WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:56:17.6400000"

NOTE recognizability:0.838

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:00.000 \rightarrow 00:00:02.250$ Real pleasure to introduce Doctor Ari

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:02.250 --> 00:00:04.680 Hakimi as today's Grand Round speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}04{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}06{.}080$ He's the an Associate Professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}06{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}08{.}240$ and Co leader of the Translational

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:08.240 --> 00:00:10.325 Kidney Cancer program and Memorial

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}10.325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}12.250$ Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}12.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}13.750$ Hakimi is a urologic surgeon who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:13.750 - > 00:00:15.598 focused on the care of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}15{.}598$ --> $00{:}00{:}16{.}639$ with urologic malignancies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:16.640 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.906$ especially kidney tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}17{.}906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20{.}438$ He received his medical degree in

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:20.438 \longrightarrow 00:00:22.182$ residency training from Einstein

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}22.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}24.080$ College of Madison and completed

00:00:24.080 --> 00:00:25.680 his fellowship in Urologic Oncology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:25.680 --> 00:00:27.300 Oncology and Memorial Sloan

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:27.300 --> 00:00:28.515 Kettering Cancer Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:28.520 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.170$ His research really aims to

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:30.170 --> 00:00:31.160 understand immune infiltration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:31.160 \rightarrow 00:00:33.015$ inflammation in the tumor microenvironment

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}33.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.372$ in RCC and to identify novel

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:35.372 \rightarrow 00:00:37.124$ therapeutic targets to overcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00{:}00{:}37.124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}38.876$ resistance to systemic the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:38.880 \rightarrow 00:00:40.840$ His studies apply bulk single

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:40.840 --> 00:00:42.800 cell and spatial RNA sequencing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:42.800 --> 00:00:45.880 flow cytometry and immunogenomic analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

00:00:45.880 --> 00:00:47.740 Really to understand both patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.600$ samples and a novel immunocompetent

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:49.662 \rightarrow 00:00:51.540$ kidney cancer mouse line that his

NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333

 $00:00:51.540 \rightarrow 00:00:53.335$ lab has developed really has been

- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:00:53.335 \rightarrow 00:00:55.036$ a game game changer for the study
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- 00:00:55.036 --> 00:00:56.844 of kidney cancer and particularly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:00:56.844 \rightarrow 00:00:58.799$ the immunobiology of kidney cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- 00:00:58.800 --> 00:01:00.558 I followed Ari's work for many,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- 00:01:00.560 --> 00:01:02.208 many years now and to see him go
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:01:02.208 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.139$ from what was a rising star in kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:01:04.139 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.935$ Cancer Research to now really one of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:01:05.935 \dashrightarrow 00:01:07.720$ the world leaders has been a pleasure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:01:07.720 \longrightarrow 00:01:09.416$ And it's a a body of work that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:01:09.416 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.240$ I've tremendously admired.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00:01:10.240 \rightarrow 00:01:12.200$ So it's really a pleasure to be able to walk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.768883635833333
- $00{:}01{:}12.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}13.999$ Welcome Doctor Akimi to grand rounds today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- 00:01:20.670 --> 00:01:21.666 All right. Thank you so much.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00{:}01{:}21.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.310$ And it's really a pleasure to be here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:24.310 \rightarrow 00:01:27.354$ at Yale and especially I was especially
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

- $00{:}01{:}27.354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}30.480$ enthusiastic come here because of David
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00{:}01{:}30{.}566$ --> $00{:}01{:}31{.}958$ and I mean talk about rising stars.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:31.960 \dashrightarrow 00:01:33.759$ David is incredible and he's got great
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:33.759 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.678$ mentors here with with Harriet and others.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:35.680 \dashrightarrow 00:01:38.677$ And I think it's it's a real pleasure here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- 00:01:38.680 --> 00:01:40.040 So that's my only disclosures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:40.040 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.905$ none of which is pertinent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:41.905 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.397$ to this talk today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00{:}01{:}43.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}45.848$ So I'll talk a little bit about the genetic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:45.848 \rightarrow 00:01:48.288$ the genomic and genetic background
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- 00:01:48.288 --> 00:01:49.752 of kidney cancer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:49.760 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.548$ in particular clear cell renal cell
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00{:}01{:}51{.}548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}53{.}676$ carcinoma which is the most common and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:53.676 \rightarrow 00:01:55.434$ aggressive form of kidney cancer but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:55.434 \rightarrow 00:01:57.477$ also one of the most immunoresponsive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:01:57.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.223$ We'll talk a little bit about the

 $00:01:59.223 \rightarrow 00:02:01.583$ role of the micro environment as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}01{.}583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}03{.}434$ predictive response and really focus

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}03{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}05{.}582$ on myeloid compartment which is one

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:05.582 \rightarrow 00:02:07.996$ of my lab's interests a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}07{.}996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}10{.}024$ from the genomic determinants of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}10.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}12.317$ and then some of the insights using

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}12.317 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}14.530$ both human and mouse strategies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}14.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}17.440$ understand this for for future targeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

00:02:17.440 --> 00:02:20.450 So kidney cancer is about is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:20.450 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.359$ 6th most common cancer overall or

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:23.360 \rightarrow 00:02:24.560$ eighth most common cancer overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}24.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}26.080$ 6th most common in men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}26.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}28.439$ There's a 2 to one gender difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}28{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}30{.}085$ and we know that you know within

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:30.085 \rightarrow 00:02:31.279$ the kidney there are many,

 $00:02:31.280 \rightarrow 00:02:33.212$ many subtypes of kidney cancer and even

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:33.212 \rightarrow 00:02:35.716$ if you just took the most common subtypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:35.720 \rightarrow 00:02:37.256$ they're very genetically different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:37.256 \rightarrow 00:02:39.880$ Clear cell represents the most common form.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}39{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42{.}512$ About 6570% of all kidney tumors are

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}42.512 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}45.020$ a clear cell and we know the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:45.020 \rightarrow 00:02:47.160$ about it from a genetic standpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.961$ But we also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}47{.}961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}49{.}296$ there's also some very intriguing

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:49.296 \rightarrow 00:02:50.479$ phenomenon that existed in it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:50.480 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.020$ particularly the amount of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:52.020 \rightarrow 00:02:52.636$ immune response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:52.640 \rightarrow 00:02:54.558$ And it's still not clear why these

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}54{.}558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}56{.}402$ tumors are so immune infiltrated and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}02{:}56{.}402 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}58{.}642$ and why they are so responsive to

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:02:58.701 \rightarrow 00:03:00.526$ immunotherapy compared to other tumors

 $00:03:00.526 \rightarrow 00:03:02.780$ that are much more highly mutated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

00:03:02.780 --> 00:03:05.106 for example like melanomas or or

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}06{.}462$ bladder lung cancers where you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:06.462 \rightarrow 00:03:08.478$ a lot of mutations in those tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:08.480 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.145$ And probably you know everyone

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:11.145 \rightarrow 00:03:13.673$ references TCGA papers initially in

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:13.673 \rightarrow 00:03:15.638$ terms of the fundamental understanding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}15.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17.215$ And I think some of the take aways

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:17.215 \dashrightarrow 00:03:18.645$ from this tumor from this analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

00:03:18.645 --> 00:03:20.797 which is one of the first tumors to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}20.797 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}22.177$ profiled was that it's really dominated

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}22.177 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}24.890$ by a few driver mutations related to

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}24.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}27.680$ tumor suppressors On the 3P locus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}27.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}28.916$ There's not a lot of mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}28{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30{.}972$ There's some copy number events that

 $00:03:30.972 \rightarrow 00:03:33.041$ are really fundamental and maybe some

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:33.041 \dashrightarrow 00:03:34.955$ of which are enriched in metastases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}34{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}37{.}018$ But there's not an obvious clue as

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:37.018 \rightarrow 00:03:39.564$ to you know why these tumors retain

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:39.564 \rightarrow 00:03:41.554$ such a high immune infiltration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:41.560 \rightarrow 00:03:43.756$ We also know a little bit about what happens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}43.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}46.202$ Thanks to Seminole work from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00:03:46.202 \rightarrow 00:03:47.612$ Sanger Institute where they looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

00:03:47.612 --> 00:03:49.466 at what were the fundamental events

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

00:03:49.466 --> 00:03:51.470 that that are associated with clear

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}51{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}53{.}319$ cell nasal carcinoma development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}53{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}55{.}868$ And what this paper showed for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}55{.}868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}57{.}959$ really the first time was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}03{:}57{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}01{.}801$ the loss of chromosome 3P1 arm is

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}04{:}01{.}801 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}03{.}967$ critical to the oncogenesis and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695

 $00{:}04{:}03{.}967 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}06{.}288$ that's followed by VHL loss whether

- NOTE Confidence: 0.868401695
- $00:04:06.288 \rightarrow 00:04:08.233$ it's mutations or or methylation.

 $00{:}04{:}08{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}10{.}599$ But basically 90% of all clear cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:10.599 \rightarrow 00:04:13.330$ have this and then eventually over time

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}13{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}16{.}113$ additional driver mutations are lost and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:16.113 \rightarrow 00:04:18.088$ leads to different evolutionary subtypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:04:18.088 --> 00:04:21.960 And in this paper Samara Trashlik and others

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:21.960 \rightarrow 00:04:25.075$ came up with a relatively complex schema.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}25{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}26{.}988$ But you know, fundamentally you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:04:26.988 --> 00:04:29.274 think about it as the tumors lose

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:29.274 \dashrightarrow 00:04:31.182$ VHL and then they usually acquire

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}31{.}182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}33{.}360$ one or two additional hits to form

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}33{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35{.}160$ into sort of different trajectories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:35.160 \dashrightarrow 00:04:38.202$ We know that tumors that lose PBM one and

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}38{.}202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}41{.}396$ set D2 for example maybe more angiogenic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:41.400 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.320$ they may they may tend to be a

 $00:04:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.160$ little bit more indolent overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:45.160 \rightarrow 00:04:47.314$ maybe possibly more responsive to certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}47{.}314$ --> $00{:}04{:}49{.}215$ the rapies like including even immunotherapy NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:49.215 \rightarrow 00:04:51.280$ although that's not entirely clear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}51{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}53{.}226$ And then BAP one mutations which occurs

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}04{:}53.226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.376$ well are are typically associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:55.376 \rightarrow 00:04:57.466$ more high grade aggressive proliferative

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:04:57.466 \rightarrow 00:05:00.157$ tumor types and then you can have multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:05:00.157 --> 00:05:01.840 clonal drivers which also represent a

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}05{:}01{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}03{.}280$ very aggressive form of kidney cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}05{:}03.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}04.960$ So we're starting to get a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:04.960 \rightarrow 00:05:06.680$ framework for the underlying genomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:06.680 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.171$ but none of this really has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:08.171 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.400$ shown to be targetable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:09.400 \rightarrow 00:05:11.680$ So for years we just really started to

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:11.680 \rightarrow 00:05:13.678$ understand what was driving kidney cancer,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:13.680 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.608$ but we really didn't,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00{:}05{:}14.608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}16.000$ wasn't giving us any further insights,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- 00:05:16.000 00:05:17.160 weren't an oncogene that you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:17.160 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.320$ could develop a target to.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:18.320 \rightarrow 00:05:21.350$ And while people are certainly working
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00{:}05{:}21.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}24.280$ on epigenetic regulation and strategies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:24.280 \rightarrow 00:05:26.730$ it's it's certainly not an obvious pathway
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:26.730 \rightarrow 00:05:29.357$ forward in kidney cancer at least right now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:29.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:30.360$ And at the same time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:30.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.764$ we also knew clinically that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:31.764 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.343$ you know most of the targeted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- 00:05:33.343 --> 00:05:35.113 the rapies were limited to the micro
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00:05:35.113 \dashrightarrow 00:05:36.599$ environment of the of the cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- 00:05:36.600 --> 00:05:39.444 And really we've seen a tremendous
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- $00{:}05{:}39{.}444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}41{.}385$ growth in in outcomes and survival
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:41.385 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.557$ for kidney cancer patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:05:42.560 --> 00:05:44.025 But it's all really focusing

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:05:44.025 --> 00:05:45.197 on the micro environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:45.200 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.256$ So even back in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}05{:}46.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.032$ in the 90s when we were studying IL 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}05{:}49{.}032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}51{.}276$ both in melanomas and kidney cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:51.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.520$ that was really the only

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:52.520 \dashrightarrow 00:05:53.760$ treatment that seemed to work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}05{:}53.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}56.280$ We had tried all the chemotherapies

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:56.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:58.116$ you can imagine in the 80s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:05:58.120 \dashrightarrow 00:06:00.640$ 90s and you would see responses

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:00.640 \longrightarrow 00:06:02.720$ even 7 to 10% cures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:02.720 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.920$ but with very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:03.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.920$ very high toxicity in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:05.920 \dashrightarrow 00:06:07.720$ populations and in those patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:07.720 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.485$ And it wasn't until the advent of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346
- 00:06:10.485 --> 00:06:12.585 of really by work from Bill Kalin

 $00{:}06{:}12.585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}14.192$ and others where we recognized the

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}14.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}15.674$ importance of Hifs that all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:15.674 \rightarrow 00:06:17.239$ focus on VEGF had come around.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:17.240 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.320$ And then it wasn't really until this

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}20{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}22{.}504$ notion of immunotherapy came around that

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:22.504 \rightarrow 00:06:24.520$ we started to see this big revolution

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:24.520 \dashrightarrow 00:06:26.560$ in terms of survival and outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:26.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.120$ But it's all really focused on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.160$ on the micro environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:06:31.160 --> 00:06:33.057 We know that you can take some

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}33.057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}34.992$ of these genetic events that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:06:34.992 --> 00:06:36.732 mentioned earlier and risk stratify

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}36{.}732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}38{.}038$ patients a little further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:38.040 \rightarrow 00:06:40.480$ This is the work that we did several

00:06:40.480 --> 00:06:42.620 years ago now looking at the impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}42.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}44.510$ of some of these common mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}44.568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}46.698$ and outcomes for patients that were NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:46.698 \rightarrow 00:06:48.762$ receiving VEGF therapy and it was NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

00:06:48.762 --> 00:06:50.688 you know prognostic maybe you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}50{.}688 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52{.}015$ further stratify patients that

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00{:}06{:}52.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}53.590$ were grouped into clinical risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.95925346

 $00:06:53.590 \rightarrow 00:06:55.519$ groups by by common mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:06:55.520 \dashrightarrow 00:06:58.257$ But it wasn't really telling us anything

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}06{:}58.257 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}00.520$ about the underlying immunobiology or

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:00.520 \rightarrow 00:07:02.000$ angiogenic biology in these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:02.000 \rightarrow 00:07:04.490$ It was really more just a

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}04.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.380$ prognostic feature about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}06.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}09.030$ So with this revolution of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}09{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10{.}598$ immuno therapies both by themselves

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:10.598 \rightarrow 00:07:12.674$ and in combination with VEDF therapy,

