572 you know, more than 700 white

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:52.572 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.100$ American breast cancer patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:54.100 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.670$ And about 170 African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:24:56.670 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.240$ patients that have contributed tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00{:}24{:}59.322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01.778$ tissue and clinical information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00{:}25{:}01.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}04.144$ So it's not surprising that all

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:04.144 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.720$ of these investigators have

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:05.796 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.668$ identified similar patterns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:25:07.670 --> 00:25:09.710 Pam 50 subtyping definitively showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:09.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.750$ that the African American women

00:25:11.811 --> 00:25:14.086 not only have higher frequencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:14.086 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.906$ of the triple negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:25:15.906 --> 00:25:17.489 immunohistochemically defined phenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:17.490 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.710$ but we also have higher rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:19.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.830$ of the intrinsic basal subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:21.830 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.960$ The African American patients are

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.002$ more likely to have TP 53 mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:25:27.002 --> 00:25:28.848 and fewer Pi K3CA mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

00:25:28.848 --> 00:25:30.864 which goes along with the higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:30.864 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.744$ frequency of triple negative and

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:32.744 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.594$ lower frequency of hormone receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.902261351

 $00:25:34.594 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.399$ positive tumors in these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}25{:}39.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}41.446$ And the phenomenon of seeing higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:25:41.446 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.491$ rates of these biologically aggressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:25:43.491 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.761$ estrogen receptor negative and triple

00:25:45.761 --> 00:25:48.046 negative breast cancers in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:25:48.046 --> 00:25:50.071 with African ancestry is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:25:50.071 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.602$ not something that's unique to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:25:52.602 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.857$ United States and other countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:25:54.860 --> 00:25:56.339 The UK, Switzerland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:25:56.339 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.311$ Brazil investigators from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}25{:}58.311 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}00.865$ countries have also published data

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:00.865 --> 00:26:03.365 showing that their African ancestry

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}26{:}03.365 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}26{:}06.196$ breast cancer patients are more likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:06.196 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.710$ to have estrogen receptor negative and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}26{:}08.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.594$ Triple negative breast cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:10.594 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.949$ compared to their non African

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:12.949 \longrightarrow 00:26:15.059$ ancestry breast cancer patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:15.060 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.860$ So This is why our group has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:16.860 --> 00:26:18.301 very excited about looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:18.301 \longrightarrow 00:26:19.866$ international data and in particular

 $00:26:19.866 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.581$ looking at the breast cancer burden

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:21.581 --> 00:26:23.418 of women on the continent of Africa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:23.418 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.920$ to try to tease out the answer to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:25.988 --> 00:26:27.956 question of whether or not African

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:27.956 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.593$ ancestry in and of itself is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:30.593 \longrightarrow 00:26:32.698$ with some heritable marker predisposing

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:32.698 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.520$ to risk for triple negative breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:35.520 --> 00:26:38.013 And this I think opens the door not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:38.013 \longrightarrow 00:26:40.939$ to exciting ways to understand disparities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:40.940 \longrightarrow 00:26:43.046$ but also a very novel ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:43.046 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.810$ of trying to understand the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:44.810 --> 00:26:47.255 Pathogenesis for triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}26{:}47.255 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}49.700$ negative breast tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:49.700 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.150$ So this is just a snapshot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:26:52.150 --> 00:26:55.000 some of our most basic findings.

00:26:55.000 --> 00:26:57.298 Looking at the frequency of triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}26{:}57.298 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}26{:}59.820$ negative breast cancer in women from

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:26:59.820 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.660$ Ghana representing Western sub-Saharan

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:01.660 --> 00:27:04.269 Africa compared to the triple net,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:04.270 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.788$ the frequency of triple negative breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}27{:}05.788 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}27{:}07.340$ cancers in women from Addis Ababa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:07.340 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.904$ Ethiopia, representing East Africa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:08.904 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.250$ And we see quite high frequencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}27{:}11.312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}12.982$ of triple negative breast cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:12.982 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.652$ in the economy and women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:14.660 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.935$ about half of them are triple negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:16.940 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.415$ but the frequency of triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:18.415 --> 00:27:19.300 negative breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:19.300 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.480$ And the Ethiopian women is

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:21.480 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.538$ very low at about 15\%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:23.538 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.002$ similar to what we see in White American

 $00:27:26.002 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.709$ and European patients with breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}27{:}28.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}30.678$ The frequency of triple negative breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:30.678 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.314$ tumors is intermediate for African

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:32.314 --> 00:27:33.679 American women between the rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}27{:}33.679 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}35.816$ that we see in Guinea and women and

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:35.816 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.350$ what we see in white American women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:39.350 --> 00:27:42.275 Now the American Cancer Society

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:42.275 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.445$ brilliant investigator,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:43.450 --> 00:27:46.042 Ahmedin Jamal has to publish data

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:46.042 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.771$ that are comparable to what we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:48.771 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.543$ seeing in our international data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}27{:}51.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}53.295$ Doctor Jamal has published data

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:53.295 --> 00:27:55.040 looking at the frequency of

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:27:55.108 --> 00:27:56.648 ER negative breast tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:27:56.650 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.634$ which of course are a subset of the

 $00:27:58.634 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.518$ triple negative breast tumors in white

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:00.518 --> 00:28:01.854 American breast cancer patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:01.860 --> 00:28:03.292 African American breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:03.292 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.836$ patients and women born in West Africa

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}28{:}05.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}07.511$ but whose cancers were diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:07.511 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.719$ and treated in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:09.720 --> 00:28:11.533 And women born in East Africa but

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:11.533 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.932$ whose breast cancers were diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:12.932 \longrightarrow 00:28:14.654$ and treated in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:14.660 --> 00:28:17.456 And similar to our international data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:17.460 \longrightarrow 00:28:19.917$ amadeen found that we see the highest

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:19.917 --> 00:28:21.779 frequencies of the ER negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:21.779 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.999$ tumors in the African American and

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:23.999 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.363$ West African born patients and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:26.363 --> 00:28:28.308 lowest frequencies of ER negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:28.308 --> 00:28:31.110 tumors in the White American and

00:28:31.110 --> 00:28:33.038 East African born patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:33.040 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.469$ So this is where we've coined the

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:35.469 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.958$ nomenclature of oncologic anthropology

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:36.958 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.274$ to try to explain these patterns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:39.280 --> 00:28:40.423 And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:40.423 \longrightarrow 00:28:42.709$ as we all recall from grade

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:42.709 \longrightarrow 00:28:44.340$ school social studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

00:28:44.340 --> 00:28:46.344 the transatlantic slave trade

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}28{:}46.344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}48.849$ brought the ancestors of contemporary

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00{:}28{:}48.849 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}50.602$ western sub-saharan Africans across

NOTE Confidence: 0.899033555666667

 $00:28:50.602 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.360$ the ocean to serve as slaves in

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:28:53.431 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.683$ the colonies. And so today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}28{:}55.683 \to 00{:}28{:}57.527$ as contemporary African Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}28{:}57.530 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}29{:}00.338$ we have quite a bit of shared genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:00.338 --> 00:29:02.908 ancestry with the contemporary Guineans.

 $00:29:02.910 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.002$ Representing Western sub-saharan Africans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:05.002 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.230$ But the slave trade from East Africa largely

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:09.230 \longrightarrow 00:29:11.770$ brought the ancestors of contemporary

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:11.770 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.262$ East Africans and Ethiopians further

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:14.262 \longrightarrow 00:29:17.370$ eastward to the Mideast and to Asia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:17.370 \longrightarrow 00:29:18.580$ And so as African Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:18.580 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.722$ we don't have quite so much

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:20.722 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.150$ shared ancestry with Ethiopia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:22.150 --> 00:29:23.426 excuse me, with Ethiopians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:23.426 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.777$ And so if there is something of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}29{:}25.777 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}27.632$ a heritable nature related to

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:27.632 --> 00:29:29.116 African ancestry predisposing to

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:29.176 --> 00:29:30.888 triple negative breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:30.890 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.910$ it's likely something specifically related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:32.910 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.190$ Related to Western sub-saharan

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:36.190 --> 00:29:38.650 African genetic ancestry.

