WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:01:07" NOTE recognizability:0.846

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.777364477142857

 $00:00:08.520 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.495$ I think you should go ahead baby.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777364477142857

 $00:00:11.500 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.338$ Yeah, thank you. So thank you

NOTE Confidence: 0.777364477142857

 $00:00:14.338 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.358$ everybody and it's my great pleasure

NOTE Confidence: 0.777364477142857

00:00:17.358 --> 00:00:20.963 to introduce Dr Ashish can a gender

NOTE Confidence: 0.777364477142857

00:00:20.970 --> 00:00:22.890 I hope it's right pronunciation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:00:24.930 --> 00:00:28.698 Ajendra got a medical degree from

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:00:28.698 --> 00:00:32.809 University of Delhi in 1989 and got

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}00{:}32.809 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}36.780$ a FRCP diploma in Psychology in 1960

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:00:36.780 \longrightarrow 00:00:41.370$ and diploma in histopathology in 2000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:00:41.370 \longrightarrow 00:00:45.123$ He is a very active leader nationally

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}00{:}45.123 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}47.888$ and internationally in the field,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:00:47.890 --> 00:00:50.794 both psychopathology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:00:50.794 --> 00:00:53.698 Europe urological pathology.

 $00:00:53.700 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.138$ He published 100 publication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:00:57.138 --> 00:00:59.690 I hope I'm right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:00:59.690 \longrightarrow 00:01:02.095$ 182 publication and thank you

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:02.095 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.318$ and he is the deputy editor

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:05.318 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.170$ for very procedures anthology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}01{:}08.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}10.477$ journal Psychopathologie, he's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:01:10.477 --> 00:01:13.553 Executive Member of British

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:01:13.553 --> 00:01:15.860 Association of Psychopathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:15.860 \longrightarrow 00:01:17.537$ and more importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}01{:}17.537 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.450$ he is the vice President of International

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}01{:}21.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.281$ Academy of Psychopathologie and

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:24.281 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.701$ its chairperson elect for British

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:27.701 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.098$ Association for Urological Pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}01{:}30.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}34.172$ He has participated in so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:01:34.172 --> 00:01:36.590 terminology inside pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:01:36.590 --> 00:01:38.970 including professor system for

 $00{:}01{:}38.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}41.945$ thyroid Paris system for urine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00{:}01{:}41.950 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}01{:}45.650$ Menards system plan and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:45.650 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.610$ International Classification of zeros.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:01:48.610 --> 00:01:50.248 I don't know what is next,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:50.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.802$ but anyway, let's wait.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:51.802 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.696$ So we are very fortunate to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:54.696 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.105$ a she's here to talk about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:01:58.105 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.079$ International classification

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

00:01:59.158 --> 00:02:01.288 of serious set of pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742486949

 $00:02:01.290 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.980$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89970567

 $00:02:06.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.770$ Thank you so much Doctor Wang for

NOTE Confidence: 0.89970567

 $00{:}02{:}08.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}10.760$ that very kind introduction and

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}10.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}13.656$ thank you Doctor Prasad for inviting me

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:13.656 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.254$ to contribute to today's grand round.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:16.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.136$ It is my great pleasure and privilege

 $00:02:18.136 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.632$ to be speaking to an audience at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}21.632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}24.050$ prestigious Yale University and I would

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:24.120 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.896$ have loved to have been there in person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}26.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}29.420$ But of course you know times don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:29.420 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.292$ allow that. So as it happens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}31.292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}33.931$ I'm attending a an executive board meeting of

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:33.931 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.066$ the British Association of Psychopathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:02:36.070 --> 00:02:37.414 Today, not in London,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}37.414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}39.430$ but in Nottingham and so I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:39.499 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.647$ sitting here from my hotel room,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:02:41.650 --> 00:02:42.930 which is why it might.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}42.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}45.084$ I might appear to be sitting

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:45.084 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.440$ in a dark room somewhere.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:47.440 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.954$ But we've just finished a board

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:49.954 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.540$ meeting and I'm here at your

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}52.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}55.018$ disposal to introduce you to the.