 $00:07:12.680 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.668$ we've seen the the survival rate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}14.668 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.558$ the response rates go up dramatically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}16.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}18.289$ So you know the median survival when

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:18.289 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.004$ when I first started my training

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:20.004 \rightarrow 00:07:21.539$ for metastatic kidney cancer was

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}21.539 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}23.515$ you know a year and a half or so

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:23.515 \rightarrow 00:07:25.091$ and now we're pushing five years

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:25.091 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.040$ for for a lot of patients and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:28.040 \dashrightarrow 00:07:30.116$ potentially curing some patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}30{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32{.}024$ And we there's a real need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}32.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}33.607$ understand why that's the case and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}33.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}35.252$ how we can do better because we

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}35{.}309 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}37{.}074$ know that invariably most patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}37{.}074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39{.}680$ despite this high response rate will

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:39.680 \dashrightarrow 00:07:43.349 \text{ eventually develop resistance and you}$ NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}43.349 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.203$ know understanding why that's the case

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:07:45.203 --> 00:07:47.118 requires you know good models to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:47.120 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.914$ So we know that from an immunotherapy NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:07:50.914 \rightarrow 00:07:53.128$ standpoint that it's not ATMB driven

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}53.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}54.820$ tumor at least not obviously and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:07:54.880 --> 00:07:56.707 maybe you can break down the types

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}07{:}56{.}707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}58{.}399$ of mutations a little bit more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:07:58.400 --> 00:08:00.045 I was just talking to David about

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:08:00.045 --> 00:08:01.480 this last night,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.520$ but you know there's it's not obvious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}03.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}04.625$ There have been several attempts

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}04.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}06.518$ to look at TMB as a predictor for

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:06.518 \rightarrow 00:08:08.247$ responses and most of the large clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.920$ trials that have been performed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}09{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}11{.}466$ have have released their data have

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:11.466 \rightarrow 00:08:12.864$ not shown this and certainly David

 $00:08:12.864 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.479$ has been on the forefront of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:08:14.480 --> 00:08:16.230 But if you look across some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:16.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.989$ the major phase three trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:17.989 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.879$ have at least released their data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}19{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}21{.}704$ there's not a really a signal at all

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:21.704 \rightarrow 00:08:23.239$ with respect tumor mutation burden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}23{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25{.}844$ We've looked in David and others have

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:25.844 \rightarrow 00:08:28.288$ looked at whether mutations in PBM one

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}28{.}288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}30{.}580$ or loss of nine P which is a common

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:30.580 \rightarrow 00:08:32.760$ event in metastatic kidney cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:32.760 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.288$ whether that's associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:34.288 \rightarrow 00:08:35.434$ immune infiltration patterns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:35.440 \dashrightarrow 00:08:37.636$ There may be some signals there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}37{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}39{.}565$ It's not a clear biomarker though and

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}39{.}565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}42{.}165$ and that sort of has been lacking from a

 $00:08:42.165 \rightarrow 00:08:43.960$ mutational and copy number standpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}43{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}45{.}752$ So I think one of the things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:45.752 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.356$ is unique about kidney cancer is

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:47.356 \rightarrow 00:08:49.369$ that you know we've started to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:49.369 \rightarrow 00:08:51.199$ many years ago now at transcriptomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:51.200 \rightarrow 00:08:52.708$ predictors because the mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:08:52.708 --> 00:08:54.970 are clearly and copy number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:08:55.033 \rightarrow 00:08:57.223$ events are clearly not sufficient to

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}57{.}223 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59{.}515$ determine who's going to respond at

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}08{:}59{.}515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}01{.}440$ least from a biomarker standpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:01.440 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.632$ And you can just take a very simple NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:09:03.632 --> 00:09:05.514 metric of the uniqueness of kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:05.514 \rightarrow 00:09:08.176$ cancer and this I just plot out you

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:09:08.176 --> 00:09:09.916 know VEGFA and CD8 infiltration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:09.920 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.320$ This was an older slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:11.320 \dashrightarrow 00:09:12.994$ but I like showing it 'cause I think it

 $00:09:12.994 \rightarrow 00:09:14.556$ shows the uniqueness of kidney cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:14.560 \rightarrow 00:09:15.102$ clear cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:15.102 \dashrightarrow 00:09:16.999$ at least with respect to some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:16.999 \rightarrow 00:09:18.800$ the micro environmental genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:18.800 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.200$ And we know that they're just

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:21.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.675$ dominated by high infiltration of CD8

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:09:23.675 --> 00:09:25.675 cells and high angiogenic programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:25.680 \longrightarrow 00:09:27.479$ So the question of course and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}09{:}27{.}479 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}29{.}163$ was shown across cancers and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:09:29.163 --> 00:09:30.879 really distinct from its from the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:30.880 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.240$ from the normal tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:32.240 \rightarrow 00:09:35.240$ If you look at for example lung cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

00:09:35.240 --> 00:09:35.542 many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00:09:35.542 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.656$ much of the lung itself is very

NOTE Confidence: 0.908135683333334

 $00{:}09{:}37.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}38.260$ mean infiltrated

 $00:09:38.320 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.000$ likely due to smoking or other

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}09{:}40{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}41{.}113$ other carcinogenic features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:09:41.113 --> 00:09:42.597 But the kidney itself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:42.600 \longrightarrow 00:09:44.150$ the normal kidney is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:09:44.150 --> 00:09:45.080 particularly mean infiltrated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.300$ but the tumors are often very

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:47.300 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.040$ dramatically infiltrated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09{:}48.040 \dashrightarrow 00:09{:}50.050$ So there's something very distinct

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}09{:}50{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}52{.}060$ about the actual tumor itself

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:52.123 \dashrightarrow 00:09:54.098$ rather than the underlying organ

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:54.098 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.073$ that it's that's derived from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:56.080 \dashrightarrow 00:09:58.352$ This is work we did when when I

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:09:58.352 \rightarrow 00:10:00.140$ was just starting out and we we

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:10:00.140 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.384$ you know we we used immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:10:02.384 \rightarrow 00:10:04.354$ deconvolution strategies to show this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:10:04.360 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.535$ You could take signatures for

- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- 00:10:07.535 --> 00:10:10.530 T cells or for macrophages,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- 00:10:10.530 --> 00:10:11.880 NK cells etcetera.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- 00:10:11.880 --> 00:10:14.580 And you can start just deconvoluting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}14.653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}16.837$ bulk RNA sequencing data and start
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}16.837 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}19.159$ to try to understand where tumors
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}19{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}21{.}000$ or particular samples might might
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- 00:10:21.000 --> 00:10:23.305 fall in a spectrum and and you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}23.305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24.955$ can use this to also subgroup.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}24.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.912$ So we use this strategy to kind of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}26{.}912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28{.}555$ think about tumor micro environmental
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:10:28.555 \rightarrow 00:10:30.385$ subgroups within kidney cancer and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}10{:}30{.}385 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}32{.}294$ this was our first attempt about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:10:32.294 \rightarrow 00:10:34.220$ eight or nine years ago to look at you NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- 00:10:34.273 --> 00:10:35.978 know whether there's these enriched
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- 00:10:35.978 --> 00:10:38.000 groups and whether there's you know NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:10:38.000 \rightarrow 00:10:39.680$ other groups within kidney cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}39{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41{.}760$ Maybe that would sort of explain why you

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}41.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}43.497$ see some some really great responses

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}43.497 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}45.771$ in the streaming top And we we did

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:10:45.771 --> 00:10:47.635 see that we saw you could clearly see

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}47.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}49.320$ these T cell infiltrated clusters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}49{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}50{.}896$ You could see at this point we really

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:10:50.896 --> 00:10:52.079 didn't think about angiogenesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:10:52.080 --> 00:10:54.036 but in retrospect you know you've

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}54.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}55.655$ seen angiogenic cluster and we'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}55{.}655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}57{.}475$ talk more about that in a minute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}10{:}57{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}59{.}580$ And you know it did correlate with

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:10:59.580 \rightarrow 00:11:01.440$ certain genetic programs mostly

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}01{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}03{.}520$ antigen presenting machinery programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}03.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}06.600$ So there was an up regulation of antigen

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:06.600 \rightarrow 00:11:08.280$ presenting machinery transcript,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}11{:}08{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}10{.}023$ but it wasn't clear still from this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}11{:}10{.}023 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}11{.}918$ point what was actually driving this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:11.920 \rightarrow 00:11:15.200$ We we looked at genetics,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:15.200 \longrightarrow 00:11:16.550$ common mutations and wasn't at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}11{:}16.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}18.190$ least obvious at the time when
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:18.190 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.355$ we first did this study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:19.360 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.272$ although that's evolved a bit and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:21.272 \rightarrow 00:11:23.144$ that same approach was applied by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}11{:}23.144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.960$ Genentech when they first published
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:24.960 \rightarrow 00:11:26.796$ and then analyze the EMOTION trial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:26.800 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.504$ This was the first attempt to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}11{:}28.504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}30.280$ combine VEGF and IO the rapies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:30.280 \rightarrow 00:11:33.240$ They used tizolizumab and bevacizumab,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00{:}11{:}33{.}240$ --> $00{:}11{:}35{.}556$ which is a VEGF monoclonal antibody.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625
- $00:11:35.560 \rightarrow 00:11:36.164$ And this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:36.164 \rightarrow 00:11:37.976$ this trial was negative in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}37{.}976$ --> $00{:}11{:}39{.}800$ of improving the standard of care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}39{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}41{.}016$ but it was biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:11:41.016 --> 00:11:43.607 Biomarker Rich and I give a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}43.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}46.043$ credit to Genentech for not only doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}46.043 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47.978$ phenomenal genomic work but also

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:11:47.978 --> 00:11:49.878 making it all publicly available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:49.880 \rightarrow 00:11:51.356$ which is something that other companies

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}51{.}356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}53{.}400$ have have been a little reluctant to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:53.400 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.534$ So and maybe it was because it

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:54.534 \rightarrow 00:11:55.280$ was a negative study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:55.280 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.400$ they were willing to share so much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:11:56.400 \rightarrow 00:11:58.356$ but it really was very helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}11{:}58{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}01{.}990$ And David McDermott and others from

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:12:01.990 \rightarrow 00:12:03.920$ Boston performed really the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:12:03.920 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.900$ type of analysis in the context

00:12:05.965 --> 00:12:08.185 of systemic therapy to show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}12{:}08.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09.665$ these micro environmental groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

00:12:09.728 --> 00:12:11.723 angi
ogenesis and T cell infiltration

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}12{:}11.723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}13.718$ and myeloid programs may stratify NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:12:13.720 \rightarrow 00:12:15.720$ patients into different groups but

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:12:15.720 \rightarrow 00:12:17.720$ also may associate with response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}12{:}17.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.560$ And one thing I would point out I

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00:12:19.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:21.306$ think it it it's sort of logical

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}12{:}21.306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.668$ that a tumor that may have a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86279424625

 $00{:}12{:}23.668 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}25.276$ T effector cells would respond well

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:12:25.280 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.008$ to amitotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:12:26.008 --> 00:12:28.556 But you know what they also showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:12:28.556 --> 00:12:30.884 was that myeloid populations as as

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:12:30.884 --> 00:12:33.328 determined by again a gene program

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}12{:}33{.}328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}35{.}758$ we're we're driving resistance also.

 $00:12:35.760 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.832$ So you could be AT effect or

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:12:37.832 --> 00:12:40.582 high tumor but if you had a high

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:12:40.582 --> 00:12:42.372 myeloid program it could superse de

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:12:42.444 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.852$ that impact and and in fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}12{:}44.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}46.496$ actually show you know dramatically

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}12{:}46.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}48.116$ different responses in that context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}12{:}48{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}50{.}184$ So that really sort of laid the groundwork

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:12:50.184 \rightarrow 00:12:51.915$ for not only the micro environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}12{:}51{.}915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54{.}013$ relevant but also it could it could

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:12:54.013 --> 00:12:55.843 predict responses and maybe give us

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}12{:}55{.}843 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}57{.}740$ some insight into into resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:12:57.740 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.680$ We applied that same strategy initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}00{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}03{.}225$ to just a VEGF cohort only and this was NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

1011 Connuclice: 0.052101055

00:13:03.225 --> 00:13:05.080 work that I did with with Bob Moecher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}05{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}06{.}858$ one of my mentors at at Sloan

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:06.858 \rightarrow 00:13:08.000$ Kettering for many years.

 $00:13:08.000 \rightarrow 00:13:10.160$ And this was just looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:10.160 \longrightarrow 00:13:12.400$ the first trial that compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:12.400 \dashrightarrow 00:13:14.280$ two different VEGF inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:14.280 \rightarrow 00:13:16.233$ At the time we had really sunitinib

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}16{.}233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}18{.}920$ and this was the first attempt to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}18{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}21{.}158$ a different strategy or a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}21{.}158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}23{.}391$ VEGF inhibitor and you know it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:23.391 \rightarrow 00:13:25.518$ really more to look at tolerability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}25{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}27{.}278$ There was no difference really in

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:13:27.280 --> 00:13:28.436 responses but actually Piszopinib

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}28{.}436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}30{.}574$ but this you know showed a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}30{.}574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}31{.}998$ toxicity profile for patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}32{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}33{.}440$ So that became the standard of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:13:33.440 --> 00:13:35.136 care ELISA Memorial for many years

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}35{.}136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}36{.}851$ until obviously we developed next

 $00:13:36.851 \rightarrow 00:13:37.880$ generations and immunotherapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:37.880 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.805$ But at this time we took a

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:13:39.805 --> 00:13:40.355 transcriptomic approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:40.360 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.684$ So we had microarray data from

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}43.684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}45.710$ Novartis and we had looked at this

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}45{.}710$ --> $00{:}13{:}47{.}356$ question of whether you can identify NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}47{.}356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}49{.}491$ subgroups and we found you know 4

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}49{.}491 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}51{.}093$ transcriptomic subgroups at the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}51{.}093 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}52{.}953$ they tended to really stratify patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:13:52.960 --> 00:13:53.260 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}13{:}53{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}55{.}360$ all these patients received EDF first line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:55.360 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.930$ so clean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:55.930 \rightarrow 00:13:57.640$ clean cohort and you could clearly

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:57.640 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.638$ see a difference in in groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:13:59.640 \rightarrow 00:14:00.949$ And there was a green group here

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:00.949 \rightarrow 00:14:02.469$ that was very responsive and a red

- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:02.469 \rightarrow 00:14:03.837$ group that was very not responsive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:03.840 \rightarrow 00:14:05.240$ And then there was these yellow and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:05.240 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.673$ blue in the middle and the green
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:06.673 \rightarrow 00:14:08.172$ group really had a lot of angiogenic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- 00:14:08.172 --> 00:14:09.948 program and that made sense, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00{:}14{:}09{.}948 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}13{.}440$ You know, if you have a lot of angiogenesis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:13.440 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.850$ it makes sense that you would
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:14.850 \rightarrow 00:14:15.555$ respond very well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:15.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:18.038$ But the red group which was #4,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:18.040 \rightarrow 00:14:19.840$ that was the one that didn't respond well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:19.840 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.560$ They were actually the worst but they had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00{:}14{:}21{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}23{.}320$ the second highest amount of angiogenesis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:14:23.320 \rightarrow 00:14:24.398$ So why why was that the case?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00{:}14{:}24{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}26{.}878$ Why didn't they stratify nicely by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00{:}14{:}26.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}28.798$ by angiogenic program and and when we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:28.798 \rightarrow 00:14:30.640$ compared that group to the other groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:30.640 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.383$ we could see that it was really