 $00:29:38.650 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.765$ So one of our terrific and brilliant

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}29{:}41.765 \to 00{:}29{:}44.489$ research partners for my research team,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:44.490 --> 00:29:46.576 the International Center for the Study of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:46.576 --> 00:29:48.547 Breast Cancer Subtypes is Doctor John Carton,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:48.550 --> 00:29:50.730 who runs the Translational Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:50.730 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.910$ Research program out at USC.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

00:29:52.910 --> 00:29:55.150 And we've been really trying to work

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:29:55.150 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.002$ quite hard to get more of our colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}29{:}58.002 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00.518$ in the oncology research world to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:30:00.518 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.709$ at the genetics of race and ethnicity

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:30:02.709 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.446$ and to quantify germline ancestral

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00:30:05.446 \longrightarrow 00:30:08.466$ genetics with the cancer outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}30{:}08.470 --> 00{:}30{:}10.390$ As a way of trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.902930456818182

 $00{:}30{:}10.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}11.350$ understand disparities better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:13.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.220$ So about five years ago,

 $00:30:16.220 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.831$ I was absolutely thrilled to be able

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:30:18.831 --> 00:30:21.340 to recruit one of John's mentees,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:30:21.340 --> 00:30:23.678 Melissa Davis, who is a card carrying

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:23.678 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.319$ PhD geneticist to serve as the scientific

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:26.319 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.289$ director for our International Center

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:28.289 \dashrightarrow 00:30:30.937$ for the Study of Breast Cancer subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:30.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:33.936$ And our international team for the last

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:30:33.936 --> 00:30:37.169 nearly 20 years now has been building

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}30{:}37.169 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}39.971$ up this biobank biorepository of tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:40.051 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.399$ specimens for somatic tumor tissue studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:43.400 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.060$ And saliva specimens as well as blood

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:46.060 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.149$ specimens suitable for germline genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:48.149 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.807$ studies from different parts of Africa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}30{:}50.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52.844$ And so it was really exciting

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:30:52.844 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.613$ to get Melissa to serve as our

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}30{:}55.613 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}57.389$ basic science research leader.

 $00:30:57.390 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.542$ So that she could use her tools to

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:30:59.542 --> 00:31:01.778 tease out some of these differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:01.778 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.414$ and understanding the genetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:03.414 \longrightarrow 00:31:04.850$ of African ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:04.850 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.770$ And for most of Melissa's career,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:06.770 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.026$ she's been a world leading expert

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:09.026 --> 00:31:10.961 in studying a particular gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}10.961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}13.502$ called the Duffy gene or the Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}13.502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}15.269$ antigen receptor for chemokines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:15.270 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.328$ And there's a particular variant of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}17.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}20.098$ the Duffy gene that is seen almost

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:20.098 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.313$ exclusively in individuals that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}22.313 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}24.330$ Western sub-saharan African ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:24.330 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.695$ It's widely called the Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:26.695 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.114$ now Gene variant.

 $00:31:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.210$ And therefore this Duffy null variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}31.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}33.986$ is an ancestry informative marker

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:33.986 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.498$ informative of African ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:36.500 --> 00:31:36.911 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:36.911 --> 00:31:38.555 Melissa's been studying Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:38.555 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.210$ null for most of her career.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:41.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:43.208$ Other investigators have kind of happened

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:43.208 --> 00:31:45.953 a Long Duffy Knoll in the context of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}45.953 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47.648$ other studies looking at disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:47.650 --> 00:31:49.180 And this slide is summarizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}49.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}51.428$ the data from a study that came

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:51.428 --> 00:31:53.058 out of the Amber Consortium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:31:54.536$ a collaborative group of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}31{:}54.536 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}31{:}56.012$ investigators looking at breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:31:56.012 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.588$ cancer disparities related to race.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:31:57.590 --> 00:31:59.630 And in this particular publication,

 $00:31:59.630 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.675$ the Amber Consortium investigators were

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}32{:}01.675 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}32{:}04.230$ looking at levels of different circulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:04.230 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.888$ chemokines that might be associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:06.890 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.515$ Cancer and in particular breast cancer risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}32{:}09.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11.592$ And they wanted to see if the levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:11.592 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.714$ of these different keeps US cytokines

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:32:13.714 --> 00:32:15.644 were different between black women

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:15.644 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.955$ and white women who had not yet

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:17.955 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.760$ been diagnosed with breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:19.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.120$ And they did identify a handful

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.112$ of cytokines that differed between

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:25.112 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.260$ the black women and white women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:27.260 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.360$ And then when they did genetic analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:29.360 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.875$ they found that these differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:32:31.875 --> 00:32:34.390 were explained by the presence

 $00:32:34.475 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.600$ of the Duffy null genotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}32{:}36.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}38.832$ We've also learned overtime that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}32{:}38.832 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}41.267$ Duffy Null variant is the variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:41.267 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.452$ that's responsible for a phenomenon

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:32:43.452 --> 00:32:45.600 called benign ethnic neutropenia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.352$ which is the fact that African

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:47.352 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.262$ Americans tend to have a lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:49.262 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.957$ circulating white blood cell count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:50.960 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.246$ Which doesn't have any biologic significance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:53.250 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.254$ but it is a numeric pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:32:55.254 --> 00:32:56.590 that seemed pretty consistently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}32{:}56.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}58.015$ And some investigators are now

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:32:58.015 --> 00:32:59.864 looking at whether or not Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:32:59.864 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.072$ null may be implicated in transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:02.072 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.808$ rejection disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:02.810 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.320$ And we are obviously looking

 $00:33:04.320 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.830$ at it in breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:05.830 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.674$ others are looking at it in

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:33:08.674 --> 00:33:10.096 prostate cancer disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:10.100 \longrightarrow 00:33:10.562$ Unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:10.562 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.024$ however,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:11.024 \longrightarrow 00:33:14.258$ when you look at the literature globally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:14.260 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.942$ there is a huge gap in terms of what

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

00:33:16.942 --> 00:33:19.736 we know about how African ancestral

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}33{:}19.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22.713$ genetics impact on cancer risk because

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:22.713 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.087$ so few of the genomic studies have

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:26.087 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.046$ included significant numbers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00:33:28.046 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.018$ individuals with African ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91807713

 $00{:}33{:}30.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}33.436$ And as shown by this study from cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:33:33.440 --> 00:33:36.075 only about 2% of individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:33:36.075 \longrightarrow 00:33:38.710$ contributing to genome wide association

00:33:38.793 --> 00:33:41.428 studies have had African ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}33{:}41.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}43.915$ So we were really excited to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:33:43.915 --> 00:33:46.144 Melissa work her magic with her

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:33:46.144 \longrightarrow 00:33:48.316$ genetics skills to apply them to

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:33:48.316 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.750$ our international biorepository,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:33:50.750 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.515$ which again has been amassing

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:33:53.515 --> 00:33:56.280 specimens for nearly 20 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}33{:}56.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}58.758$ So I'm Melissa did a really cool

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:33:58.758 --> 00:34:01.000 study where she looked at Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:01.000 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.576$ Null compared to a series of other

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}34{:}03.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}05.909$ genetic variants that have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:34:05.909 --> 00:34:08.570 potentially linked to risk of breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.620$ cancer and hormone receptor negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:10.620 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.484$ triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:34:12.484 --> 00:34:14.814 And in working with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:14.814 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.969$ other brilliant researcher,

 $00:34:16.970 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.194$ our geneticist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:18.194 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.642$ biostatistician yallah chin from

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:34:20.642 --> 00:34:23.790 the Henry Ford Health system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:23.790 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.142$ Yalley was able to show that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:34:26.142 --> 00:34:28.287 presence of this Duffy Null variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:28.287 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.779$ was by far and away the strongest

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:30.855 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.150$ determinant of having a triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:34:33.150 --> 00:34:35.445 negative breast cancer versus having

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}34{:}35.450 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}34{:}39.290$ a non triple negative breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:34:41.814$ The phenomenal anthropologist Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:34:41.814 --> 00:34:46.370 Sarah Tishkoff has shown us very nicely,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:46.370 \longrightarrow 00:34:48.810$ as demonstrated by this graphic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}34{:}48.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51.594$ that many of the ancestry informative

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:51.594 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.156$ markers that we look at aren't markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:34:55.156 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.408$ variants that developed randomly over time.