 $00:02:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.580$ International system for reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:02:57.580 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.500$ serious fluid psychopathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}02{:}59.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}02.746$ So this was announced in active

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:02.746 --> 00:03:06.281 cytological in June 2019 and I'm very

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:06.281 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.845$ pleased to say that the book is now

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:09.845 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.289$ available both as an electronic book as

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:13.289 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.600$ well as in paperback through Springer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:16.600 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.920$ Who are the publishers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}03{:}18.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}21.431$ And if you do decide to buy the book

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}03{:}21.431 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}24.135$ please do buy it from Springer and not

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:24.135 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.450$ other websites which are more expensive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:26.450 --> 00:03:29.880 It is my duty to first acknowledge

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}03{:}29.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}31.839$ my Co
 editors, Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:31.839 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.817$ Barbara Crowther's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}03{:}32.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35.262$ doctor Daniel Curtis and abroad

 $00:03:35.262 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.735$ Dr Fernando Schmidt who were the

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}03{:}38.735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}42.345$ leading lights in bringing this this

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:42.345 --> 00:03:44.520 project together which is jointly

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:44.520 --> 00:03:47.266 sponsored by the American Society of

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:47.266 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.611$ Cyto Pathology and the International

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:49.611 --> 00:03:51.968 Academy of Psychology and I'm very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:51.970 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.964$ very much indebted to all the chapter

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:03:54.964 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.100$ authors who have contributed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:57.100 --> 00:03:58.729 To this book,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:03:58.729 --> 00:04:01.444 during a particularly difficult time

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:01.444 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.096$ over the pandemic, and we were very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:05.096 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.103$ very fortunate to see it come to

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:04:08.103 --> 00:04:10.408 fruition and publication at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:10.408 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.252$ end of last chair.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:12.260 \longrightarrow 00:04:14.860$ So what was the need for this project?

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:04:14.860 --> 00:04:17.037 You know, we when we thought about,

00:04:17.040 --> 00:04:17.900 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:17.900 \longrightarrow 00:04:20.480$ do we really need a terminology

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:20.480 \longrightarrow 00:04:23.328$ system for serious fluid cytology?

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:23.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.034$ We had to have a discussion I had

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:04:25.034 --> 00:04:26.906 to put forward a proposal to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667 00:04:26.910 --> 00:04:27.426 you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:27.426 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.232$ What would be the point of doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}04{:}29.232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}31.380$ this and what motivated me was

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:31.380 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.450$ the need for some answers to very

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:34.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.097$ practical clinical questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:04:36.100 --> 00:04:38.494 The parish system had set a really

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:38.494 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.682$ good precedent to evaluation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:40.682 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.580$ adequacy criterion, fluid samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}04{:}42.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}45.820$ urine in the case of the parish system

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:45.901 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.189$ and had linked it to volume and celularity,

 $00:04:49.190 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.908$ and to my mind there would was a link

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:04:51.908 --> 00:04:54.636 to fluid samples and adequacy taking

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:54.636 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.039$ into account both volume the cell content.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:04:58.040 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.064$ And this in turn I thought would help

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:00.064 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.130$ us define what is a true negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:02.130 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.635$ sample for a particular patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:03.640 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.892$ That is to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:05:04.892 --> 00:05:06.457 if the cytology sample from

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:06.457 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.659$ a pleural fluid is negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:08.660 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.551$ then it does in fact mean that

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}05{:}11.551 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}14.568$ the patient is free of metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:14.568 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.378$ disease to the pleural cavity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}05{:}17.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}19.996$ There was also the issue of the use

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00{:}05{:}19.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}22.989$ of the existing terminology systems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

00:05:22.990 --> 00:05:25.134 which weren't internationally accepted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:25.134 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.880$ so everyone was doing their own thing.