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}14{:}32{.}383 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34{.}080$ being dominated by a myeloid program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:14:34.080 --> 00:14:36.755 So despite having high angiogenic

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:14:36.755 --> 00:14:38.360 phenotype or transcript,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}14{:}38{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40{.}856$ they were they were reversing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}14{:}40.856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}43.617$ response based on an infiltration of

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:43.617 \rightarrow 00:14:46.167$ myeloid myeloids at least inferred

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00{:}14{:}46{.}167 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}49{.}382$ by by microarray data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

00:14:49.382 --> 00:14:49.853 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:49.853 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.679$ so that suggested that it could

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:52.680 \rightarrow 00:14:55.506$ actually be driving a response overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:55.506 \rightarrow 00:14:58.353$ and the micro environment may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:14:58.353 \rightarrow 00:15:01.135$ useful in understanding biomarkers in in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:15:01.135 \longrightarrow 00:15:03.075$ in metastatic kidney cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635

 $00:15:03.080 \rightarrow 00:15:04.106$ And then actually this was something

- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:15:04.106 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.410$ that we did and at the end and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.832781635
- $00:15:05.410 \rightarrow 00:15:06.480$ actually the my fellow at the time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}15{:}06{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}07{.}392$ one of the urology fellows at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:07.392 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.400$ the time who was working in,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:08.400 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.816$ in my group actually had the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:09.816 \rightarrow 00:15:10.760$ suggestion that we look,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:10.760 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.594$ we kind of left them all together
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:12.594 \rightarrow 00:15:14.159$ because there's open Evans Sunitnib,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}15{:}14.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}15.918$ we're sort of both VEGF inhibitors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}15{:}15{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18{.}040$ But we know that the TKIS target
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- 00:15:18.040 --> 00:15:19.720 lots of different kinases,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:19.720 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.200$ not they're not super specific
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:22.200 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.678$ and actually if you look at the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:24.678 \dashrightarrow 00:15:26.240$ macrophage and angiogenic groups,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:15:26.240 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.160$ you could actually see that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

00:15:28.160 --> 00:15:30.680 Pizzopinib has quite a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}15{:}30.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}31.493$ stratification than ts unitiv.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}15{:}31{.}493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}33{.}390$ This suggests to us we we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:33.436 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.878$ talk about too much in the paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}15{:}34.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}36.952$ but it it really suggested that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}15{:}36{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38{.}896$ targets of these TKIS may also actually NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:38.896 \rightarrow 00:15:40.480$ be driving some of their responses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:40.480 \rightarrow 00:15:42.960$ So some of these kinases are present on

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:42.960 \rightarrow 00:15:45.477$ on immune cell populations for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}15{:}45{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47{.}454$ And the fact that these biomarkers

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}15{:}47{.}454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}49{.}136$ were actually different with respect

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:49.136 \rightarrow 00:15:50.984$ to the different Tkis was something

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:50.984 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.958$ that that we've now followed up on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

00:15:52.960 --> 00:15:54.766 And I think it's a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

00:15:54.766 - 00:15:56.320 interesting finding that he made.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:15:56.320 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.245$ And this just leads back to the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}15{:}58{.}245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}59{.}977$ same concept that what Dave
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}15{:}59{.}977 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}01{.}944$ showed in in this in this beautiful
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:16:02.005 \rightarrow 00:16:03.883$ paper from the from the Genentech
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:16:03.883 \rightarrow 00:16:06.150$ study others have looked at micro
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}16{:}06{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}07{.}710$ environmental features in other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}16{:}07{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}09{.}344$ in other more positive trials.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- 00:16:09.344 --> 00:16:09.920 So this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:16:09.920 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.397$ this was also sort of a negative,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}16{:}11{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}13{.}549$ well not negative but has not has
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:16:13.549 \rightarrow 00:16:15.520$ not been brought forward further.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- 00:16:15.520 --> 00:16:19.615 This was the Javelin 101 study again
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}16{:}19.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}22.168$ avolumab and exit inib again another
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}16{:}22.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}26.145$ combination of PD one and and VEGF
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:16:26.145 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.800$ and they focused on a a lymphocytic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}16{:}30{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}33{.}620$ signature identified 26 genes again
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:33.620 \rightarrow 00:16:36.120$ specific signature for specific trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}16{:}36{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}37{.}752$ Some of the challenges of these have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:37.752 \rightarrow 00:16:39.476$ you know applying it to other data sets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:39.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.350$ But again you could see the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:42.350 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.126$ micro environmental features being

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}16{:}44.126 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}46.038$ associated with response here

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:46.040 \rightarrow 00:16:47.840$ and suggesting you know that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:47.840 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.719$ could utilize this as a strategy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}16{:}49{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}51{.}946$ And then there have been subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:16:51.946 \rightarrow 00:16:55.304$ efforts by by collaborative

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}16{:}55{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}56{.}840$ groups including Genentech again

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}16{:}56{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}59{.}175$ to integrate what we know about

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}16{:}59{.}175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}00{.}623$ mutations and those evolutionary

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:17:00.623 \rightarrow 00:17:02.857$ subtypes I showed you earlier into

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}02.857 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}04.677$ and the micro environmental feature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:17:04.680 \rightarrow 00:17:06.682$ So if we have the micro environment

- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}06.682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.878$ and we know the genetics that are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:17:08.880 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.078$ that arise as kidney cancers evolve,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:17:12.080 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.089$ could they could they be sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}14.089 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}16.172$ grouped together to form these kind
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- 00:17:16.172 --> 00:17:17.720 of different molecular subgroups?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}17{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}19{.}352$ And I think there's been some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:17:19.352 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.440$ attempt to do this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- 00:17:20.440 --> 00:17:21.600 I think it's improving,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}21.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24.270$ but you know you sort of have the sense
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:17:24.270 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.160$ that there are these different angiogenic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:17:26.160 \rightarrow 00:17:27.336$ stromal and angiogenic alone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}27{.}336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}29{.}462$ So some of these may have this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}29{.}462 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31{.}292$ myeloid phenotype that I showed you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00{:}17{:}31{.}292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33{.}264$ earlier and just a purely angiogenic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333
- $00:17:33.264 \rightarrow 00:17:35.076$ tumor maybe the purely angiogenic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:17:35.076 \rightarrow 00:17:37.290$ tumors would respond really well to

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}37{.}349 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}39{.}148$ VEGF alone and those are tend to

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

00:17:39.148 --> 00:17:41.436 be the less aggressive tumors PBR 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}41.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}43.228$ mutated and then you have the ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}43.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}44.515$ that are myeloid and angiogenic

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

00:17:44.515 --> 00:17:45.930 and those actually don't respond NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:17:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.100$ at all to to VEGF inhibitors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00:17:48.100 \rightarrow 00:17:49.200$ then you have these proliferative

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}49{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}50{.}320$ ones and and other ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}50{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}52{.}042$ So we're starting to get a sense

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

00:17:52.042 --> 00:17:53.920 that maybe you can subgroup kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.779711778333333

 $00{:}17{:}53{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}55{.}360$ cancers into those features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}17{:}55{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}57{.}115$ And then came along this

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:17:57.115 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.519$ notion of single cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}17{:}58.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.680$ And there have been a series of papers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:00.680 \longrightarrow 00:18:01.760$ one of which David LED,
$00:18:01.760 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.489$ but that came out from the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}03{.}489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}05{.}338$ because we had done all of all

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:18:05.338 --> 00:18:06.916 this work on bulk RNA sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:06.920 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.870$ And as the fields across

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:08.870 \rightarrow 00:18:10.040$ cancers have evolved,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:10.040 \rightarrow 00:18:13.144$ we started utilizing single cell to not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:13.144 \rightarrow 00:18:16.719$ get a better sense of what was happening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:18:16.720 --> 00:18:18.382 but also really understand you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}18{.}382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20{.}559$ what are the specific features of these of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:20.560 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.838$ of the of the micro environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:21.838 \rightarrow 00:18:23.480$ in a much more high resolution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}23{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}24{.}894$ So the advantage of bulk RNAC of

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:18:24.894 --> 00:18:26.200 course is that you can do big,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}26{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}28{.}350$ big numbers of samples because

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.640$ it's relatively inexpensive.

00:18:29.640 --> 00:18:30.918 Single cell gives you deep dive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:30.920 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.280$ but often the cohorts were

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

 $00:18:32.280 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.640$ much more modest in size.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:33.640 \rightarrow 00:18:34.625$ So I think there's constantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}34.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}36.079$ a need to go back and forth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}36{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}37{.}235$ If you find a signal in one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:37.240 \longrightarrow 00:18:38.680$ you have to validate in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

 $00:18:38.680 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.640$ other so to speak.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:39.640 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.752$ And so we we did this in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:43.752 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.866$ clear cell focusing really on

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}45{.}866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}49{.}142$ patients that had received just dual

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:49.142 \rightarrow 00:18:51.840$ immunotherapy with PD1 and CTLA 4.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:51.840 \dashrightarrow 00:18:54.756$ We focused on 6 patients initially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}18{:}54{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}57{.}240$ When we did this together with Ming Lee,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:18:57.240 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.520$ one of my immunology mentors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:18:58.520 --> 00:18:59.008 Christina Leslie,

 $00:18:59.008 \rightarrow 00:19:00.716$ who's a computational biologist and a very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:00.720 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.108$ very talented graduate student at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:03.108 \rightarrow 00:19:06.112$ time who's finishing his post doc at Harvard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

00:19:06.112 --> 00:19:07.360 now Shirag Krishna.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:07.360 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.461$ And we looked at patients that had

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

 $00{:}19{:}10{.}461 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}13{.}512$ either were were high risk and not

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:13.512 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.753$ had not received PD one right away or

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

 $00:19:16.753 \dashrightarrow 00:19:21.030$ versus ones that had had Ipinivo. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:21.030 \rightarrow 00:19:23.760$ And were eventually went on to surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:19:23.760 -> 00:19:25.096 One of the unique things I I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:25.096 \rightarrow 00:19:26.790$ as a surgeon is that we're able

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

 $00{:}19{:}26.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}28.379$ to get tissue after treatment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}19{:}28.379 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}29.801$ kidney cancer has evolved so much

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}19{:}29{.}801 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}31{.}534$ so because of the response rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:31.534 \rightarrow 00:19:33.224$ now to upfront immunotherapy that

 $00:19:33.224 \rightarrow 00:19:35.390$ most patients if they come in with

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:19:35.390 --> 00:19:36.825 metastatic disease will get up front

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:36.878 \rightarrow 00:19:38.630$ systemic therapy and then we're being NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:38.630 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.643$ asked to operate on them later on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:40.643 \rightarrow 00:19:42.610$ So that gives us a unique opportunity

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:19:42.668 --> 00:19:44.398 to study tissue after treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:44.400 \rightarrow 00:19:46.176$ which is something I think really

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:19:46.176 --> 00:19:47.870 unique to kidney cancer amongst many

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:47.870 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.400$ solid tumors we have this opportunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}19{:}49{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}51{.}262$ So we were able to utilize that

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:51.262 \longrightarrow 00:19:52.628$ strategy here and this sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:52.628 \rightarrow 00:19:54.172$ gave us a broader sense and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:54.172 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.672$ has been replicated I think by

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:19:55.672 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.063$ many other single cell studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:19:57.063 --> 00:19:58.251 including David's really Seminole

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}19{:}58{.}251 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00{.}524$ work in this and you can kind of

 $00:20:00.524 \rightarrow 00:20:02.440$ get a sense of what's happening now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:02.440 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.492$ One of the things that's interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:04.492 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.084$ about a quirk of single cell is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:07.084 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.638$ you know there's for those of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}20{:}08.638 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.174$ familiar with the technology is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.96644356111111

 $00{:}20{:}10.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}11.944$ you know there's generally at least if

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:11.944 \rightarrow 00:20:13.760$ you do single cell and not single nucleus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}20{:}13.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}15.790$ you have to do some sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:15.790 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.520$ sorting and a lot of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

00:20:17.520 --> 00:20:18.704 Tumor cell populations actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:18.704 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.480$ die die off from that process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00:20:20.480 \rightarrow 00:20:22.856$ They're very fragile for some ironically

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}20{:}22{.}856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}25{.}443$ and immune cells will often survive

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}20{:}25{.}443 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}27{.}315$ although you lose neutrophils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.966443561111111

 $00{:}20{:}27{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}28{.}940$ So kind of interesting quirk

 $00:20:28.940 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.560$ of any sort of single

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:20:30.628 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.825$ cell study that you do, you lose a

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:20:32.825 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.235$ lot of the cancer cell populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:20:34.240 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.464$ But we're able to kind of get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}35{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}36{.}955$ good sense of what's going on in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}36{.}955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}38{.}091$ immune cell population and you get NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}38.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}39.267$ a general sense that and this has

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:20:39.267 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.040$ been replicated by our flow analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:20:41.040 --> 00:20:43.544 over the many years that about 6040

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}43.544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}46.440$ to 60% of the immune compartment is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}46{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}48{.}904$ is made-up of T cell and you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:20:48.904 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.920$ a good amount of Tams in this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}50{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}53{.}440$ And then a whole bunch of other

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:20:53.440 --> 00:20:55.312 populations including B cells and K

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:20:55.312 \rightarrow 00:20:57.240$ cells and dendritic cell populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}20{:}57{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}59{.}858$ but they're really dominated by these T

 $00{:}20{:}59{.}858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}02{.}996$ cell and and and and Tam populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:21:03.000 \rightarrow 00:21:04.362$ and you could further phenotype them

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:21:04.362 \rightarrow 00:21:06.119$ into you know and this has been done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:06.120 --> 00:21:06.648 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:06.648 --> 00:21:08.232 everyone's got their own slightly different

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}21{:}08{.}232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}09{.}768$ way of of phenotyping populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:21:09.768 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.502$ but this allows to sort of get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:12.502 --> 00:21:14.228 sense of what's happening, yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}21{:}14{.}228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}16{.}368$ in both primary sensitivity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:16.368 --> 00:21:18.080 and primary resistant patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:18.080 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:21:20.264 And you know this one again we

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:20.264 --> 00:21:22.271 had epinivo resistant and a mixed

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}21{:}22{.}271 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23{.}956$ response and a complete response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:21:23.960 --> 00:21:25.215 complete response patients are always

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}21{:}25{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}26{.}722$ interesting because why are we operating