 $00:34:58.410 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.232$ Many of them actually represent evolutionary

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}35{:}02.232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}05.397$ selection pressure over our ancestors

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:05.397 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.037$ to to allow our ancestors to survive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

00:35:09.040 --> 00:35:11.532 Different threats to longevity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:11.532 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.024$ threats to life expectancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:14.030 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.006$ related to infectious diseases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:16.006 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.488$ related to climate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:17.490 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.578$ related to food sources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:19.578 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.144$ And then today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:21.150 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.896$ when we look at the descendants

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:22.896 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.769$ of those populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}35{:}23.770 \longrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25.826$ you can you can continue to see many

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:25.826 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.060$ of these ancestry informative markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00{:}35{:}28.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}29.448$ regardless of where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912492391333333

 $00:35:29.448 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.183$ descendants reside over the globe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:35:33.910 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.470$ The Duffy Null variant is just one more

 $00:35:36.470 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.257$ example of such a variant that was acquired

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}35{:}39.257 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}41.754$ over the millennia as a consequence

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:35:41.754 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.846$ of evolutionary selection pressure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:35:43.850 --> 00:35:46.300 The Duffy Novariant is something

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:35:46.300 \longrightarrow 00:35:49.365$ that became apparent that was adopted

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:35:49.365 \longrightarrow 00:35:51.425$ in Western sub-Saharan Africa

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:35:51.425 --> 00:35:54.168 many many thousands of years ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:35:54.170 --> 00:35:56.498 linked to the need to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:35:56.498 --> 00:35:58.050 some resistance to malaria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}35{:}58.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}59.930$ and malaria became endemic in

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:35:59.930 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.434$ Western sub-Saharan Africa because

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:01.434 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.450$ of the tropical nature of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:03.450 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.984$ With the geography there with the many

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:05.984 \longrightarrow 00:36:08.460$ watery areas and low altitude areas

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:08.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.094$ supporting the lifecycle of the mosquito,

 $00:36:11.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.824$ which of course is the host

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:13.824 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.640$ for the malaria parasites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:15.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.573$ And there are other examples of variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:18.573 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.206$ that were acquired to confer some

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:21.206 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.804$ resistance to malaria that thalassemia is

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:23.804 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.017$ seen in European Mediterranean populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615 00:36:27.020 --> 00:36:28.060 Sickle cell, NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:28.060 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.140$ the Duffy Null variant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:36:30.140 --> 00:36:33.436 doesn't have quite as many of the adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:33.436 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.780$ health consequences as those variants do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}36{:}35.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}39.203$ and therefore the Duffy null variant is

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:39.203 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.974$ seen in nearly 100% of the descendants

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}36{:}42.974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}45.278$ of Western sub-saharan Africans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:36:45.280 --> 00:36:47.680 Something occurred about 5-6 thousand

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:36:47.680 --> 00:36:51.070 years ago called the Band 2 expansion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:51.070 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.130$ where Western sub-saharan Africans

 $00:36:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.190$ migrated across the continent

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:55.190 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.804$ to populate the various areas of

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}36{:}57.804 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}59.689$ East Africa and South Africa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:36:59.690 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.007$ And while many of those areas have

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:02.007 --> 00:37:04.028 more mountainous areas that do not

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:04.028 --> 00:37:05.628 support the mosquito life cycle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:05.630 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.024$ so they have a different history of

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:08.024 \dashrightarrow 00:37:10.592$ endemic malaria in those parts of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:10.592 \dashrightarrow 00:37:12.800$ continent but with the Bantu expansion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:12.800 --> 00:37:14.912 The Duffy Null variant did track

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:14.912 --> 00:37:17.081 across the continent of Africa and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:17.081 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.157$ you see varying degrees of admixture

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}37{:}19.157 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}21.674$ and the presence of this stuffy null

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:21.674 \longrightarrow 00:37:23.957$ variant in those reasons of Africa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:23.957 --> 00:37:27.576 Just as with the transatlantic slave trade,

 $00:37:27.580 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.338$ the Duffy Null variant came across

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:29.338 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.539$ to the Americas and with the genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:31.539 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.814$ admixture that we see in African Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:33.820 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.452$ this results in about 2/3 to 3/4 of

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:36.452 --> 00:37:38.198 African Americans expressing that Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:38.198 --> 00:37:41.010 Null variant and if you overlay a map

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:41.010 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.140$ of the frequency of triple negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:43.140 --> 00:37:44.765 Breast cancer in different parts

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:44.765 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.345$ of the world with a map of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:47.345 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.830$ the the Duffy Null variant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:48.830 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.248$ there's actually a pretty close correlation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:51.250 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.858$ so we've been exploring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:52.858 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.270$ Ways to understand how to connect

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:37:55.346 --> 00:37:57.775 the dots between the stuff we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:37:57.775 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.515$ variant and the risk of having a

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:00.515 \longrightarrow 00:38:02.143$ triple negative breast cancer.

 $00:38:02.150 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.238$ The reason why that Duffy Null

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}38{:}04.238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}05.981$ variant confers some resistance to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:05.981 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.703$ malaria is because if you possess

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:07.703 \longrightarrow 00:38:09.070$ the Duffy null variant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:09.070 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.660$ you do not express the Duffy

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:10.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:12.389$ protein on your red blood cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:38:12.390 --> 00:38:14.710 And the Duffy protein on the red blood

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.363$ cell is kind of the entry portal for

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38{:}17.363 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}19.716$ the malaria parasites to get into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:19.716 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.921$ red blood cell and cause the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}38{:}21.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}24.066$ So now what we are learning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:24.070 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.314$ And the work that's ongoing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}38{:}26.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}29.209$ Melissa let slip is seeking to better

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:29.209 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.849$ understand how this Duffy protein and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:31.849 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.937$ lack of the Duffy protein on the red

00:38:34.937 --> 00:38:37.219 blood cell impacts on circulating chemokines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:38:37.219 --> 00:38:39.184 which would explain the findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:39.184 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.604$ of the Amber Consortium that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:41.604 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.780$ showed you previously.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:42.780 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.838$ And how this may have a downstream

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00{:}38{:}44.838 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}47.231$ in fact when the mammary tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

00:38:47.231 --> 00:38:48.677 microenvironment and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874422510384615

 $00:38:48.677 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.605$ inflammatory the immune landscape

NOTE Confidence: 0.8240383148

 $00{:}38{:}50.669 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}52.359$ of the Mary mammary tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8240383148

 $00:38:52.360 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.144$ Which can then have an impact on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8240383148

 $00{:}38{:}54.144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}55.987$ types of breast tumors that develop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:38:58.870 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.586$ Melissa has also been doing work with

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:01.586 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.098$ the Cancer Genome Atlas looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:04.098 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.218$ tumor tissue expression presence of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

00:39:06.218 --> 00:39:09.338 the the Duffy protein and you see as

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:09.338 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.464$ you would predict lower levels of

00:39:11.464 --> 00:39:13.753 Duffy protein in the breast tumors of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00{:}39{:}13.753 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}15.686$ African American compared to white