 $00:05:28.880 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.590$ In particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:29.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.365$ the tippy and suspicious categories

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:31.365 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.632$ showed a great degree of overlap

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:33.632 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.778$ in published literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667

 $00:05:34.780 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.258$ and I thought that the time had

NOTE Confidence: 0.822738156666667 00:05:37.258 --> 00:05:38.320 come to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:05:38.406 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.286$ and define a tipiya and suspicious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:05:41.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.258$ As you know, individual categories and define

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:05:44.258 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.289$ some criteria for putting cases into these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:05:47.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.068$ Categories I also thought that visiting

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}05{:}50.068 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}05{:}53.250$ revisiting the value of cytology in Miso,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:05:53.250 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.710$ thi Lio Ma was very timely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}05{:}55.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}59.000$ Now, given that the diagnosis of mesothelioma

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:05:59.000 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.487$ rests on ancillary work up and fish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:03.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.740$ and although the gold standard

 $00:06:05.740 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.540$ still remains a biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:07.540 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.240$ I do not contest that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}06{:}09.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}11.697$ But it is possible to reach a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:11.697 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.287$ conclusive diagnosis of mesothelioma

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:13.287 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.607$ based on a psychology sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:15.610 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.488$ And then there was this, really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:17.488 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.578$ Tricky question about peritoneal washings

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:19.578 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.529$ and how to report the presence of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}06{:}22.529 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}24.554$ epithelial cells in these specimens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:27.624$ So there were a good number of reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}06{:}27.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}29.247$ in the proposal and I was very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:29.250 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.028$ very pleased that both the American

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.906$ Society of Psychopathology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:33.906 \longrightarrow 00:06:35.782$ the International Academy thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:35.782 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.210$ this was a project worth doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:38.210 \longrightarrow 00:06:40.410$ And So what does the system look like?

00:06:40.410 --> 00:06:40.942 Happily,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:40.942 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.666$ it is a very familiar looking terminology

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:44.666 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.406$ system where you have the nondiagnostic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

00:06:47.406 --> 00:06:50.612 Category or and where you have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:50.612 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.858$ negative for malignancy category

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}06{:}52.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55.138$ followed by a typia suspicious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

00:06:55.140 --> 00:06:57.390 Just like you have in Paris,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:06:57.390 \dashrightarrow 00:07:00.370$ Bethesda Thyroid and Milan terminologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:07:00.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.896$ With the only difference being that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:07:02.896 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.080$ the malignant category in fluid

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}07{:}05.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}07.210$ cytology is split into primary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:07:07.210 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.830$ which of course includes MISO.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}07{:}08.830 --> 00{:}07{:}09.666$ Thi Lio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}07{:}09.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}12.156$ Ma mainly and also secondary which

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:07:12.156 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.740$ includes metastatic cost numbers

 $00:07:13.740 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.720$ but also secondary involvement by

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00:07:15.781 \longrightarrow 00:07:18.036$ hematopoietic neoplasms such as leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}07{:}18.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}20.742$ And then foamers and hence the choice

NOTE Confidence: 0.88220778

 $00{:}07{:}20.742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}23.128$ of secondary rather than meta static.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:25.330 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.528$ So what are the factors involved in

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:07:27.528 --> 00:07:29.848 adequacy in serious fluid cytology samples?

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:07:29.850 --> 00:07:32.346 As I said, there's of course sample volume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:32.350 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.575$ but then there's also sell

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:34.575 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.355$ content and cellular preservation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:36.360 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.982$ So is there a recommended volume

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:07:38.982 --> 00:07:40.730 for serous fluid samples?

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:40.730 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.410$ Was the question that we wanted to answer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:43.410 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.189$ and for this there was already existing

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:46.189 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.504$ evidence that came from Doctor Ruper

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:07:48.504 --> 00:07:50.947 at all from Johns Hopkins who had

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}07{:}51.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}53.274$ demonstrated through a very large

00:07:53.274 --> 00:07:56.076 volume study of big sample size.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:07:56.076 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.634$ That 75 male was probably an optimal

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}07{:}59.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}01.690$ volume for psychological assessment

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:01.767 --> 00:08:04.297 and exclusion or confirmation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:04.297 --> 00:08:07.316 milling malignancy between 50 and 75

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:07.316 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.746$ was probably an acceptible volume

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:09.746 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.905$ to request the clinicians to send

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:12.905 --> 00:08:14.791 for psychological evaluation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:14.791 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.746$ a couple of years time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:15.750 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.700$ They also published data to