- $00:21:26.722 \rightarrow 00:21:28.394$ on them if they have a complete response?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00{:}21{:}28{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29{.}720$ Well, when I say complete response,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00{:}21{:}29{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}31{.}500$ I mean that the tumor's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:31.500 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.280$ mass itself is not viable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- 00:21:33.280 --> 00:21:35.240 It's it's it, it there's a mass there,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:35.240 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.160$ we we take it out.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- 00:21:36.160 --> 00:21:37.640 But actually under the microscope,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:37.640 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.740$ there's no tumor left.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- 00:21:38.740 --> 00:21:40.115 It's just a conglomerate of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00{:}21{:}40.115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}42.680$ immune cells and fibroblasts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00{:}21{:}42.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}44.185$ And so that's kind of an interesting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:44.185 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.395$ population to look at because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00{:}21{:}45{.}395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}46{.}439$ what's what's residual there.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:46.440 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.690$ And there we found these tissue
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:48.690 \rightarrow 00:21:50.622$ resident T cell populations that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814
- $00:21:50.622 \rightarrow 00:21:53.708$ were very abundant in the in the

 $00:21:53.708 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.325$ in the residual mass of the of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}21{:}56{.}325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}58{.}038$ of that of that kidney even though

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:21:58.038 \rightarrow 00:21:59.879$ it was there was no tumor left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:21:59.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:01.338$ And then we found within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}01{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}02{.}610$ patients that were not responding

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:02.610 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.626$ it really you know there was T cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:04.626 \rightarrow 00:22:06.411$ there but it was really dominated

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:22:06.411 -> 00:22:07.595 by specific Tam populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:22:07.600 --> 00:22:08.920 This was a primary resistant patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}08{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}10{.}994$ He had had big tumor, big lymph nodes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}10{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}12{.}601$ We gave him a trial with Epinivo to

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}12.601 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}14.033$ see if that would help and it didn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}14.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16.120$ So we still end up operating on him,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}16.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}17.596$ no response in the tumor what soever.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}17.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}19.532$ And you could see this was really

 $00:22:19.532 \rightarrow 00:22:20.892$ a Tam dominated tumor type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}20.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}22.488$ So it started giving us insights

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:22.488 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.241$ that really this may be associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}24{.}241 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}25{.}117$ again small numbers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}25{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}26{.}506$ So you really have to start building

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}26.506 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}27.785$ that out and you can develop

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:27.785 \rightarrow 00:22:29.075$ signatures which is what we did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:29.080 \rightarrow 00:22:31.882$ We actually took the single cell genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}31.882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}34.294$ and from the different clusters and

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}34{.}294 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36{.}746$ overlaid them on some of these genomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}36.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}38.076$ signatures that have been published.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:38.080 \rightarrow 00:22:39.914$ The javelin when I mentioned the the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}39{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}40{.}247$ the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}40{.}247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}42{.}536$ the genomic ones from Genentech and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:42.536 \rightarrow 00:22:45.132$ started saying like what are the actual

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:45.132 \rightarrow 00:22:46.636$ populations that they're capturing.

 $00:22:46.640 \longrightarrow 00:22:48.831$ You get a better sense that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

00:22:48.831 --> 00:22:50.760 are some dominant Tam populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}50{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}53{.}040$ and that some of these populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00:22:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.416$ may be potentially targetable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910131814

 $00{:}22{:}54{.}416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}56{.}880$ And I'll talk about that in in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:22:56.935 --> 00:22:58.838 moment. But I want to bring your

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}22{:}58.838 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}00.760$ attention to some of these a denosine

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:00.760 --> 00:23:02.515 signatures that were were published

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}02{.}515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}04{.}643$ from an HUAR inhibitor which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}04.643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06.521$ something that has been shown to

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}06{.}521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}08{.}120$ potentially shift Tam phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:08.120 --> 00:23:09.848 So, so this was sort of an interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}09{.}848 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}11{.}712$ way for us to look at the data and

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:11.712 --> 00:23:13.164 you can develop signatures based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}13{.}164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}15{.}680$ the single cell data and compare them NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:15.680 \rightarrow 00:23:18.695$ to existing signatures to see if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:18.695 --> 00:23:20.750 could further stratify patients and

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}20{.}819 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}23{.}052$ responses across different different data

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:23.052 \rightarrow 00:23:25.160$ sets And and we were able to do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:25.160 \longrightarrow 00:23:26.760$ And then the question is also, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}26.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}29.400$ is there a relationship between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:29.400 --> 00:23:31.844 underlying micro genetic micro environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:31.844 \rightarrow 00:23:34.994$ and these specific immune micro environments?

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:35.000 --> 00:23:36.840 So I I showed you again on bulk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:36.840 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.412$ maybe there's these different

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:38.412 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.198$ sub classifications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:39.200 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.624$ but we also know there's a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:40.624 --> 00:23:41.762 heterogeneity in kidney tumors, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:41.762 \longrightarrow 00:23:43.940$ So we know that if you took a kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:44.005 \rightarrow 00:23:46.315$ tumor and you sequence different regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:46.320 \rightarrow 00:23:47.580$ Charlie Swanton showed this many years

00:23:47.580 --> 00:23:49.478 ago in a famous paper New England Journal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:49.480 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.542$ intratumal heterogeneity exists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:50.542 \rightarrow 00:23:52.666$ Does that same thing apply to

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:52.666 \rightarrow 00:23:54.478$ the micro environment as well?

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}23{:}54{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}55{.}860$ And that's something of of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:55.860 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.430$ if you're going to develop a

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:23:57.430 --> 00:23:58.638 biomarker or suggest something,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:58.640 \longrightarrow 00:23:59.636$ you have to think about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:23:59.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.504$ And this is work that we did in

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}01{.}504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02{.}893$ collaboration with Illumina where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:02.893 \rightarrow 00:24:04.633$ really thought about this question of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}04.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}04.816$ OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}04{.}816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}06{.}224$ now we have a good sense of what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}06{.}224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}07{.}560$ going on in the micro environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:07.560 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.666$ We have a good sense of what's

 $00:24:08.666 \rightarrow 00:24:09.617$ going on in the underlying

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:24:09.617 -> 00:24:10.919 genomics and how does that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}10{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}13{.}320$ how does that relate to the individual tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.133$ And one of the reasons why clinically

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}15{.}133 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}16{.}509$ that's interesting is 'cause if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:24:16.509 --> 00:24:18.805 look at at at data sets where the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:24:18.805 --> 00:24:20.598 primary tumor's still in place in

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}20.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22.410$ the with the patient with metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:22.410 \longrightarrow 00:24:23.760$ disease and they get immunotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:23.760 \rightarrow 00:24:25.320$ often the Mets will respond well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:25.320 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.795$ but the primary tumors maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:26.795 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.912$ only shrink modestly, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}27{.}912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}28{.}840$ So there's not a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}28.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}31.038$ there's not that same level of response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:31.040 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.400$ And one hypothesis is that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:32.400 \rightarrow 00:24:32.713$ well,

00:24:32.713 --> 00:24:34.591 it's because the primary tumor is

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}34{.}591 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}36{.}184$ more clonally diverse and the Mets

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:36.184 \longrightarrow 00:24:38.228$ is just a a clone that was able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:38.228 \rightarrow 00:24:39.998$ metastasize out that was selected for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}40.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}42.392$ So when you get a response in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:42.392 \rightarrow 00:24:44.314$ Mets maybe it's because there's just

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:44.314 \rightarrow 00:24:45.399$ a clone that's really responsive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:45.400 \rightarrow 00:24:46.723$ but the primary may only have that

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}46{.}723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}48{.}389$ clone in in part of it and sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:48.389 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.439$ of been our rationalization for

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:49.485 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.700$ continuing to operate on these

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:24:50.700 \rightarrow 00:24:52.314$ patients because I tell them well

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

00:24:52.314 --> 00:24:54.678 a you know I like operating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}54{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}56{.}660$ But more more fundamentally it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}24{:}56.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}58.862$ actually because we think that you

 $00:24:58.862 \rightarrow 00:25:00.194$ know we're we're removing the diverse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}25{:}00{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01{.}478$ the biological diversity of them Even

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:25:01.478 \rightarrow 00:25:03.280$ if they've had a good response up front,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:25:03.280 \rightarrow 00:25:05.359$ the chance for them to develop persistence

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:25:05.359 \rightarrow 00:25:07.955$ down the road may come from from the primary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}25{:}07{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}10{.}246$ And so we tried to look at this with

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}25{:}10.246$ --> $00{:}25{:}11.839$ multi regional sequencing again

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:25:11.839 \rightarrow 00:25:13.959$ relatively modest numbers but we

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}25{:}13.959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}16.007$ we utilized the combinations of DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}25{:}16.007 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}18.177$ and RNA and and TCR and different

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00{:}25{:}18.177 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}20.462$ things within within tumors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.888787088181818

 $00:25:20.462 \longrightarrow 00:25:22.290$ had been exposed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}25{:}22{.}372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}24{.}164$ immuno therapies as part of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}25{:}24.164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.560$ trial that we ran and others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}25{:}25{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}27{.}990$ And so we were able to look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:25:27.990 \rightarrow 00:25:29.932$ question of whether overall immune

- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}25{:}29{.}932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31{.}876$ diversity is associated with,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:25:31.880 --> 00:25:33.880 I'm sorry, overall genetic diversity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}25{:}33{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35{.}880$ is associated with particular micro
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:35.880 \rightarrow 00:25:36.867$ micro environmental phenotypes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:25:36.867 -> 00:25:39.170 Indeed, we found at least in this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}25{:}39{.}226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}41{.}368$ study that if you were a very high lead
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:41.368 \rightarrow 00:25:43.080$ diverse tumor from a genomic sample,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:43.080 \rightarrow 00:25:44.280$ you were more likely to be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:44.280 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.080$ a myeloid high tumor,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:45.080 \rightarrow 00:25:48.152$ which was interesting and and vice
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:48.152 \rightarrow 00:25:51.022$ versa with respect to some of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:25:51.022 --> 00:25:52.118 antigen presenting machinery genes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:25:52.120 \rightarrow 00:25:54.508$ So the ITH tumors were actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}25{:}54{.}508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}57{.}068$ lower with respect to the APM genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}25{:}57.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59.406$ and actually if you took a specific
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:25:59.406 \rightarrow 00:26:02.020$ tumor and you actually marked out

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}26{:}02.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03.792$ the immune infiltration patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:03.800 \rightarrow 00:26:05.040$ you could start seeing evolution

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:26:06.032$ within that same tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:06.040 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.680$ So this is an example of a of

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:07.680 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.197$ a tumor that was I TH high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:09.200 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.131$ It had a lot of intratumoral heterogeneity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

00:26:11.131 --> 00:26:14.448 It was AP Bear Monsanti 2 kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

00:26:14.448 --> 00:26:15.664 micro environment or evolutionary

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:15.664 \rightarrow 00:26:17.787$ subtype and we were able to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:17.787 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.923$ at individually in different

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:18.923 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.479$ regions of this tumor to see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}26{:}20{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}22{.}013$ We found that some of the regions

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}26{:}22.013 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}23.498$ were very T cell infiltrated at

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}26{:}23.498 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}25.008$ least by RNA and some of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:25.008 \rightarrow 00:26:25.918$ were very mild and infiltrated.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:25.920 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.066$ And we were actually able to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}26{:}27.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}28.357$ track down like what were the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}26{:}28{.}357 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29{.}567$ individual genetic events that were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:29.567 \rightarrow 00:26:30.959$ occurring as this tumor developed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:26:30.960 --> 00:26:32.292 And you could see that, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:32.292 \rightarrow 00:26:33.596$ as the tumor developed,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:33.600 \rightarrow 00:26:35.968$ there was loss of HLA and maybe some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:26:35.968 --> 00:26:38.374 CDK into A&B loss which has been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}26{:}38{.}374 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}40{.}540$ associated with a more immune desert
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}26{:}40{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}42{.}640$ or less immune infiltrated micro.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:42.640 \rightarrow 00:26:44.116$ So within the same tumor itself,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}26{:}44{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}45{.}686$ you could see this evolution and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}26{:}45{.}686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47{.}501$ that was correlating with the micro
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:47.501 \rightarrow 00:26:48.581$ environmental features suggesting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:26:48.581 \rightarrow 00:26:50.381$ that there's this constant interplay
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}26{:}50{.}435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52{.}163$ And I think David has shown this and

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}26{:}52{.}163 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53{.}695$ others have suggested this constant

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:53.695 \rightarrow 00:26:55.520$ interplay between the underlying Genoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:55.520 \rightarrow 00:26:57.599$ architecture of a tumor and what's actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

00:26:57.600 --> 00:26:58.560 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:26:58.560 \rightarrow 00:27:00.288$ underlying the response micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

00:27:00.288 --> 00:27:01.440 environmentally in that tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:01.440 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.560$ Obviously we don't fully tease

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:02.560 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.880$ out the mechanism here at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:03.880 \rightarrow 00:27:06.925$ but it begs the question that there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}06{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}09{.}678$ an opportunity here to to explore this

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}09.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.360$ and what about in in the metastatic question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}11.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}12.240$ So that was another

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:12.240 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.560$ question we had in the lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}13.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}15.331$ So I've showed you everything in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:15.331 \rightarrow 00:27:16.640$ of treatment response potentially.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}16.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}18.832$ But we also wanted to know are are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:27:18.832 \rightarrow 00:27:20.640$ these micro environmental groups
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}20.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23.005$ also predicting or or associating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:27:23.005 00:27:24.230 with development of metastas,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:27:24.230 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.480$ which is a different question,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}25{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}25{.}687$ right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:27:25.687 --> 00:27:27.136 You know you could have a micro
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:27:27.136 \longrightarrow 00:27:27.877$ environment that's really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}27{.}877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}29{.}037$ important for treatment response,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:27:29.040 --> 00:27:31.116 but it may not be associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00:27:31.116 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.154$ with metastatic development.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- 00:27:32.160 --> 00:27:32.579 So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}32{.}579 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}35{.}512$ so David had had somewhat hinted at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}35{.}512 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38{.}284$ this with his work with with Ellie
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636
- $00{:}27{:}38{.}284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41{.}000$ and Tony and others at Dana Farber
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:41.000 \rightarrow 00:27:42.953$ and they showed it you know very

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}42.953 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}44.731$ elegantly in this paper that looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

00:27:44.731 --> 00:27:46.593 our paper focused on the advanced NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

10112 Connuclice: 0.001407920505050

 $00{:}27{:}46.593 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48.558$ disease and and Ibidevo treated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}48.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}51.944$ But David's work was performing single

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00:27:51.944 \rightarrow 00:27:54.476$ cell sequencing on early locally

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}54.476$ --> $00{:}27{:}55.856$ advanced in metastatic tumors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}55.856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}58.029$ at least in this work he showed this

NOTE Confidence: 0.861487926363636

 $00{:}27{:}58.029 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}59.547$ evidence of T cell exhaustion but

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}27{:}59{.}595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}01{.}311$ also this shift in the macrophage

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}01{.}311 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}03{.}040$ polarity as tumors became more