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:15.686 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.002$ women contributing specimens to TCG A.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:18.010 \longrightarrow 00:39:21.074$ And the lower presence of a Duffy tends

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00{:}39{:}21.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}23.594$ to correlate with worse prognosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:23.594 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.826$ across the different phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:25.830 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.622$ So this phenotype agnostic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:27.622 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.856$ If you will affect on tumor tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:30.856 \dashrightarrow 00:39:33.640$ tumor outcome may be what's explaining

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:33.640 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.152$ what we see in looking at the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00:39:37.152 \dashrightarrow 00:39:39.503$ the impact of race ethnicity on

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00{:}39{:}39.503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}41.694$ outcomes in women with that have ER

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00{:}39{:}41.694 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}43.659$ positive disease as we saw from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871899942

 $00{:}39{:}43.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}45.340$ tailor X and the responder trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:39:47.890 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.870$ Many people are doing very,

 $00:39:49.870 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.558$ very exciting work seeking to subtype

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}39{:}52.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}54.990$ the triple negative breast cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:39:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.518$ and a lot of this work was pioneered

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:39:57.518 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.010$ by the Vanderbilt Group identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}00.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}02.985$ about 6 different intrinsic triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:02.985 \longrightarrow 00:40:04.990$ negative subtypes initially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:04.990 \longrightarrow 00:40:06.794$ However, the publicly available

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}06.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}09.500$ datasets that contribute to to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}09.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}12.030$ definition of those different triple

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:12.030 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.490$ negative subtypes largely came from

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:14.559 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.766$ communities that had very few, if any.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:17.766 \longrightarrow 00:40:19.500$ African ancestry individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:19.500 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.691$ So we really don't know if those

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:21.691 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.493$ triple negative breast tumor subtypes

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:23.493 \longrightarrow 00:40:25.488$ are applicable to the African

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}25.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}27.464$ ancestry populations that have a

00:40:27.464 --> 00:40:29.259 higher inherent risk of developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}29.259 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}40{:}32.350$ these triple negative subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

00:40:32.350 --> 00:40:33.950 In working with Clayton Yates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:33.950 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.010$ who used to be at Tuskegee and and now

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

00:40:37.010 --> 00:40:40.287 he's recently relocated to Johns Hopkins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}40.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}42.576$ Clayton has also been utilizing data

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:42.576 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.527$ from our international buyer repository

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}44.527 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}47.110$ and has identified the fact that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}47.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}48.911$ triple negative breast tumors of

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00{:}40{:}48.911 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50.915$ African American women does seem to

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:50.915 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.802$ have different signatures compared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.949547916

 $00:40:52.802 \longrightarrow 00:40:55.570$ what we see in white American women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00{:}40{:}59.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}03.387$ We're also utilizing data from TCG a

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00{:}41{:}03.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}06.060$ Melissa's been looking at the impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00:41:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.485$ of tumor infiltrating tumor associated

 $00:41:08.485 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.325$ lymphocytes on breast cancer outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00{:}41{:}11.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.312$ And we typically think of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00:41:14.312 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.300$ tumor infiltrating lymphocytes as

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00:41:16.379 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.747$ a favorable prognostic feature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00{:}41{:}18.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}21.182$ But in this is these are unpublished data

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

00:41:21.182 --> 00:41:23.527 and these preliminary data from TCG a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00:41:23.530 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.525$ the relationship seems to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

00:41:25.525 --> 00:41:27.520 flipped for African American women

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

00:41:27.583 --> 00:41:29.227 with the higher frequency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00:41:29.230 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.400$ Of tumor associated lymphocytes seems

NOTE Confidence: 0.759665074285714

 $00{:}41{:}31.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}34.180$ to be an adverse prognostic feature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00{:}41{:}36.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}39.155$ Data correlating with these findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

00:41:39.155 --> 00:41:42.550 from TCG A have been published,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:41:42.550 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.728$ again by members of the Amber Consortium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:41:45.730 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.250$ This comes from a study published by

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:41:48.250 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.596$ Christine Andersoni and her group where

 $00:41:50.596 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.008$ they looked at the tumor microenvironment

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:41:53.008 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.420$ signature of breast cancers from African

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:41:55.420 \longrightarrow 00:41:57.370$ American and white American women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:41:57.370 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.492$ And while they did show that African

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

00:42:00.492 --> 00:42:03.915 American women tended to have a more

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:03.915 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.915$ robust tumor infiltrating lymphocyte.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:05.920 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.632$ Content to their tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:07.632 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.772$ the lymphocytes of the African

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

00:42:09.772 --> 00:42:12.048 American women were more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

00:42:12.048 --> 00:42:14.560 have this T cell exhaustion signature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:14.560 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.764$ as they called it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:15.764 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.570$ And so their function was different

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00{:}42{:}17.627 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}20.077$ compared to what we see in the what she saw,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:20.080 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.956$ what they saw in the white American

NOTE Confidence: 0.815447774545455

 $00:42:21.956 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.170$ women with breast cancer.

 $00:42:25.970 \longrightarrow 00:42:28.301$ And this was an intriguing study that

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:42:28.301 --> 00:42:31.071 was published in Cell just a few years

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:31.071 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.771$ ago where some investigators were

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:32.833 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.203$ looking at immune cells that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:42:35.203 --> 00:42:37.182 basically primed with specific pathogens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:42:37.182 --> 00:42:39.142 infectious agents and then looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:39.142 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.608$ at the response of these immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:42:41.608 --> 00:42:44.104 cells from patients that were African

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:44.104 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.110$ American compared to white American.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:42:46.110 --> 00:42:48.528 And they saw very distinct and

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00{:}42{:}48.528 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}42{:}50.981$ different responses in terms of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:50.981 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.285$ immune activity of these immune cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:53.290 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.678$ When they're linked to different pathogens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:42:56.678 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.067$ So you can only imagine that if the

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:43:00.067 --> 00:43:02.317 immune cells of African ancestry

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:43:02.317 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.193$ individuals are responding differently

 $00:43:04.193 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.443$ to infectious diseases compared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:43:06.443 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.034$ the immune cells of white individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:43:09.034 \longrightarrow 00:43:11.386$ there could easily be differences in

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

 $00:43:11.386 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.765$ the way these immune cells function

NOTE Confidence: 0.872870970666667

00:43:13.765 --> 00:43:15.670 in terms of cancer biology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

00:43:20.100 --> 00:43:22.428 So Melissa has been continuing to

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:22.428 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.426$ utilize our international data set

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:24.426 \longrightarrow 00:43:26.306$ in conducting other studies looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00{:}43{:}26.306 \to 00{:}43{:}28.534$ at the triple negative breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00{:}43{:}28.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}30.830$ risk alleles and I'm going to go

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

00:43:30.830 --> 00:43:32.740 through these next few slides quickly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:32.740 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.120$ In the interest of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00{:}43{:}34.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}36.005$ we've also been working with

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:36.005 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.890$ investigators from the University of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:37.955 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.015$ Michigan been creating PDX models

 $00:43:40.015 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.075$ based upon our International Studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00{:}43{:}42.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}43.598$ And then very recently a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:43.598 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.357$ of months ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:44.360 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.118$ we were really excited about our work

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:47.118 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.008$ with triple negative breast cancer subtyping.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00{:}43{:}50.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}52.481$ Which was the cover article for cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

00:43:52.481 --> 00:43:54.470 discovery a couple of months ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:54.470 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.174$ So to us that was like being on

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:56.174 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.860$ the cover of our vogue magazines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:57.860 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.931$ We were very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:43:58.931 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.430$ very thrilled about this and we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:44:01.509 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.260$ able to show that looking at genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:44:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.639$ ancestry does have independent meaning

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

00:44:06.639 --> 00:44:09.449 compared to self reported ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:44:09.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:11.760$ And there were several 100 genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:44:11.760 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.679$ linked to genetic African ancestry

00:44:13.679 --> 00:44:16.487 that you don't see if you look only at

NOTE Confidence: 0.877931432333333

 $00:44:16.554 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.009$ self reported racial ethnic identity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}44{:}26.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}28.386$ And this is another slide that came

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:28.386 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.899$ from that particular publication

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:29.899 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.214$ where we're just demonstrating the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:44:32.214 --> 00:44:34.066 genetic admixture of populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:34.132 \longrightarrow 00:44:36.010$ in different parts of the world,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:36.010 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.350$ specifically looking at Ghanian patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:44:38.350 --> 00:44:39.973 African American patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:39.973 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.137$ Ethiopian patients and European

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:44:42.137 --> 00:44:44.430 ancestry white American patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:44:44.430 --> 00:44:46.902 And it's an example of how much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}44{:}46.902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}49.229$ you can learn about genetics of

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:44:49.229 --> 00:44:51.677 disease by drilling down into the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:51.680 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.876$ Genetic ancestry.