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:28:03.040 \longrightarrow 00:28:04.058$ aggressive, more metastatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}04.058 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06.361$ So suggesting to us and others that

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}06{.}361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}09{.}087$ you know maybe some of these Tams and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}09{.}087 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}10{.}918$ and myeloid populations that were so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}10{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}14{.}040$ so, so driving responses are also

- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.900$ associated with metastatic development.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:15.900 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.770$ And so for this we again utilize
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:18.770 \rightarrow 00:28:20.967$ our strategy with with going
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:20.967 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.301$ to clinical trials and we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:23.301 \rightarrow 00:28:24.886$ worked with this adjuvant study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:24.886 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.670$ So this was one of the series of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:28:26.718 --> 00:28:28.158 negative studies unfortunately,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}28{:}28{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}30{.}144$ but again the benefit of having a lot
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}28{:}30{.}144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}32{.}001$ of genomic data looking at whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:32.001 \rightarrow 00:28:33.957$ giving it a VEGF inhibitor monotherapy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:28:33.960 --> 00:28:35.670 Again Pezopinib in this case was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}28{:}35{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}36{.}810$ associated with better outcomes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:28:36.861 --> 00:28:38.523 in patients with high risk non
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:38.523 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.354$ metastatic kidney cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:28:39.360 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.184$ All these patients in this trial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:28:41.184 --> 00:28:42.400 had advanced kidney cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}42{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}46{.}520$ They had a high risk of relapse but

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:28:46.520 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.088$ but you know standard at the time NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:28:48.088 --> 00:28:50.005 was just to observe them and so there

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}28{:}50.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}52.206$ was a series of trials to see if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:28:52.206 \rightarrow 00:28:53.640$ gave a VEGF inhibitor whether that NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:28:53.640 \rightarrow 00:28:56.600$ actually was improved their survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:28:56.600 \rightarrow 00:28:58.595$ The vast majority of the studies were

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:28:58.595 --> 00:29:00.651 were -1 was sort of positive but no

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:29:00.651 -> 00:29:02.724 one has really adopted it and now

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}29{:}02{.}724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}04{.}960$ we've moved on to immunother apy but at

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:04.960 \rightarrow 00:29:07.040$ this time this was a very interesting study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:07.040 \rightarrow 00:29:09.021$ So we we compared we had microarray

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:09.021 \rightarrow 00:29:10.440$ yet again from Novartis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}29{:}10.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}12.720$ we compared the the again all high risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:12.720 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.095$ So they're they're you're sort

- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:29:14.095 00:29:15.470 of controlling for the potential
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:29:15.518 \rightarrow 00:29:16.958$ tumor confounding features right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:29:16.960 --> 00:29:18.316 They're all high risk patients and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}18.316 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}19.763$ we compared the ones that relapsed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:29:19.763 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.998$ versus the ones that didn't.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}21.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}23.412$ This is work that one of our one of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}23{.}412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}26{.}166$ our fellows LED and who who's now at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:29:26.166 \rightarrow 00:29:27.928$ Rochester with a surgeon scientist
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:29:27.928 --> 00:29:30.394 track their great guy Phil Rippolt
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}30{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}32{.}784$ with with Lynn Von from my lab who's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00:29:32.784 \rightarrow 00:29:34.828$ a senior member now and we compared
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}34.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}36.244$ the the tumors that record versus
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}36{.}244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}38{.}115$ didn't and we used an unbiased you know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- $00{:}29{:}38.115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}39.480$ whole genome approach with with this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556
- 00:29:39.480 --> 00:29:42.336 And so of course you saw things
- NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:29:42.336 --> 00:29:43.804 like EMT and mtor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:43.804 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.268$ which made sense to us because

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:45.268 \rightarrow 00:29:46.688$ those are obviously very known

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:29:46.688 \rightarrow 00:29:47.964$ and relevant oncogenic processes

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}29{:}47.964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}49.240$ that that promote metastases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:29:49.240 --> 00:29:51.896 But we also saw a lot of immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:29:51.896 --> 00:29:54.048 inflammatory genes in particular Illinois

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}29{:}54.048 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}57.192$ 6 and Jack in Stat 3 kind of stood out

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}29{:}57{.}192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00{.}076$ to us as being a driver of metastasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:30:00.080 --> 00:30:00.400 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:30:00.400 - > 00:30:02.320 we applied the same single cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:02.320 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.375$ strategies what we had done before to

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:04.375 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.410$ see you know what are these myeloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:30:06.410 --> 00:30:08.520 inflammation and Illinois 6 pathways,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:08.520 \rightarrow 00:30:09.876$ what are they really converging on?

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}30{:}09{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}13{.}500$ And and and indeed it it showed a

 $00{:}30{:}13.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}16.292$ real enrichment in some of these tan

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:16.292 \dashrightarrow 00:30:18.271$ populations that we had defined a

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:18.271 \rightarrow 00:30:20.799$ little bit better with the single cell data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}30{:}20{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}22{.}872$ And suggesting that if you were a tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}30{:}22.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}25.116$ that was myeloid high or a denosine high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:25.120 \rightarrow 00:30:26.716$ similar overlapping signatures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:26.716 \rightarrow 00:30:30.440$ you are more likely to develop metastasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:30.440 \rightarrow 00:30:32.160$ Again controlling for other features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00:30:32.160 \rightarrow 00:30:34.036$ all of the clinical and pathologic features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}30{:}34{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}37{.}000$ These are completely independent programs

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

00:30:37.000 --> 00:30:39.781 and you could show that if I mean if

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}30{:}39{.}781 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}41{.}645$ you were a AMSK inflammatory signature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847979665555556

 $00{:}30{:}41.645$ --> $00{:}30{:}43.990$ which was a gene signature we developed NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:30:44.043 --> 00:30:46.304 from from the micro RAY data strongly

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}30{:}46{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48{.}224$ overlapping with the myeloid signature

 $00{:}30{:}48.224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}50.677$ from Genentech and others that you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}30{:}50{.}677 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52{.}393$ take all these high risk patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:30:52.400 --> 00:30:54.297 And really I mean it's pretty amazing

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:30:54.297 \rightarrow 00:30:56.120$ to see curves like this separate out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}30{:}56{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}57{.}560$ But again all of these patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}30{:}57{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}59{.}660$ this is a myeloid load tumor intermediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:30:59.660 \dashrightarrow 00:31:01.992$ and then very high and you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:31:01.992 --> 00:31:03.360 see their survival probability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}03{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}05{.}368$ And then we were able to replicate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}05{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}07{.}030$ in multiple other data sets including

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:31:07.030 --> 00:31:08.968 from one of our former fellows who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}08{.}968 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}10{.}662$ at Moffett now and and again showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}10.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}12.288$ that if you were controlling for

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}12.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}14.260$ all these high risk features from

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}14.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}15.640$ a clinical pathologic standpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:15.640 \rightarrow 00:31:17.338$ you you could still stratify patients

 $00:31:17.338 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.412$ by the risk of recurrence in that

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}20{.}412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}22{.}316$ and it didn't seem to be associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}22{.}316$ --> $00{:}31{:}23{.}800$ much with the T cell response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}23.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}25.624$ So what was driving metastas is

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:25.624 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.479$ at least in this data set,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}27{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}28{.}920$ but again it has been valid in others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:28.920 \rightarrow 00:31:31.314$ was not really AT cell driven process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:31.320 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.693$ What was at least from a micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}33.693 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}34.710$ environmental standpoint promoting

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}34.762 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}36.637$ metastasis was independent seen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}36{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}38{.}306$ We tried all the different T cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}38{.}306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}39{.}559$ signatures that have been shown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}39{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}41{.}400$ We looked at IHC scores,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}41{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}43{.}590$ we had IHC from CD8 infiltration

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:43.590 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.320$ patterns here.

 $00:31:44.320 \rightarrow 00:31:45.904$ We were able to see if they were inflamed

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:45.904 \rightarrow 00:31:47.674$ or excludeded and we really didn't see me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.618$ Maybe there's a signal with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}49{.}618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}51{.}506$ desert that those are the tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:51.506 \rightarrow 00:31:53.354$ that have no T cells at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}53{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}55{.}448$ but it wasn't clear at least that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}55{.}448 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}57{.}199$ that wasn't the clear driver here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:31:57.200 \rightarrow 00:31:59.160$ It was really much more of the myeloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}31{:}59{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}01{.}071$ and Tam phenotypes and actually the

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:01.071 -> 00:32:02.776 angiogenic tumors that were low

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:02.776 \dashrightarrow 00:32:04.559$ were also similarly associated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:04.560 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.436$ not quite as clean of a signal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:06.440 \dashrightarrow 00:32:07.959$ but it's certainly it looks like if

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:07.959 \dashrightarrow 00:32:09.517$ you're a low angiogenic tumor you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:09.517 --> 00:32:11.233 you're much more likely to recur.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:11.240 \rightarrow 00:32:13.490$ So this suggested that these micro

 $00:32:13.490 \rightarrow 00:32:14.990$ environmental features also might

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:15.051 \rightarrow 00:32:16.511$ be useful for adjuvant strategies

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:16.511 -> 00:32:18.756 and indeed a lot of the work now

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}18.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}20.702$ that's going forward in some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:20.702 --> 00:32:22.735 newer adjuvant trials are factoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:22.735 \dashrightarrow 00:32:24.850$ in things like these transcriptonic

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:24.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:26.256$ signatures into risk adapted models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}26.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}28.357$ And I think you know the future of

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:28.357 --> 00:32:29.822 course would would incorporate

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}29.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}31.745$ some of these into selecting not only

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:31.745 --> 00:32:33.848 who's going to recur or not but maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:33.848 --> 00:32:35.672 whether you give them a combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}35.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}37.397$ strategy or a single agent drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}37{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}38{.}198$ But how can we test this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}38{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}40{.}950$ So ultimately you know I I show a lot of

 $00:32:41.026 \rightarrow 00:32:43.504$ like nice kind of genomic correlative

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:43.504 \rightarrow 00:32:46.146$ work and maybe some evolution of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:46.146 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.622$ we think about kidney cancer from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:32:48.622 --> 00:32:49.877 micro environmental and genomic standpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:49.880 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.280$ but really how do we test this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:51.280 \dashrightarrow 00:32:53.035$ And so this is the challenge that I faced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}53{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}54{.}657$ I was kind of writing all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:54.657 \rightarrow 00:32:56.338$ papers and thinking about this a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}32{:}56{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}57{.}748$ and getting advice from mentors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:57.802 \rightarrow 00:32:59.475$ everyone kept saying well you got to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:32:59.480 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.041$ you got to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:33:00.041 \rightarrow 00:33:01.920$ you got to find a model that that works.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00{:}33{:}01{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}03{.}888$ And so you know we didn't have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:33:03.888 \dashrightarrow 00:33:06.155$ lot of good models at the time and

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

 $00:33:06.160 \rightarrow 00:33:07.455$ I'm going to talk about one we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.886790947272727

00:33:07.455 --> 00:33:08.010 we've developed a

- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}08{.}053 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}09{.}217$ second which which I think is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:33:09.217 -> 00:33:10.478 maybe even better, but I'm going
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}10{.}478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}12{.}408$ to talk about the first one today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:33:12.408 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.430$ So. So you know there are some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:33:15.430 -> 00:33:16.680 genetic models in kidney cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}16.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}18.682$ The, the one that was used
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:33:18.682 \rightarrow 00:33:20.503$ really until this time was really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}20{.}503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22{.}822$ the Renka model which is for those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}22.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}24.877$ of you familiar it spontaneously
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}24.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}28.368$ arose in a valve C mouse which is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:33:28.368 --> 00:33:30.164 immunocompetent mouse and it was called
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}33{:}30{.}164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}31{.}319$ the renal cortical Adam carcinoma.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:33:31.320 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.035$ Back then we we really had very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:33:33.040 \dashrightarrow 00:33:34.570$ limited understanding but it has
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:33:34.570 --> 00:33:36.378 been profiled now and we know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:33:36.378 \dashrightarrow 00:33:37.963$ that it's not a VHL driven tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:33:37.963 --> 00:33:40.190 So VHL as I showed you earlier is is

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}33{:}40.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41.636$ the fundamental event in in clear

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:33:41.636 \rightarrow 00:33:43.411$ cell you have to have a VHL mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:33:43.411 - 00:33:47.715 to be a clear cell really and and so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}33{:}47.715 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}50.240$ so it was used for ever.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}33{:}50{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}51{.}864$ GEM models of course we know the

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:33:51.864 \rightarrow 00:33:53.500$ genetics so why can't we just use

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}33{:}53{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55{.}141$ gems and there are there are many

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}33{:}55{.}141 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}56{.}665$ many GEM models you can probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}33{:}56.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}58.720$ find six or seven out there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:33:58.720 --> 00:34:01.318 They're often from mixed mixed backgrounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:34:01.320 \rightarrow 00:34:04.000$ They have a very long tumor initiation time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:34:04.000 --> 00:34:06.400 very low lower tumor petitrins

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:34:06.400 \rightarrow 00:34:08.641$ compared to other gems and they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}08.641 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}10.243$ very hard to transplant and often

- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:34:10.243 \rightarrow 00:34:11.725$ they develop cystic renal failure
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}34{:}11.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}13.623$ because when you knock out even in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:34:13.623 --> 00:34:16.800 a KSP specific or Cree specific
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:34:16.800 --> 00:34:19.080 kidney specific fashion you will,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:34:19.080 \dashrightarrow 00:34:20.290$ you'll often develop cystic renal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}34{:}20{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}22{.}285$ failure which is what you see in in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:34:22.285 \rightarrow 00:34:23.515$ people with hereditary kidney cancers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:34:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.830$ Many of them especially with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:34:24.830 --> 00:34:25.878 VHL will develop many,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:34:25.880 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.120$ many cysts in their kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:34:27.120 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.112$ in addition to tumors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}34{:}28.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}28.500$ So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}34{:}28{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}31{.}160$ so it's hard to use those models.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}34{:}31{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}33{.}442$ So we teamed up with Scott Lowe
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}34{:}33{.}442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}35{.}681$ together and Scott Lowe is for those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:34:35.681 - > 00:34:37.959 of you not familiar with him is very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:34:37.959 \rightarrow 00:34:39.354$ very compass scientists at Memorial

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}39{.}354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}41{.}511$ and does a lot of mouse engineering

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:34:41.511 -> 00:34:43.485 beautiful ways and we used an

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}43.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}44.942$ electroporation strategy at the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:34:44.942 \dashrightarrow 00:34:46.886$ which would allowed us to deliver guides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}46.886 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}48.842$ We focused on a actually interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}48.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.700$ combination of genes which are not

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:34:50.700 --> 00:34:52.080 super common in kidney cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}52{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}53{.}578$ but they define and I'll show you

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}53{.}578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55{.}068$ in a minute some of the myeloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:34:55.068 \rightarrow 00:34:56.676$ phenotypes which is one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}56.676$ --> $00{:}34{:}58.547$ reasons why we focus on it is there

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00{:}34{:}58{.}547 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}00{.}299$ also happen to be a very nice gem

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:35:00.299 --> 00:35:02.214 from Ian Frus group in in Germany.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:35:02.214 \dashrightarrow 00:35:04.536$ It's time that utilize VHRB and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:04.536 \rightarrow 00:35:07.230$ P53 and showed very nicely a gem
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}35{:}07{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}08{.}811$ that which we had been using in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:35:08.811 --> 00:35:10.086 lab for many years and I'll show
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:10.086 \rightarrow 00:35:11.560$ you some of that work in a minute.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:11.560 \rightarrow 00:35:13.546$ But we had utilized this strategy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:13.546 \rightarrow 00:35:15.543$ because a because Scott had utilizing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}35{:}15{.}543 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}17{.}692$ P53 in a lot of different tumour
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:17.692 \rightarrow 00:35:19.632$ models and he had very good guides
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:19.632 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.013$ for and very good strategies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00:35:21.013 \rightarrow 00:35:23.011$ but also because of the genetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- 00:35:23.011 --> 00:35:24.776 combination and also because of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}35{:}24.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25.838$ the myeloid phenotypes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}35{:}25{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}27{.}828$ This was sort of our strategy at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}35{:}27.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}29.765$ the time and this was not trivial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632
- $00{:}35{:}29.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}31.842$ because we had VHL as the backbone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

 $00:35:31.842 \longrightarrow 00:35:33.798$ and that that makes cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:35:33.798 --> 00:35:35.879 very tricky to add additional guys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:35:35.880 --> 00:35:37.752 For some reason when when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.803683961052632

00:35:37.752 --> 00:35:39.000 when you knockout VHL

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:35:39.000 --> 00:35:40.510 in vitro the cells don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:35:40.510 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.718$ tolerate it very well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:35:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.800$ They they senesce they they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}43.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}45.792$ And so this was about a year and

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}45{.}792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}47{.}760$ a half of work that Lynn did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}47{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}49{.}368$ And eventually though we were able

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}49{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}51{.}232$ to develop a tumor that we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}51{.}232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}52{.}714$ transplant and we were able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}52{.}714$ --> $00{:}35{:}54{.}082$ show transcriptomically that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}35{:}54.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}55.852$ matched into that myeloid high

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:35:55.852 \dashrightarrow 00:35:57.804$ group that that Bob Moitzer and NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:35:57.804 --> 00:35:59.359 others from Genentech had shown

 $00:35:59.360 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.118$ to be critical for that cluster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}01{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}02{.}812$ The the, the very aggressive one

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:36:02.812 --> 00:36:04.982 that seems to be resistant to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:04.982 \rightarrow 00:36:06.599$ vegif and I can show you here

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:36:06.599 --> 00:36:08.424 you know this was that cluster

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:08.424 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.030$ here it's P53 enriched 30%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:10.030 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.010$ Again P53 is not commonly seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}12.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}13.960$ in localized kidney cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:36:13.960 --> 00:36:15.556 but if you look at metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}15{.}556 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}16{.}990$ cohorts it's about between 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.195$ and 30% of those will have them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}19{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}21{.}168$ And so this is really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}21.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22.152$ stromal proliferative cluster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}22.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}26.720$ When you do flow cytology analysis on it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}26{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}28{.}946$ they they're very macrophage and rich

 $00:36:28.946 \rightarrow 00:36:31.876$ tumors and they have AP 53 program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}31.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}33.120$ When you look at transcriptomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:33.120 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.680$ it's very similar to that group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}34{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}36{.}423$ And as I mentioned there was this

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}36{.}423 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37{.}948$ a denosine signature that we saw which

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:37.948 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.158$ overlap with the myeloid sector.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:36:39.160 --> 00:36:39.521 This,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:39.521 \rightarrow 00:36:42.048$ this actually came from this paper that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}42.048 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}46.158$ was published in from UCSF from Fong ET al.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}36{:}46.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}47.860$ In combination with with Corvis

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:47.860 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.006$ which is a biotech company.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:50.006 \rightarrow 00:36:53.384$ And they had developed an adenosine

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:53.384 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.357$ 2 receptor blockade therapy for

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:56.357 \rightarrow 00:36:57.625$ patients with metastatic kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:57.625 \rightarrow 00:36:59.210$ cancer that were treatment refractory

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:36:59.254 \rightarrow 00:37:00.682$ and they had developed a signature

 $00:37:00.682 \rightarrow 00:37:02.336$ which which was very much overlapping

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}02{.}336$ --> $00{:}37{:}03{.}636$ with this myeloid signature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:03.640 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.120$ So this gave us the thought of OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}05{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}07{.}656$ well we showed that this myeloid program is

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:07.656 \rightarrow 00:37:09.880$ so important for metastasis development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:09.880 \dashrightarrow 00:37:12.196$ Maybe if we targeted this adenosine

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:12.196 \rightarrow 00:37:14.480$ pathway this could abrogate metastasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:37:14.480 --> 00:37:16.720 And So what Lynn did in her model

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}16.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}18.865$ when she developed it was was

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}18.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}20.755$ stored sort of started testing

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:20.760 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.040$ CP1444 is this adenosine inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}22.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}23.680$ And we were able to show that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}23.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25.231$ get this dramatic abrogation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}25{.}231 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}27{.}036$ metastasis doesn't fully control it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:37:27.040 --> 00:37:30.008 but the the number of Mets and the

 $00:37:30.008 \rightarrow 00:37:31.528$ development of Mets is abrogated

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:31.528 \rightarrow 00:37:33.140$ quite dramatically using a myeloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:33.140 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.775$ depletion strategy or a specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:37:34.775 -> 00:37:35.756 myeloid depletion strategy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}35{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}36{.}760$ It doesn't deplete all Tams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}36{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}38{.}650$ but it does shift the phenotype of

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}38.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}40.879$ some of the Tams quite dramatically

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:40.880 \rightarrow 00:37:43.448$ suggesting perhaps that this could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}43.448 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}46.199$ a strategy and utilizing a mouse model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:46.200 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.160$ In the background of all this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

00:37:47.160 --> 00:37:49.944 we've also you know really been

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:49.944 \rightarrow 00:37:53.068$ thinking about how to utilize the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}53.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}56.238$ micro environment to study resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}56{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}57{.}761$ And so again we had to go back to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00{:}37{:}57{.}761 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}59{.}844$ a mouse model and I I showed this

NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505

 $00:37:59.844 \rightarrow 00:38:01.319$ engineering model which we developed.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00:38:01.320 \longrightarrow 00:38:02.360$ But we're in the background of all this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00{:}38{:}02{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}04{.}136$ For many years we had been utilizing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00:38:04.136 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.768$ this gem and we we utilize this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- 00:38:06.768 --> 00:38:08.840 gem from Ian Frue ET all this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- 00:38:08.840 --> 00:38:12.288 Again this was a KSP, sorry Cree,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00{:}38{:}12.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}16.925$ ERT 2 KSP 1 Flocks mouse that had lost VHL,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00{:}38{:}16{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}18{.}140$ PT3 and RB.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00:38:18.140 \rightarrow 00:38:20.570$ They develop pretty nice clear cell
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00{:}38{:}20.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}23.430$ tumors and we utilize this model to to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93650505
- $00{:}38{:}23{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}25{.}719$ actually study some of these questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:38:25.720 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.865$ We want to understand what's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:38:27.865 \dashrightarrow 00:38:30.603$ happening with both PD1 and VEGF
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:38:30.603 \rightarrow 00:38:33.158$ therapies alone and in combination.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:38:33.160 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.868$ Again I showed you the the real
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00{:}38{:}34{.}868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}36{.}745$ the relevance of this from a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:38:36.745 \rightarrow 00:38:37.837$ predicting response standpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}38{:}37{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}40{.}248$ And so we first looked at these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:38:40.248 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.547$ tumors genomic this is this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:38:42.547 --> 00:38:44.537 unpublished data but hopefully will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}38{:}44{.}537 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}46{.}956$ be submitted in the next few months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:38:46.960 \dashrightarrow 00:38:48.928$ So, so we we started looking at these NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:38:48.928 \dashrightarrow 00:38:50.726$ KVPR tumors that had from this Ian NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:38:50.726 \rightarrow 00:38:52.455$ fruit model again validating the fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}38{:}52{.}455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}54{.}080$ that they are really representative

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}38{:}54{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}56{.}524$ of this myeloid high tumor that I had

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}38{:}56{.}524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}58{.}400$ shown you earlier from from Bob's work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:38:58.400 --> 00:39:00.266 This is again showing RNA sequencing NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:00.266 --> 00:39:02.382 from from from many tumors that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}02{.}382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}04{.}286$ have from these mice and that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:39:04.343 \dashrightarrow 00:39:06.282$ overlap very nicely with the the myeloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:39:06.282 \dashrightarrow 00:39:10.640$ high PV 3 driven tumors in in human.

 $00:39:10.640 \rightarrow 00:39:12.560$ And we started treating these mice

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}12.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}14.428$ and really focusing on a combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}14.428 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}16.780$ strategy which I think is near to dear

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:16.843 --> 00:39:18.716 Harriet from her from work in Melanoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:18.720 --> 00:39:21.952 But we we utilized linvanib and and PD

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}21.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}23.998$ one in combination for a few reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}24.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}25.344$ One we were very interested in levanim

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}25{.}344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}27{.}137$ and PD one comma that that has the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}27.137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}28.077$ highest overall response rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:28.080 --> 00:39:29.998 If you look at the clinical trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:30.000 --> 00:39:32.639 it's about 75% of patients will have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}32{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}34{.}117$ a first line response which is really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}34{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}38{.}798$ really incredible and also we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:38.798 --> 00:39:40.874 know that Lenva has potentially a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:39{:}40.874$ --> $00:39{:}42.983$ lot of micro environmental targets

00:39:42.983 --> 00:39:45.636 beyond just veg F So so we're very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:39:45.636 \rightarrow 00:39:47.070$ interested in this question and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}47.123 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}48.796$ utilized a sort of a mouse clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:39:48.796 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.800$ trial from this work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}49{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}53{.}755$ We also included though ACSF 1 inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:39:53.760 \rightarrow 00:39:56.289$ BLZ 945 to see if if we just broadly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:39:56.289 --> 00:39:58.038 depleting Tam's would be helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}39{:}58.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}00{.}376$ And I should note that CSF one and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:00.376 --> 00:40:02.108 our inhibitors have been have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}40{:}02{.}108 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}03{.}478$ a DUD in the clinic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}40{:}03.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}04.760$ Primarily because they tend

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:04.760 --> 00:40:06.460 to deplete lots of Tams and Tams

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:06.460 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.956$ can be good and they can be bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:07.960 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.738$ So we don't really we we weren't

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:09.738 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.239$ really didn't really know what to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:11.239 \rightarrow 00:40:12.849$ expect here and I'll just show some

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:12.898 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.312$ of that data and we did single
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:14.312 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.920$ cell on pretty much all of these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:16.920 \rightarrow 00:40:18.864$ mice that we developed tumors from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:18.864 \rightarrow 00:40:19.836$ in different categories.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:19.840 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.240$ And we and we this to this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:21.240 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.115$ this model actually is quite
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:23.115 \rightarrow 00:40:24.880$ sensitive to linvatinib and actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:24.880 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.480$ the combination is is pretty
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00{:}40{:}26{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}27{.}400$ dramatically responsive here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:27.400 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.500$ But they don't respond at all to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- 00:40:29.500 --> 00:40:30.905 PD1 and actually CSF ONE inhibitors
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00{:}40{:}30{.}905 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}32{.}200$ don't really do anything at all.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:32.200 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.076$ So we were then also able to take
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00{:}40{:}36.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}38.198$ early responders and resistant and and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575
- $00:40:38.198 \rightarrow 00:40:40.080$ actually start comparing them as well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.928$ So we can look at the impacts on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}40{:}41.928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43.743$ the micro environment from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:43.743 --> 00:40:45.463 different treatment strategies alone

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}40{:}45{.}463 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}47{.}756$ in combination and in resistance and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}40{:}47.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}49.640$ in sensitivity which is which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:49.640 --> 00:40:51.234 really I think something you want to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00{:}40{:}51{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}52{.}766$ And we could take single cell data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:52.766 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.212$ from this same strategy that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:54.212 --> 00:40:55.706 applied before and start looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:55.706 --> 00:40:56.946 the differences between responders

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:40:56.946 \rightarrow 00:40:58.836$ and non responders between ones that NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

00:40:58.836 --> 00:41:01.773 are in combination or or alone and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8089033575

 $00:41:01.773 \rightarrow 00:41:03.797$ get a sense of what's really driving us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333

 $00{:}41{:}03.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}05.642$ You know one of the interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333

 $00:41:05.642 \rightarrow 00:41:07.415$ things about this single cell data

NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333

 $00{:}41{:}07{.}415 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}09{.}102$ set was that we actually had a

- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:09.102 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.998$ lot of neutrophil populations and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- 00:41:11.000 00:41:12.278 we don't really know their role.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:12.280 \rightarrow 00:41:14.212$ I mean there's been some really nice
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00{:}41{:}14{.}212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}16{.}143$ work from Taha Murgoob and Jed Walchak
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- 00:41:16.143 --> 00:41:18.360 recently on the on on neutrophils
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00{:}41{:}18.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}21.760$ roles in in immunotherapy strategies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- 00:41:21.760 --> 00:41:22.308 So it's an emergency,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- 00:41:22.308 --> 00:41:23.312 but I'm not going to talk about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:23.312 \longrightarrow 00:41:23.916$ that too much today,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:23.920 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.649$ but it was a striking finding here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:25.649 \rightarrow 00:41:27.603$ and we could further subtype the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:27.603 \rightarrow 00:41:29.139$ macrophage clusters within here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00:41:29.139 \dashrightarrow 00:41:30.880$ and understand what's happening.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- 00:41:30.880 --> 00:41:32.736 It's a, it's a very Tam dominated tumor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.917395440833333
- $00{:}41{:}32{.}736$ --> $00{:}41{:}34{.}999$ type as I mentioned with the P53 and RB.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:37.400 \rightarrow 00:41:39.098$ And we can actually further stratify

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}41{:}39{.}098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}40{.}978$ them and to understand what's actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:40.978 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.054$ happening in the context of both

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:43.054 \rightarrow 00:41:44.520$ therapeutic sensitivity and resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}41{:}44{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}46{.}446$ And you can start to see that certain Tams

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:46.446 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.413$ are associated with response and certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:48.413 \rightarrow 00:41:50.113$ Tams are associated with resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:50.120 \rightarrow 00:41:52.118$ So even though if you just deplete all Tams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:52.120 \rightarrow 00:41:53.956$ you would actually lose that effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:41:53.960 --> 00:41:55.202 But actually if you understood which

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}41{:}55{.}202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}56{.}332$ Tams which tumor associated macrophages

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}41{:}56{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}57{.}677$ are actually associated with response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}41{:}57.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}58.920$ these Angio hide Tams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:41:58.920 \rightarrow 00:42:00.780$ Tams that are producing angiogenic genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}00{.}829 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}02{.}949$ which may be have been reflected by some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:02.949 --> 00:42:05.156 those Angio bulk RNA sequencing data earlier,

 $00:42:05.160 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.400$ they're actually associated with response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:06.400 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.264$ Whereas other Tams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:07.264 --> 00:42:08.704 maybe those myeloid high Angio

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:08.704 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.705$ hide tumors that don't respond are

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:10.705 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.077$ actually associated with resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:12.080 \rightarrow 00:42:14.504$ So now we can start getting further into

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:14.504 \rightarrow 00:42:16.760$ the phenotypes of these Tams and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:16.760 \rightarrow 00:42:18.355$ the context of treatment strategies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:18.360 --> 00:42:19.680 And for the sake of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:19.680 --> 00:42:20.718 I won't talk about the neutrophils,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:20.720 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.620$ but it is another story and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:23.620 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.570$ can actually use neutrophils to

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:25.570 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.440$ associate again further responses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}27{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}29{.}231$ So perhaps there's a a major role for them

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}29{.}231 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}31{.}000$ and I don't have time to talk about it.