00:44:52.876 --> 00:44:55.866 And African Americans have tremendous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}44{:}55.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57.919$ tremendous genetic admixture

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:44:57.919 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.651$ compared to either Africans

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:00.651 \longrightarrow 00:45:03.410$ or European ancestry people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:03.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.130$ Individuals and you can't rely

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:06.130 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.306$ upon self reported ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:08.310 \longrightarrow 00:45:11.050$ There are three individuals in

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:11.050 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.242$ the European ancestry group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:13.250 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.860$ These are individuals who self

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:14.860 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.148$ reported as being white,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:16.150 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.586$ but they have between 30 and 80%

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:18.590 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.450$ of African genetic ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:20.450 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.660$ So you definitely misinformation if you rely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:23.660 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.435$ Exclusively upon self reported racial

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:26.435 \longrightarrow 00:45:29.302$ ethnic identity and there are other

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:45:29.302 --> 00:45:31.492 examples of how genetic ancestry

 $00:45:31.492 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.970$ might be correlated with health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}45{:}33.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}36.328$ April lipoprotein One is an African

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}45{:}36.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}38.300$ ancestry variant that has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:45:38.300 --> 00:45:40.310 linked to severity of kidney disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:40.310 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.772$ and we all know that end stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}45{:}42.772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}44.512$ renal disease is more prevalent

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:45:44.512 --> 00:45:46.920 in the African American community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:46.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.495$ This particular variant is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:49.495 \longrightarrow 00:45:52.396$ a variant that was acquired to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:52.396 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.706$ develop resistance to the African

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:45:54.789 --> 00:45:56.730 sleeping sickness disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923 00:45:56.730 --> 00:45:57.190 Also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:45:57.190 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.950$ our wonderful colleague out in California,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}45{:}59.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}02.020$ Lauder Fairman has been doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:02.020 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.676$ similar work looking at.

 $00{:}46{:}03.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}06.452$ Latin X individuals and Lauda has

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:06.452 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.885$ demonstrated that extent of genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:08.885 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.913$ Native American ancestry reduces

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:10.913 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.060$ the risk of getting breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:14.060 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.584$ On the other hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:46:15.584 --> 00:46:17.489 higher extent of European ancestry

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:46:17.489 --> 00:46:20.023 is associated with a higher risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:20.023 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.687$ of getting breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}46{:}21.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}23.342$ Other investigators have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:23.342 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.820$ trying to figure out the germline

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}46{:}25.889 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}46{:}27.824$ genetic ancestral causes of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:27.824 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.251$ BRC a founder mutations and have

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}46{:}30.251 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}31.955$ been potentially linking some

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:31.955 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.085$ of those founding mutations to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.898$ fertility over the millennia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:37.900 \longrightarrow 00:46:39.238$ So we've of course been very,

 $00:46:39.240 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.165$ very excited about our international

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:46:41.165 --> 00:46:43.090 group with respect to these

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}46{:}43.154 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}44.780$ different research avenues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:44.780 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.186$ But it's also been an incredibly

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:47.186 \longrightarrow 00:46:48.790$ rewarding experience from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:48.860 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.954$ perspective of being able to invest

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:50.954 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.634$ in the cancer care resources of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}46{:}53.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}55.654$ facilities for our partners work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:46:55.660 --> 00:46:57.526 And our mission statement is to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:46:57.526 --> 00:46:59.178 reduce the global breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:46:59.178 \longrightarrow 00:47:00.578$ burden through advances in

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:00.578 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.844$ research and delivery of care to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}47{:}02.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}04.218$ diverse populations worldwide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:47:04.220 --> 00:47:06.660 A few examples of how we've been making

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:06.660 \longrightarrow 00:47:08.128$ those investments are shown here.

 $00:47:08.130 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.110$ We've been able to establish

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:47:10.110 --> 00:47:11.298 immunohistochemistry training programs

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:47:11.298 --> 00:47:13.606 so that our colleagues can perform

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:13.606 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.426$ their own immunohistochemistry on site

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:15.426 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.372$ and actually characterize the cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}47{:}17.372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}19.652$ of the patients that they're treating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:19.660 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.128$ We've established core needle

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:21.128 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.963$ biopsy training program so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:22.963 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.303$ they can make their diagnosis more

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:25.303 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.835$ efficiently and accelerated through

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}47{:}26.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}28.697$ the COVID experience is that we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:28.697 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.344$ been able to stay in very close

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:31.344 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.404$ contact utilizing zoom meetings and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:34.404 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.360$ telemedicine tumor board discussions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:37.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.027$ And now that our program is headquartered

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:40.027 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.039$ at Wild Cornell in New York,

 $00:47:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.581$ we are able to align our International

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:44.581 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.463$ Studies with the robustly diverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:46.463 \longrightarrow 00:47:48.641$ population of New York and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:47:48.641 --> 00:47:51.113 have our New York based breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

00:47:51.113 --> 00:47:52.793 cancer campuses in Manhattan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:52.800 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.552$ Brooklyn and Queens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:54.552 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.888$ which has tremendous diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00:47:56.888 \longrightarrow 00:47:58.640$ in those communities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874518983076923

 $00{:}47{:}58.640 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}48{:}00.810$ And a lot of our work today is being done

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:00.872 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.817$ in conjunction with the Englander

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:02.817 --> 00:48:04.373 Institute of Precision Medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:04.380 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.184$ Whenever I talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:06.184 --> 00:48:07.537 breast cancer disparities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:07.540 --> 00:48:10.540 I always include these survival rates of 60%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:10.540 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.340$ forty 3% and 20%, which have absolutely

 $00:48:13.340 \longrightarrow 00:48:16.199$ nothing to do with cancer outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:16.200 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.270$ But these are the survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:17.270 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.340$ rates for the first class,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:18.340 \longrightarrow 00:48:20.090$ second class and 3rd class

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:20.090 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.840$ cabin passengers of the Titanic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:21.840 --> 00:48:23.968 And even though my own career in

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:23.968 \longrightarrow 00:48:25.614$ breast Cancer Research and studying

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:25.614 --> 00:48:26.962 disparities has been heavily

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}48{:}26.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}28.980$ rooted in trying to understand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:28.980 --> 00:48:32.070 Human biology linked to African ancestry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}48{:}32.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}34.950$ We always have to end just the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:34.950 \longrightarrow 00:48:37.981$ we began this discussion with a an

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:37.981 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.196$ expression of the fact that outcome and

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:41.196 \longrightarrow 00:48:44.367$ the ability to survive any threat is

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:44.367 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.906$ going to be related to access to care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:46.910 --> 00:48:48.765 And just as the third place cabin

 $00:48:48.765 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.880$ passengers of the Titanic did not have

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:50.880 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.465$ equitable access to the lifeboats,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:48:52.470 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.482$ it unfortunately and tragically

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:54.482 --> 00:48:57.134 remains true that communities of color,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:57.134 --> 00:48:59.594 including African Americans, do not have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:48:59.594 --> 00:49:01.634 Equal access to cancer care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:49:01.640 --> 00:49:06.140 screening, research opportunities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:06.140 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.660$ And as stated by Doctor Martin Luther King

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:08.660 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.618$ Junior, of all the forms of inequality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:10.620 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.308$ injustice and health is the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:13.308 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.652$ shocking and inhumane.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:14.660 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.090$ We saw this injustice in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}49{:}17.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}17.900$ COVID experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:17.900 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.440$ And as you guys know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:19.440 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.570$ it's been projected that as a

 $00:49:21.570 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.903$ consequence of the COVID shutdown and

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}49{:}23.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}26.429$ its downstream impact on Cancer Research

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:26.429 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.918$ and cancer screening and treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.990$ we're probably going to see an

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:30.990 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.158$ excess of about 10,000 deaths from

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}49{:}33.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}35.306$ colorectal and breast cancer in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:35.306 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.500$ next 10 years because of the COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:38.500 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.060$ recession was disproportionately

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:40.060 \longrightarrow 00:49:42.319$ severe in communities of color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:42.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.218$ We really do have to be proactive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}49{:}45.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}48.034$ In making sure that we protect

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:49:48.034 --> 00:49:49.441 our disadvantaged communities

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:49.441 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.238$ from experiencing these excess

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:49:52.238 --> 00:49:53.740 deaths disproportionately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:49:53.740 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.116$ we want to get rid of all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}49{:}55.116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}56.694$ these excess deaths, of course.

 $00:49:56.694 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.482$ But unless we support

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:49:58.482 --> 00:50:00.270 our safety net hospitals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:00.270 \longrightarrow 00:50:01.894$ which were disproportionately financially

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:01.894 --> 00:50:04.660 devastated by the costs of COVID care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:04.660 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.450$ unless we protect our advocacy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:07.450 --> 00:50:09.755 philanthropy groups that provide a

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:09.755 --> 00:50:11.957 lot of our free screening programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:11.960 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.504$ and unless we really work with

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:14.504 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.776$ our hospital leadership.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}50{:}15.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.318$ To make sure that they don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:18.318 --> 00:50:19.587 cut navigation programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:19.590 --> 00:50:20.382 outreach programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}50{:}20.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}22.362$ when they're trying to balance

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:22.362 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.561$ their budgets in the wake of

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:24.561 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.829$ the the COVID experience,

 $00:50:25.830 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.014$ we're going to have an exacerbation

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}50{:}28.014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}30.579$ of these types of mortality gaps.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:30.580 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.839$ But I am an optimist and I do know

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:32.839 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.932$ that by working together we are going

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:34.932 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.599$ to be able to eliminate these these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:37.600 \longrightarrow 00:50:38.336$ these disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:38.336 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.544$ And I look forward to strengthening

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:40.544 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.089$ all of the other partnerships that

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}50{:}43.089 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}45.264$ are already ongoing and bringing

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:45.264 \longrightarrow 00:50:46.778$ researchers from different areas

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}50{:}46.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}49.144$ together to to try to conquer these

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:49.150 \longrightarrow 00:50:52.200$ problems from all different angles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:52.200 --> 00:50:53.073 And in closing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:53.073 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.599$ I just want to thank all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:50:55.599 \longrightarrow 00:50:57.664$ wonderful teams that have supported

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:50:57.664 --> 00:50:59.800 our research over the years.

00:50:59.800 --> 00:51:01.534 And in closing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:51:01.534 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.002$ I do also want to acknowledge

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:51:05.002 \longrightarrow 00:51:06.616$ this phenomenal woman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:51:06.616 --> 00:51:08.688 my sister Deborah Newman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:51:08.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.659$ who passed away almost a year ago

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:51:12.660 \longrightarrow 00:51:16.130$ today from an incredibly aggressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:51:16.130 --> 00:51:19.600 and virulent inflammatory form of

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00{:}51{:}19.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}22.718$ triple negative breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:51:22.720 --> 00:51:25.300 and my sister Debbie,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:51:25.300 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.920$ a Princeton graduate, former US prosecutor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

00:51:28.920 --> 00:51:32.280 She's a perfect example of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.888823984736842

 $00:51:32.280 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.840$ socioeconomics

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

 $00{:}51{:}32.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}35.907$ are not the exclusive explanation

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

 $00{:}51{:}35.907 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}38.287$ for breast cancer disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

 $00:51:38.290 \longrightarrow 00:51:40.837$ And so it's an in her memory that I

00:51:40.837 --> 00:51:43.154 and my research team continue the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

 $00:51:43.154 \longrightarrow 00:51:45.839$ the work that we've been doing so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

00:51:45.840 --> 00:51:47.505 I do thank all of you for your time

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

 $00:51:47.505 \longrightarrow 00:51:48.987$ and attention and for inviting

NOTE Confidence: 0.880449592105263

 $00:51:48.987 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.542$ me to deliver this presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9729095

00:52:00.070 --> 00:52:02.670 Thank you so much Doctor Newman

NOTE Confidence: 0.9729095

00:52:02.670 --> 00:52:04.690 for sharing your extraordinary

NOTE Confidence: 0.9729095

 $00:52:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.550$ research with our group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90559693

 $00{:}52{:}06.550 \to 00{:}52{:}08.542$ I'd be happy to start with any questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.90559693

 $00:52:08.542 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.270$ from the audience before we turn

NOTE Confidence: 0.934497205

 $00:52:10.280 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.360$ to the zoom chat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916564146666667

 $00:52:13.080 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.650$ Go ahead and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:18.130 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.170$ One point. Really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:22.170 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.630$ Was how the self reporting of race

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:27.630 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.470$ definitely does not usually capture

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00{:}52{:}30.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}32.546$ release what the person is and

 $00:52:32.546 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.989$ that really has me thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00{:}52{:}34.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}36.862$ populations might be able to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:36.862 \longrightarrow 00:52:39.729$ at these sort of studies that we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

00:52:39.729 --> 00:52:41.497 segregating typically but people

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:41.497 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.792$ said decreased sequencing cost and

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:43.792 \longrightarrow 00:52:46.828$ ease of access to that sort of data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:46.830 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.685$ Do you and your group's plan on

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:48.685 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.515$ looking at those populations and

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:50.515 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.467$ identifying specific genetic factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

00:52:52.470 --> 00:52:53.380 And if you're not ready,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00{:}52{:}53.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}55.485$ you seen whether a specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.77534117

 $00:52:55.485 \longrightarrow 00:52:56.748$ rates have dominance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00{:}53{:}02.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04.362$ Thanks so much for the kind comment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00{:}53{:}04.362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}06.685$ I totally agree with your points that

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

00:53:06.685 --> 00:53:08.798 we definitely have an obligation to

 $00:53:08.798 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.850$ look more closely at genetic admixture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00{:}53{:}10.850 \longrightarrow 00{:}53{:}12.518$ And you're right, self reported race.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:12.520 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.150$ I mean it's really primitive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:14.150 \longrightarrow 00:53:17.120$ And as cancer researchers we've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:17.120 \longrightarrow 00:53:21.032$ so late to bring the technology of

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

00:53:21.032 --> 00:53:24.704 quantification of ancestry into our work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:24.710 \longrightarrow 00:53:26.350$ but the general population has

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:26.350 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.990$ been doing this for years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

00:53:27.990 --> 00:53:30.020 I mean millions of people are purchasing

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:30.020 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.097$ these products or they've spent in a cup.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00{:}53{:}32.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}34.151$ And get back their pie diagram of

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:34.151 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.839$ where their ancestors are come from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:35.840 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.396$ So I mean I think that this type of

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

00:53:38.396 --> 00:53:40.928 work should be routine in our studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

00:53:40.928 --> 00:53:43.731 because we do have the technology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:43.731 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.713$ it's so much more precise and meaningful.