00:42:31.000 --> 00:42:31.994 But then then of course you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}31{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}33{.}077$ to go back to the human right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:33.080 \rightarrow 00:42:34.438$ because I showed you something in mouse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:34.440 \rightarrow 00:42:36.170$ But are there analogous populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:36.170 --> 00:42:37.733 in human post treatment, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:37.733 --> 00:42:38.598 Because if you're going to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:38.600 --> 00:42:40.238 you can cure lots of mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:42:40.240 --> 00:42:41.955 but you don't know if if those,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}41{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}44{.}840$ if those populations are are

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:44.840 \rightarrow 00:42:46.544$ relevant to human biology and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:46.544 \rightarrow 00:42:48.080$ a major challenge for immuno,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:48.080 \rightarrow 00:42:50.855$ immuno genomic studies or immunologies

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:50.855 \rightarrow 00:42:53.075$ immunotherapy related studies because

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}53.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}55.908$ of course the mouse and the human micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}42{:}55{.}908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}57{.}516$ environments are can be quite different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:42:57.520 \rightarrow 00:43:00.598$ So that requires post treatment tissue.

00:43:00.600 --> 00:43:01.398 So how do you do that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:01.400 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.944$ So that's you know some of the beauty

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:03.944 \rightarrow 00:43:06.716$ about going back and forth in my group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:06.716 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.960$ So this is work that was led by

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:08.960 \rightarrow 00:43:10.625$ Steven Reese who's graduating from

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:10.625 \longrightarrow 00:43:11.957$ our program this year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}11{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}14{.}021$ He's spent a year with me in the lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}14.021 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.681$ and a whole whole including a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}16.681 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18.506$ very talented pathologists and research

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:18.506 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.446$ pathologists and of course Christina

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}20{.}446 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}22{.}676$ Leslie from the Computational Biology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}22.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}24.066$ And we and we we took all these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}24.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}25.597$ that we've been operating on over the years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}25.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}27.622$ Now we started to define them

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:43:27.622 --> 00:43:29.770 into categories right of early

 $00:43:29.770 \rightarrow 00:43:31.600$ response of a complete response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:31.600 \rightarrow 00:43:33.520$ partial response and and no response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}33{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}36{.}008$ These are patients that Pat operates

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}36{.}008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}38{.}560$ on all the time and and I operate on

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00{:}43{:}38{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}40{.}296$ quite a bit and these are patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:40.296 \rightarrow 00:43:41.791$ that that are post immunotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:41.791 \longrightarrow 00:43:43.720$ now which is a new new frontier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:43.720 \rightarrow 00:43:45.770$ A lot of our surgery now is now in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:45.832 \rightarrow 00:43:48.152$ in the post IO space that gives you a very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:48.160 \rightarrow 00:43:50.015$ very unique opportunity to actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:50.015 \rightarrow 00:43:51.870$ study what's happening both within

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:51.925 \longrightarrow 00:43:52.879$ and across tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.664$ And so this this is allows us to

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:55.664 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.963$ assemble cohorts of patients that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:43:57.963 \rightarrow 00:44:00.480$ been exposed to IO therapy alone to

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:44:00.480 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.925$ IOTKI therapy and we have some with

 $00:44:03.925 \rightarrow 00:44:06.158$ just TKLO but that's really not done anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

00:44:06.160 --> 00:44:06.502 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:44:06.502 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.554$ so essentially we can look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.862237040454545

 $00:44:08.554 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.580$ responses both defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}09{.}647 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}11{.}112$ clinically, radiographically but

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:11.112 \rightarrow 00:44:12.696$ also pathologically and understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:12.696 \rightarrow 00:44:14.915$ are there what are the populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:14.915 --> 00:44:16.938 in human and are they analogous to

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:16.938 --> 00:44:19.151 the mouse of course which is you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:19.151 --> 00:44:21.272 something that I you know really want

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:21.272 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.520$ to do what we really want to focus on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}24{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}26{.}092$ And so you can start defining

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}26.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}26.878$ this different ways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:26.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:27.984$ This hasn't been,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}27{.}984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}29{.}638$ there's not an official Canon

 $00:44:29.638 \longrightarrow 00:44:31.474$ here on how to do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}31{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}33{.}384$ It's sort of been adopted a lot from

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:33.384 --> 00:44:34.934 the Melanoma literature about how

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}34{.}934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}36{.}634$ to define true pathologic response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}36{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}37{.}936$ A lot of us have looked at you

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:37.936 --> 00:44:38.811 know complete response where

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:38.811 --> 00:44:40.076 there's no residual viable tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.055$ RVT, residual viable tumor or

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:42.055 --> 00:44:43.240 near complete response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}43.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}44.770$ And those patients actually if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}44{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}46{.}679$ if you take their their kidneys out

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}46{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}48{.}435$ we we showed and and we'll show in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}48{.}435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}50{.}436$ our paper that you know they have really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}50{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}52{.}078$ really durable responses you know many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:52.080 \rightarrow 00:44:53.796$ many years without even off therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:44:53.800 \rightarrow 00:44:55.528$ So that's a it's a good biomarker for

 $00:44:55.528 \rightarrow 00:44:57.157$ how they're going to do down the road.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:57.160 --> 00:44:58.630 And then you can have these partial

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:44:58.630 - 00:44:59.904 responses where they have this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}44{:}59{.}904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}01{.}297$ between and you have these non responses

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:01.341 \rightarrow 00:45:02.955$ where there's really no treatment response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}02{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}04{.}710$ You can see it all within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}04.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}06.879$ tumor and you could do single cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}06{.}879 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}08{.}569$ sequencing on these cohorts and

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}08{.}569 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}10{.}152$ start to get obviously in the human.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:45:10.152 --> 00:45:12.030 You still see a lot more T cells as

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:12.030 \rightarrow 00:45:13.395$ I showed you earlier from the work

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}13{.}439 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14{.}999$ that we did and what David has done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}15{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}16{.}953$ But you can see these tan populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}16.953 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}19.278$ here and then you can overlay work that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:45:19.280 --> 00:45:20.320 Andrew Corners,

 $00:45:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.491$ who's an MD medical oncology fellow

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}23{.}491 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}26{.}060$ working with Ming Lee has done

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}26.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}27.320$ a lot of this work now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}27{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}29{.}280$ And we can start seeing what are

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:29.280 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.740$ the differences between the IO only

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}30{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}32{.}264$ and the IOTKI and the untreated

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:32.264 \rightarrow 00:45:34.280$ populations in terms of the single cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:34.280 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.968$ again post treatment populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:35.968 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.924$ and we can start focusing on some NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:38.924 \rightarrow 00:45:41.042$ of these same populations that we NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:41.042 \rightarrow 00:45:43.670$ saw that and then we can actually NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}43.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}45.550$ overlay the mouse Tam signatures

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:45:45.550 --> 00:45:47.800 onto these populations to see other NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}47{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}49{.}601$ analogous populations and are they

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}45{:}49{.}601 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}50{.}933$ associated with resistance and

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:45:50.933 \rightarrow 00:45:52.642$ response both within the tumors

- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}45{:}52.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}54.277$ and across the different regions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}45{:}54{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}56{.}120$ And that's sort of where we're focusing now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00:45:56.120 \rightarrow 00:45:57.800$ And so we can further substratify
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}45{:}57{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}59{.}838$ the Tams just like I showed you in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}45{:}59{.}838 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}01{.}931$ the mouse and to see are the TKII
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}46{:}01{.}931 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}03{.}953$ iOS really depleting some of these.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00:46:03.960 \longrightarrow 00:46:05.703$ This is just looking at them broadly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00:46:05.703 \rightarrow 00:46:07.000$ without looking at resistance.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}46{:}07{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}09{.}128$ But you can start seeing that that the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00:46:09.128 \rightarrow 00:46:11.016$ the different populations are being
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}46{:}11.016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}13.224$ affected in different ways by the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- 00:46:13.224 --> 00:46:15.052 different treatments in maybe similar ways,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- 00:46:15.052 --> 00:46:16.144 but I'm sure different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}46{:}16{.}144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}17{.}678$ ways as well as the mouse.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272
- $00{:}46{:}17.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}19.388$ But hopefully that will help us hone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:46:19.388 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.068$ in on what are the most relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}46{:}21.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}22.676$ targets to try in the mouse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

00:46:22.680 --> 00:46:24.040 And you can see this if you focus

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:46:24.040 \rightarrow 00:46:25.464$ on one of the M0 signatures from

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:46:25.464 \rightarrow 00:46:26.720$ the mouse that I showed you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}46{:}26{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}28{.}440$ that Cape, that GEM mouse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:46:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.798$ You can see that there's clearly

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00:46:30.798 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.952$ differences in terms of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.827261062727272

 $00{:}46{:}32{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}34{.}479$ TKIO combination patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00:46:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.936$ and in in the upper tail and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00{:}46{:}35{.}936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}37{.}600$ lower tail on this platter actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00:46:37.600 \rightarrow 00:46:39.160$ associating with resistance and response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00:46:39.160 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.351$ So you get a sense that maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00:46:41.351 \rightarrow 00:46:42.819$ these populations are relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00:46:42.819 \longrightarrow 00:46:44.054$ across you know species.

NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632

 $00:46:44.054 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.860$ So that I think is sort of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.716195541052632
- $00:46:45.924 \rightarrow 00:46:48.080$ where we're headed. So overall
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}46{:}50{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}51{.}876$ my conclusions really are that RNA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}46{:}51{.}876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}53{.}020$ signatures and immune response
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00:46:53.072 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.440$ are really the the useful ones.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- 00:46:54.440 --> 00:46:56.132 Clinically I showed you sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}46{:}56{.}132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}57{.}846$ the genetic recap of kidney cancers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}46{:}57.846 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}59.701$ and how it might relate to some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}46{:}59{.}701 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}01{.}439$ of these microviomal feature.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- 00:47:01.440 --> 00:47:03.337 But that's really what we have from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}47{:}03{.}337 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}05{.}883$ a from a predictive and prognostic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}47{:}05{.}883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}07{.}945$ standpoint and maybe it'll help us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- 00:47:07.945 --> 00:47:09.149 select adjuvant treatment strategies
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}47{:}09{.}149 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10{.}520$ down the road for patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}47{:}10{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}12{.}896$ certainly pick the high risk patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}47{:}12.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}15.550$ a little bit better perhaps the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

00:47:15.550 --> 00:47:17.080 phenotype seems to be enriched in

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

00:47:17.080 --> 00:47:19.105 the in the map in the metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00:47:19.105 \rightarrow 00:47:21.992$ setting and particularly post IO.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00:47:21.992 \rightarrow 00:47:24.005$ And and maybe this this cross

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}24.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}25.779$ analysis will allow us to prioritize

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}25{.}779$ --> $00{:}47{:}27{.}897$ targets to test pre clinically and NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}27.897 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}29.706$ then hopefully bring them out to

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00:47:29.706 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.316$ the to the clinic now that more

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}31{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}33{.}225$ and more companies are interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}33.225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}35.130$ in in targeting tan populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00:47:35.194 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.718$ with different inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}36{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}38{.}632$ And I want to obviously thank my funding

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00:47:38.632 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.912$ and of course, members of my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00:47:40.912 \rightarrow 00:47:42.992$ Ming Lee's lab, the urology department,

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

00:47:42.992 --> 00:47:44.712 Christina Leslie from computational biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375

 $00{:}47{:}44.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}46.958$ and all the medical colleges I work with,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- 00:47:46.960 --> 00:47:47.815 particularly Doctor Mozer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00{:}47{:}47{.}815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}50{.}279$ who's been a wonderful mentor to me for many,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00:47:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.920$ many years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00:47:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.852$ Thank you so much.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.866673109375
- $00:47:52.852 \rightarrow 00:47:54.800$ And I'll have you answer any questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778
- 00:48:08.580 --> 00:48:09.304 Thanks, Ari.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778
- $00:48:09.304 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.838$ That was a real Tour de force.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778
- $00:48:11.840 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.000$ I have a question about the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778
- 00:48:14.000 --> 00:48:15.440 complexity of your clustering.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778
- $00{:}48{:}15{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}19{.}260$ So I I noted that you had 21 clusters of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778
- 00:48:19.358 --> 00:48:21.960 myeloid cells in one of your figures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778
- $00{:}48{:}21{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}24{.}912$ I believe it was one of the mouse figures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778
- $00{:}48{:}24{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}29{.}880$ Yeah. Well so that's sort of the art and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778
- $00{:}48{:}29{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}31{.}840$ the dark art of of single cell sequencing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778
- 00:48:31.840 --> 00:48:33.610 You could, you can cluster any
- NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:48:33.610 -> 00:48:36.217 way you want and you can set your

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:48:36.217 \rightarrow 00:48:38.020$ parameters quite differently. So yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:48:38.020 \rightarrow 00:48:41.599$ and this is all all my Lloyd populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:48:41.600 - 00:48:42.359 you're absolutely right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:48:42.359 \rightarrow 00:48:45.077$ So one of the things we do then of course is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}48{:}45{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}47{.}798$ is then go back with my immunology

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:48:47.798 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.834$ colleagues and actually start

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:48:48.834 \rightarrow 00:48:50.239$ to think about what are the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:48:50.240 \rightarrow 00:48:52.400$ what are what are really representing

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:48:52.400 --> 00:48:53.882 unique populations versus just

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}48{:}53{.}882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}56{.}126$ slicing and dicing single cell data

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:48:56.126 \rightarrow 00:48:58.198$ in more and more complex ways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:48:58.200 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.615$ And we try to validate them by

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:00.615 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.448$ flow and to look at really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:49:02.448 \longrightarrow 00:49:03.440$ the dominant populations there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:49:03.440 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.246$ So it's just that this is just

 $00:49:05.246 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.537$ sort of an early iteration of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:07.537 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.352$ what would be real clustering.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:49:09.360 --> 00:49:10.200 No, I get it and it's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:49:10.200 --> 00:49:11.500 it is really complicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}49{:}11.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}12.800$ before treatment on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:12.800 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.330$ But my other question is spatially