00:53:46.720 --> 00:53:49.044 I I agree with you in trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00{:}53{:}49.044 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}50.720$ to understand cancer outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:50.720 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.144$ Now we do need to look at self

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:53.144 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.746$ reported race as well because a self

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:53:55.746 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.671$ reported identity does have very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

00:53:57.680 --> 00:54:00.170 very important relationships

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:54:00.170 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.660$ to HealthEquity and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:54:02.660 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.235$ Services that are available to

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:54:04.235 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.810$ some communities and not available

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:54:05.861 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.878$ to other communities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:54:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.124$ but we can't overlook

NOTE Confidence: 0.883841121851852

 $00:54:09.124 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.807$ the genetics components.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88384112185185200:54:10.810 --> 00:54:11.130 So that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73749167

 $00:54:13.300 \longrightarrow 00:54:14.110$ Doctor Weiner.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:18.870 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.090$ OK. So Lisa, thanks for a great

 $00:54:23.090 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.859$ talk and sorry about your sister

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:25.859 \longrightarrow 00:54:28.359$ and thanks for sharing that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:28.360 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.950$ I want to go down a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:30.950 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.970$ bit on ERP project.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

00:54:32.970 --> 00:54:36.879 And of course adherence to therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

00:54:36.879 --> 00:54:40.274 Fabian issue, not only adherence

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

00:54:40.274 --> 00:54:42.990 but doctors prescribing entering

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

00:54:43.086 --> 00:54:45.522 therapy which isn't really adherence

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00{:}54{:}45.522 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}47.944$ which you think of as a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:47.944 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.990$ issue but maybe a doctor issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:50.990 \longrightarrow 00:54:54.457$ But the other question with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:54.457 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.460$ question I have is to what extent

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:54:57.553 \longrightarrow 00:55:00.385$ do we know whether simple things

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

00:55:00.385 --> 00:55:03.370 like ER expression vary across race?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00{:}55{:}03.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}05.798$ Or whether monumental air

NOTE Confidence: 0.94081753

 $00:55:05.798 \longrightarrow 00:55:08.226$ versus B percentages bearing.

 $00:55:09.020 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.640$ Yeah, it well terrific questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

00:55:12.640 --> 00:55:15.064 Now from our biorepository,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:15.064 \longrightarrow 00:55:18.094$ we definitely see higher frequencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:18.094 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.438$ of those weekly positive ER tumors 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:21.438 \longrightarrow 00:55:24.365$ to 9% in the African ancestry patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:24.365 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.120$ compared to the white patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:27.120 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.200$ I can't say that I've seen that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

00:55:30.200 --> 00:55:32.240 broadly in publications however,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

00:55:32.240 --> 00:55:34.730 because we usually just talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:34.730 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.293$ your positive or negative using the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

00:55:37.293 --> 00:55:39.758 ASCO CAP guidelines, but in our.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:39.758 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.788$ Database, we do see that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

00:55:41.790 --> 00:55:44.352 So I do think that it's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00{:}55{:}44.352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}45.450$ spectrum that's present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:45.450 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.201$ I I think you're probably right that

 $00:55:48.201 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.773$ there are variations in how endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:50.773 \longrightarrow 00:55:52.978$ the rapies are prescribed and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:52.978 \longrightarrow 00:55:55.642$ much attention we pay as healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:55.642 \longrightarrow 00:55:57.777$ providers to adherence to treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:55:57.777 \longrightarrow 00:56:00.940$ based upon what our patients look like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:56:00.940 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.215$ I think those are very real issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

00:56:03.220 --> 00:56:07.316 I am so excited that people like you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:56:07.320 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.642$ the leaders in the clinical trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00{:}56{:}09.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}11.590$ are paying attention to this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:56:11.590 \longrightarrow 00:56:13.380$ In looking at these, these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:56:13.380 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.508$ these gene expression profiles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:56:14.508 \longrightarrow 00:56:16.200$ they're going to be I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6241993412

 $00:56:16.200 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.666$ incredibly powerful in studies to come.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:56:25.080 --> 00:56:27.430 Presentation of the body of

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:56:27.430 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.310$ work that features beautifully.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:56:29.310 --> 00:56:30.962 Molecular epidemiology,

 $00{:}56{:}30.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}34.266$ clinical functions and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}56{:}34.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}36.744$ you've highlighted cultural.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:56:36.750 --> 00:56:38.766 I think you have devoted a lot of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}56{:}38.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}41.350$ If I take the same discussion

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:56:41.350 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.070$ interest cancer in TCG,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:56:43.070 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.626$ I'll tell you there are five

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:56:45.626 --> 00:56:47.330 patients of African argument.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:56:47.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.690$ And and that's the disconnect

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:56:48.690 --> 00:56:50.050 that I'm always struck with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}56{:}50.050 \longrightarrow 00{:}56{:}53.368$ you know so much that threat that

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}56{:}53.368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}55.153$ biologic and rogenicity matters and

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}56{:}55.153 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}56.968$ clinicians have always been able

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}56{:}56.968 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}59.375$ to people like we've been able

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:56:59.375 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.155$ to answer fundamental questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:57:01.160 \longrightarrow 00:57:03.662$ Yet my worry is in our passion to and

00:57:03.662 --> 00:57:05.976 you track the time article right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:57:05.980 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.738$ And I've seen the same thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:57:07.740 \longrightarrow 00:57:10.498$ that in our desire to be equal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:57:10.500 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.370$ we're perhaps missing on those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:57:14.370 --> 00:57:16.370 Essential things you pointed out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:57:16.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:19.082$ how do we teach that Vern

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:57:19.082 --> 00:57:19.986 academic organization?

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:57:19.990 --> 00:57:22.600 And you have highlighted how clinicians

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00:57:22.600 \longrightarrow 00:57:25.170$ can interact with basic scientists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

 $00{:}57{:}25.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}28.210$ How do we as leaders make sure we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178

00:57:28.210 --> 00:57:31.097 pointing that out to the next generation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.67296178 00:57:31.100 --> 00:57:31.930 I

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:57:32.240 \longrightarrow 00:57:35.186$ would question and it's something that

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:57:35.186 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.560$ we all have to keep working on overtime.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

00:57:39.560 --> 00:57:45.790 I I again I am very optimistic the fact that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:57:45.790 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.050$ People are documenting cancer outcomes.

00:57:51.050 --> 00:57:53.430 Stratified by racial ethnic identity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:57:53.430 \longrightarrow 00:57:55.378$ where it wasn't necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:57:55.378 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.326$ documented in the past,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:57:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.148$ the fact that there's a very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}57{:}59.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}01.470$ there's a lot of momentum to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:01.470 \longrightarrow 00:58:04.221$ the the diversity of our workforce and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

00:58:04.221 --> 00:58:06.723 to develop pipeline programs when very

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}58{:}06.723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}08.984$ little attention was paid for the to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}58{:}08.984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}11.190$ this in the past people would remark

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}58{:}11.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}14.149$ upon the lack of a workforce diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:14.150 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.346$ but everybody said well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:15.346 \longrightarrow 00:58:18.152$ this is a problem that no group can address

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:18.152 \longrightarrow 00:58:20.970$ over night and so nobody tried to do anything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:20.970 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.891$ To address it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

00:58:21.891 --> 00:58:24.830 but I think that's the the COVID experience,

 $00:58:24.830 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.890$ horrific as it was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:26.890 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.465$ the COVID experience with disparities

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}58{:}29.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}32.053$ and COVID outcome hitting us

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:32.053 \longrightarrow 00:58:34.037$ literally in the face,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:34.040 \longrightarrow 00:58:36.020$ coupled with witnessing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

00:58:36.020 --> 00:58:38.495 horrific murders of George Floyd,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

00:58:38.500 --> 00:58:39.925 Brianna Taylor, so many others

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:39.925 \longrightarrow 00:58:42.100$ in the hands of law enforcement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}58{:}42.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}44.790$ all of those events happening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:44.790 \longrightarrow 00:58:46.980$ Together made this an extremely

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:46.980 \longrightarrow 00:58:48.732$ unique moment in time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:48.740 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.504$ And so I think that the efforts

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:50.504 \longrightarrow 00:58:52.143$ that we're seeing now in achieving

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00{:}58{:}52.143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}53.805$ Health Equity are are real and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

00:58:53.805 --> 00:58:55.833 think that it's going to make a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:58:55.833 \longrightarrow 00:58:56.961$ difference and accelerate the

 $00:58:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:59:00.720$ pace of disparities research and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:59:00.720 \longrightarrow 00:59:03.200$ Accelerate the pace of trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.78965661

 $00:59:03.200 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.688$ to achieve HealthEquity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839884168

00:59:05.990 --> 00:59:07.445 Breast cancer sort of luminaries

NOTE Confidence: 0.839884168

 $00.59:07.445 \longrightarrow 00.59:10.055$ in the in the room right now in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839884168

 $00:59:10.055 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.438$ breast, their breast goes other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.578174253333333

 $00:59:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:59:17.094$ Will have no. Problems giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.578174253333333

 $00:59:17.094 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.754$ their splits the life opportunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:21.600 \longrightarrow 00:59:25.560$ Ravens. Give patients the audience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.601$ People come. Retesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:26.601 \longrightarrow 00:59:30.121$ And Antonio Wolf and a bunch of us wrote an

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:30.121 \longrightarrow 00:59:32.508$ editorial saying that was a horrible idea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:32.510 \longrightarrow 00:59:33.834$ That about any guide?

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:33.834 \longrightarrow 00:59:36.419$ So people are willing to give their data

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:36.419 \longrightarrow 00:59:38.940$ yet if they come in for an IRB file,

 $00:59:38.940 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.848$ they're going to make them really

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:40.848 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.270$ hard and so accurately that makes it

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

00:59:43.270 --> 00:59:45.890 very hard for people to people happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:45.890 \longrightarrow 00:59:47.330$ And we put so many barriers

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:47.330 \longrightarrow 00:59:48.690$ into look at clinical trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

00:59:48.690 --> 00:59:52.098 it's really hard for people to limited means

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:52.098 \longrightarrow 00:59:56.246$ to come to Cornell or to come to New Haven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00:59:56.250 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.396$ So how do we change that because who has

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $00{:}59{:}59.396 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}01.490$ the best interest in understanding that

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:01.490 \longrightarrow 01:00:05.458$ patients and yet we make it so complicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:05.460 --> 01:00:07.930 Urge all of us to sort of think about how

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:07.990 --> 01:00:10.398 do we break those barriers to make this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:10.400 --> 01:00:11.429 because it's fundamental.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:11.429 --> 01:00:14.924 As you said, this was an evolutionary

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:14.924 --> 01:00:17.040 mechanism to survive in Africa, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:17.040 \longrightarrow 01:00:18.102$ Malaria is endemic.

 $01{:}00{:}18.102 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}20.580$ And now we're seeing like it makes

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01{:}00{:}20.649 --> 01{:}00{:}22.877$ your hemocyanin your inflammatory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:22.880 --> 01:00:23.964 You have this response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:23.964 --> 01:00:26.590 but you know, it's the flip side and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:26.590 \longrightarrow 01:00:28.975$ So I think that there's a peace for us

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:28.975 \longrightarrow 01:00:31.537$ as as leaders of the field to say what

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:31.537 --> 01:00:34.075 are the are we making researches too

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:34.075 \longrightarrow 01:00:38.290$ complex and simple things like my background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:38.290 \longrightarrow 01:00:41.090$ Probably affects how I respond to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:41.090 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.323$ world was evolutionary and written into

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

01:00:43.323 --> 01:00:45.334 our DNA work thousands of years, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.570492618

 $01:00:45.334 \longrightarrow 01:00:46.900$ And we're trying to fix that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:00:48.730 --> 01:00:51.260 You are so right. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:00:51.260 --> 01:00:52.628 And you hit the nail on the head,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:00:52.630 --> 01:00:55.752 I think, in talking about how we've

 $01:00:55.752 \longrightarrow 01:00:58.245$ inadvertently created barriers to diverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}00{:}58.245 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}00.409$ populations contributing to research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:00.410 \longrightarrow 01:01:02.762$ You know, many studies show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:02.762 \longrightarrow 01:01:04.330$ African American cancer patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:04.392 \longrightarrow 01:01:06.752$ are at least if not more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}01{:}06.752 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}08.858$ participate in clinical trials if they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:08.858 \longrightarrow 01:01:11.030$ offered the opportunity to do so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:11.030 \longrightarrow 01:01:13.536$ And we've created all these barriers where

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}01{:}13.536 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}15.832$ clinicians are less likely to offer them

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:15.832 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.090$ for a whole host of different reasons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:18.090 \longrightarrow 01:01:20.090$ implicit biases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:20.090 \longrightarrow 01:01:23.090$ Sometimes it's just.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:23.090 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.750$ Incidental Mel with well meaning

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:24.750 \longrightarrow 01:01:26.765$ physicians who are worried that they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:01:26.765 --> 01:01:28.541 going to alienate their patients if

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:28.541 \longrightarrow 01:01:30.466$ they offer an African American cancer

 $01{:}01{:}30.466 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}32.755$ patient to clinical trial for fear that

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}01{:}32.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}33.966$ the patient might think that they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:01:33.966 --> 01:01:35.532 being treated like * **** Guinea pig.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:35.532 \longrightarrow 01:01:37.649$ But we have to get over those types

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:37.649 \longrightarrow 01:01:39.857$ of things and we have to offer all

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}01{:}39.857 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}41.857$ treatment opportunities to all of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:01:41.857 --> 01:01:44.456 patients even when it comes to our IRB's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:44.456 \longrightarrow 01:01:46.878$ You know we have all these regulations

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:46.878 \longrightarrow 01:01:49.053$ that try to protect people against

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}01{:}49.053 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}51.646$ coercion and so we don't want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:51.646 \longrightarrow 01:01:53.286$ offer a financial incentives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:53.290 \longrightarrow 01:01:55.700$ Patients for fear of more

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:55.700 \longrightarrow 01:01:57.628$ vulnerable patients being coerced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:01:57.630 \longrightarrow 01:02:00.022$ But our socioeconomically disadvantaged

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:00.022 \longrightarrow 01:02:03.012$ patients need that financial support

 $01:02:03.012 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.357$ in order to take the time off work so

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:06.357 \longrightarrow 01:02:09.150$ that they can come in for the visits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777 01:02:09.150 --> 01:02:11.270 So. NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:02:11.270 --> 01:02:12.344 Such a broad,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:12.344 \longrightarrow 01:02:14.492$ sweeping problem to try to meaningfully

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}02{:}14.492 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}17.070$ and thoughtfully get rid of some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:17.070 \longrightarrow 01:02:19.033$ these barriers that we've inadvertently

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:02:19.033 --> 01:02:21.787 created and trying to protect our

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01{:}02{:}21.787 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}23.810$ patients against research and justice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

01:02:23.810 --> 01:02:25.530 The research abuse is, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:25.530 \longrightarrow 01:02:26.850$ we can't let those come back,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:26.850 \longrightarrow 01:02:29.361$ but we do also have to be thoughtful and

NOTE Confidence: 0.71263777

 $01:02:29.361 \longrightarrow 01:02:31.748$ make research easier for our patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75272113

 $01:02:35.320 \longrightarrow 01:02:35.530$ Thank.