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:14.330 \rightarrow 00:49:16.012$ are some of the clusters uniquely

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:16.012 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.119$ positioned in a certain area of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:18.119 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.757$ large tumours that's in humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:49:19.760 --> 00:49:20.960 I guess is where I'm interested.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:49:20.960 --> 00:49:21.456 Yeah, yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:49:21.456 --> 00:49:21.704 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:49:21.704 --> 00:49:23.440 so in that same cohort that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}49{:}23{.}496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}25{.}036$ showed you that we're doing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}49{:}25{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}28{.}240$ we're working with Heartland Jackson

00:49:28.240 --> 00:49:31.120 who's at who's in Toronto who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:49:31.120 --> 00:49:32.960 spatial mass cytometry kind of person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:49:32.960 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.600$ We developed from the single cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:49:35.600 --> 00:49:37.720 data a series of of populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:49:37.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.120$ really relying on most of the human.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}49{:}40{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}41{.}954$ So we we took a conglomerate of

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}49{:}41{.}954 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}43{.}332$ the different single cell studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}49{:}43{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}45{.}201$ that David has done and others have

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}49{:}45{.}201 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}47{.}115$ done and kind of come up with like

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:49:47.115 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.048$ a meta analysis of what are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}49{:}49{.}048 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}50{.}920$ key markers of the different Tam

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:49:50.985 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.935$ populations to reduce it down to

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:49:52.935 \rightarrow 00:49:55.600$ maybe five or six that might you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:49:55.600 --> 00:49:58.470 you tag a Tam by you know CD 68 or

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}49{:}58{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}59{.}995$ something else and then you can add

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}49{:}59{.}995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}01{.}339$ a few additional markers and then

 $00:50:01.339 \longrightarrow 00:50:02.797$ look at the spatial orientation

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:50:02.797 \longrightarrow 00:50:03.757$ in these contexts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:50:03.760 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.118$ So we're we're taking all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}50{:}06{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07{.}830$ regions both within tumors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}50{:}07{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}09{.}855$ across tumors and and reducing it

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}50{:}09{.}855 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}11{.}115$ down to probably a core.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:50:11.120 --> 00:50:12.195 And I think ultimately from

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

00:50:12.195 --> 00:50:12.840 a biomarker standpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00:50:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.108$ you want to kind of just be able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:50:15.108 --> 00:50:16.595 choose a particular Tam or particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}50{:}16.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.383$ T cell that would be relevant and

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00:50:18.383 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.147$ just reduce it to a couple quick

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}50{:}20{.}147 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}21{.}531$ stains that a pathologist could

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:50:21.531 --> 00:50:23.868 hopefully do as opposed to have to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}50{:}23.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}25.638$ fancy and very expensive sequencing.

 $00:50:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:50:27.842$ So absolutely thinking about the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.59175242777778

 $00{:}50{:}27.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}29.919$ same questions that you bring up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

 $00{:}50{:}29{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}30{.}688$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591752427777778

00:50:30.688 --> 00:50:32.160 I guess I haven't

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:50:34.840 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.640$ not. I got an unrelated 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}50{:}36{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}38{.}960$ unrelated the mouse cell line.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:50:38.960 \rightarrow 00:50:40.796$ So thank you for sending us and sharing that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:50:40.800 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.599$ Of course, the cell line with us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}50{:}42.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}44.328$ You're planning on making additional ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}50{:}44{.}328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}45{.}833$ with different genetic proteins. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}50{:}45{.}833 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}47{.}864$ So that's real community service, yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}50{:}47.864 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}50{.}176$ Yeah. So, so we, yeah, we are doing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:50:50.176 --> 00:50:52.116 we have a VHLBA P1 CD can to be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}50{:}52{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}54{.}542$ which is a more common combination and

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:50:54.542 \rightarrow 00:50:58.340$ that one is a sarcomatoid tumor perfectly

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:50:58.340 \rightarrow 00:51:02.600$ responds well to CTLA 4 very nicely.

 $00{:}51{:}02.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}05.652$ So that one yeah we'll be hopefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:05.652 \rightarrow 00:51:07.530$ that's that papers you know we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:07.586 \dashrightarrow 00:51:09.279$ finishing up this that work but

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:09.279 \rightarrow 00:51:11.050$ that I think that will be something

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}11{.}101 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}12.865$ that people find more exciting just

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}12.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}14.560$ because of the common genetics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}14.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}17.010$ In fact when I presented this one

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:51:17.010 --> 00:51:19.360 initially Bill very Bill Kalin very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}19{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}21{.}106$ very a stutely said you know that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}21{.}106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}23{.}120$ not a very common genetic study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.758$ I'm like yeah but that's it's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:51:24.758 --> 00:51:26.584 common one for the for the bad

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}26{.}584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}27{.}914$ tumors that don't respond well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:51:27.920 --> 00:51:30.980 So so this one is is a much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}30{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}33{.}644$ common genetic subtype and I it's a

 $00{:}51{:}33{.}644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}34{.}799$ challenge of doing anything engineering.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}34{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}37{.}666$ We tried of course all the the more

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}37.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}40.384$ common mutations as has Bill and

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:40.384 \rightarrow 00:51:42.604$ others you know Crisp bring out PBR

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}42.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}44.744$ and what the tumors just don't grow

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:44.744 \rightarrow 00:51:47.155$ well and they're very hard so the the NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:47.155 \dashrightarrow 00:51:49.800$ nice clear cells are hard to engineer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}49{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}52{.}187$ The bad ones that don't look super

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:51:52.187 --> 00:51:54.669 clear cell but have they retain the CA

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}54{.}669 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}57{.}281$ 9 and hip one at least don't don't look

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}51{:}57{.}281 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}59{.}480$ you know those are the ones that grow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:51:59.480 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.070$ It's it's a challenge of any

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:52:01.070 --> 00:52:01.600 syngeneic system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

00:52:01.600 --> 00:52:03.769 So that's why you know you can rely on

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00{:}52{:}03.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}06.033$ gems but gems are just hard to to treat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.642265273333333

 $00:52:06.040 \longrightarrow 00:52:07.440$ So limitation of the field

 $00{:}52{:}10{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}11{.}280$ sure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:15.240 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.416$ Thank you. So so really great work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:17.416 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.520$ terms of single cell transcriptomics and

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:19.520 \rightarrow 00:52:22.120$ even profiling and site off and such.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}22{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}24{.}502$ But ultimately the biomarker should be

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}24{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}26{.}939$ translated into clinic and should be

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:26.939 \rightarrow 00:52:29.279$ easily performed and reputable and cheap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:29.280 \rightarrow 00:52:31.716$ So how do you envision translating these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}31.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}33.520$ yeah, into the clinic? That's great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:33.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.040$ So a couple couple ways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}35{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}36{.}048$ And I think we're thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}36{.}048 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}36{.}920$ this a few different ways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}36{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}40{.}552$ So one of course is where obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}40{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}42{.}920$ reducing it to a few markers that might

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}42.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}44.781$ stand for the most relevant populations

 $00:52:44.781 \rightarrow 00:52:47.120$ and maybe it's a combination of Tams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:47.120 \rightarrow 00:52:49.214$ maybe some neutrophils and some CDA

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}49{.}214$ --> $00{:}52{:}50{.}959$ populations that might ultimately come NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:50.959 \rightarrow 00:52:52.996$ up with a very straightforward IHC panel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}52{:}53.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}54.776$ The other thing of course is that what

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:54.776 \rightarrow 00:52:56.740$ a lot of people are thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:56.740 \rightarrow 00:52:58.559$ is digital pathology and sort of AI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:52:58.560 \rightarrow 00:53:02.248$ So if you can define groups of tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:02.248 \rightarrow 00:53:04.130$ transcriptionally and then you you

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:04.130 \rightarrow 00:53:06.130$ put it into some model where you have NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:06.130 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.460$ the scan slide scanned in and and put

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:08.460 \longrightarrow 00:53:09.920$ through a machine learning platform.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}09{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}11{.}462$ You could may be even digitally say

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}11.462 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}13.355$ this is this tumor has this feature

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:13.355 \rightarrow 00:53:14.710$ even though the pathologist has

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.278$ no idea what they're seeing,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:16.280 \longrightarrow 00:53:17.920$ but the the model does.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:17.920 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.416$ And so for that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- 00:53:18.416 --> 00:53:19.520 you know and I know a lot of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:19.520 \rightarrow 00:53:20.315$ people are working on this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}20{.}320$ --> $00{:}53{:}21{.}846$ but we you know for that same
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}21.846 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}23.118$ Novartis study where I showed you,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.352$ we showed that the myeloid phenotype
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}25{.}352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}26{.}840$ is associated with recurrence.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}26{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}28{.}238$ We're working with group at Dartmouth
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:28.238 \rightarrow 00:53:29.839$ that has a machine learning model.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:29.840 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.200$ We have all the transcriptomic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}31{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}33{.}296$ We have the the slides sent from Novartis
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00:53:33.296 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.236$ which is like 12 terabytes of data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}35{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}35{.}958$ They high,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428
- $00{:}53{:}35{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}38{.}112$ high resolution scanned all the slides
- NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

00:53:38.112 $-\!>$ 00:53:40.344 from that trial and we've given them

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:40.344 \rightarrow 00:53:41.488$ the micro environmental subgroups

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

00:53:41.488 --> 00:53:42.878 and strategies and they're trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}42.878$ --> $00{:}53{:}44.480$ figure out if they can do that and

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}44{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}46{.}032$ they have already done it on the TCGS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

00:53:46.040 --> 00:53:47.816 So you can kind of replicate it because

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}47.816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}49.434$ that that might be a way to to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

00:53:49.440 --> 00:53:49.770 OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:49.770 \longrightarrow 00:53:52.080$ now you've put it through an AI

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}52{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}54{.}111$ system and they say this tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}54{.}111 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}55{.}532$ is this thing and this patient's

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:55.532 \rightarrow 00:53:56.987$ going to recur much more or this

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00{:}53{:}56{.}987 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}57{.}999$ patient might respond better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:53:58.000 \rightarrow 00:54:00.144$ So that that's that's a strategy that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:54:00.144 \rightarrow 00:54:02.399$ think a lot of us are thinking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754209888571428

 $00:54:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.480$ Great question for the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- 00:54:08.000 --> 00:54:09.200 community service and making
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:09.200 \rightarrow 00:54:11.000$ these mouse models and thank you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:11.059 \rightarrow 00:54:12.439$ for sharing with us as well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:12.440 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.090$ I'm curious from the immuno
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- 00:54:15.090 --> 00:54:16.680 oncology metabolism world,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00{:}54{:}16{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}19{.}092$ you know we talked a lot about the obesity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:19.092 \dashrightarrow 00:54:20.917$ paradox in Melanoma and lung cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:20.920 \rightarrow 00:54:23.195$ Do patients with obesity respond
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:23.195 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.560$ better to immunotherapy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00{:}54{:}24{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}27{.}616$ So I'm wondering if you know knowing that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:27.616 \rightarrow 00:54:29.880$ RCC actually is associated with obesity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00{:}54{:}29{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}31{.}896$ I'm I'm wondering if you can speak
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:31.896 \rightarrow 00:54:34.125$ to your mouse models if if you've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00{:}54{:}34{.}125 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}35{.}441$ observed any potential difference
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375
- $00:54:35.441 \rightarrow 00:54:37.146$ in the response to immunotherapy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:54:37.146 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.212$ in in these models because it in

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}54{:}39{.}212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}40{.}654$ mice with obesity and if not may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:54:40.654 \rightarrow 00:54:42.297$ we can collaborate that. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

00:54:42.297 --> 00:54:44.857 So. So it's a great question and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:54:44.857 \dashrightarrow 00:54:46.639$ something that's very near and dear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:54:46.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.896$ So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}54{:}46{.}896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}49{.}200$ So I I do have funding through the DoD

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}54{:}49{.}263 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}51{.}482$ to look at obesity in kidney cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}54{:}51{.}482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}53{.}458$ and these models and we've we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:54:53.458 \rightarrow 00:54:55.014$ been utilizing the transplantation

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}54{:}55{.}014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}57{.}865$ models we so we do we did the GEM

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}54{:}57{.}865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}00{.}150$ model first we we did fat feed them

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:00.150 \longrightarrow 00:55:02.142$ they're they're hard to to feed

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:02.142 \dashrightarrow 00:55:03.797$ because of the mixed background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:03.800 \rightarrow 00:55:05.872$ So they they gain weight not as nicely

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}05{.}872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}08{.}293$ as if they were a clean genotype but

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:08.293 \rightarrow 00:55:10.139$ we do observe earlier onset tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}10{.}139 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}12{.}355$ in those in those mice but then so

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:12.360 \rightarrow 00:55:14.202$ genetically when we implant them and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:14.202 \rightarrow 00:55:16.212$ that's not trivial by the way if

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:16.212 \rightarrow 00:55:17.913$ you're going to do us an orthotopic

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}17{.}971 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}19{.}581$ transplantation model in a fat

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:19.581 \rightarrow 00:55:21.417$ mouse because just like humans they

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:21.417 \dashrightarrow 00:55:22.719$ develop a lot of perine phric fat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}22{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}25{.}120$ So if you try to open up the mouse and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:25.192 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.478$ inject it it's like a **** show part

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:27.478 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.711$ of my French but but but essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}29{.}711 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}31{.}622$ it's very challenging so so we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}31{.}622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}34{.}119$ been doing but we do see that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}34{.}119 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}36{.}136$ tumors grow faster in obese which

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

00:55:36.136 --> 00:55:38.790 sort of makes sense because we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:38.790 \rightarrow 00:55:41.070$ that obesity associated with with

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

00:55:41.070 --> 00:55:43.345 better development of kidney cancers

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}43{.}345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}45{.}547$ but in it does suggest in human at

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:45.547 \rightarrow 00:55:47.638$ least they seem to be less aggressive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}47.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}50.160$ So we're we're now trying to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}50{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}51{.}763$ immunologically what's going on but NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}51{.}763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}53{.}394$ I would I think we're talking soon

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:53.394 \rightarrow 00:55:55.383$ so I'm happy to talk more about that

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}55{.}383 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}57{.}280$ Rachel but I think it would be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:55:57.280 \rightarrow 00:55:58.982$ really it's a really cool area and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}55{:}58{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}00{.}676$ we're we're we're focused on on Trem

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}56{:}00.676 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}02.839$ 2 macrophages which has been shown to

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:56:02.839 \dashrightarrow 00:56:04.716$ be associated with lipid their the

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:56:04.716 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.306$ lipid associated macrophages and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:56:06.306 \rightarrow 00:56:08.400$ it's associated with more aggressive tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:56:08.400 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.597$ So we can talk more about that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00:56:09.600 \rightarrow 00:56:10.720$ but definitely something that we're,

NOTE Confidence: 0.663871534375

 $00{:}56{:}10.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}11.520$ we're thinking a lot about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.20446036

 $00{:}56{:}17{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}17{.}640$ All right.