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}08{:}17.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}19.650$ show that for pericardial fluid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:19.650 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.836$ 60 mil was an acceptable volume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}08{:}22.840 \longrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.304$ but that is not to say that smaller

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:25.304 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.160$ volume samples should be rejected.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:27.160 --> 00:08:29.056 Perhaps you know everything does have

 $00:08:29.056 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.857$ have to be booked in and accessioned in

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}08{:}31.857 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}34.065$ the cytology laboratory and reported upon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:34.070 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.662$ But if the sample volume is very small

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:36.662 --> 00:08:38.899 and normal agency is demonstrated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:38.900 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.940$ then perhaps a comment is warranted

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:40.940 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.935$ to say that you know if the clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:43.935 --> 00:08:45.895 suspicion of malignancy is high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.244$ then perhaps a 50 to 75 mil volume

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:49.244 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.610$ of sample should be sent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:51.610 --> 00:08:52.118 Also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:08:52.118 --> 00:08:55.166 on that point worth mentioning that

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:55.166 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.309$ aliquoting specimens for other

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:08:57.309 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.004$ investigations on serious fluid samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:00.004 --> 00:09:03.240 such as microbiology and biochemistry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:03.240 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.784$ should all be done at the same time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:05.790 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.006$ So when you collect the sample from the

 $00:09:08.006 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.065$ patient on the ward or in the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}09{:}10.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}12.302$ split it up into sample to go to

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:12.302 --> 00:09:13.677 psychology and biochemistry and

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:13.677 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.552$ microbiology separately and not send

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:15.552 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.699$ it all to microbiology and expect

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:17.699 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.596$ them to then split it and send it to

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:20.596 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.888$ cytology and biochemistry because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}09{:}21.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}24.572$ That delay of course causes a

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:24.572 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.886$ deterioration in the quality of

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:26.886 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.568$ the sample for cytology and equally

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:29.568 --> 00:09:31.990 for microbiology or biochemistry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:31.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.738$ Cell content.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}09{:}32.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}35.730$ Big question was do we have to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:35.814 --> 00:09:38.432 me that email cells in serous fluids

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:38.432 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.119$ in order to call them adequate?

00:09:41.120 --> 00:09:43.880 And the short answer to that is no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}09{:}43.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}46.046$ you don't because it is completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:46.046 --> 00:09:48.310 acceptable to find only lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:48.310 --> 00:09:50.634 say in a tuberculosis or chylous effusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:50.640 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.592$ or neutrophils,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:51.592 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.924$ or in an empire from an acute

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:54.924 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.360$ bacterial infection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:09:56.360 \longrightarrow 00:09:58.772$ and you may have benign effusions

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:09:58.772 --> 00:10:00.380 without major female cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:00.380 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.436$ So and conversely,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}10{:}01.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}03.196$ also you could have malignancies

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:03.196 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.720$ where there's a single cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:10:04.720 --> 00:10:06.770 Population of malignant cells only,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:06.770 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.739$ without mesothelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:07.739 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.414$ so it's nice to see me the serial

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}10{:}10.414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}12.850$ cells because it does give you the

 $00:10:12.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.927$ confidence that the the plural or

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:10:14.927 --> 00:10:16.443 pericardial or peritoneal cavity

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:16.443 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.580$ has been sampled,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:10:17.580 --> 00:10:19.911 but you do not pronounce the specimen

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:19.911 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.054$ as being non diagnostic simply because

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:22.054 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.239$ you don't see me as a theory of cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:10:25.240 --> 00:10:28.020 Perhaps the most important feature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:28.020 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.674$ very much like FNA samples or samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:10:31.674 --> 00:10:34.890 fluid samples from other sides you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:34.890 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.710$ You could have a very cellular specimen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00:10:36.710 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.020$ but it is poorly preserved and it

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}10{:}39.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41.323$ could still be non diagnostic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

 $00{:}10{:}41.323 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}42.961$ this could be because there's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.807533446153846

00:10:42.961 --> 00:10:43.780 loss of quality

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:10:43.837 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.472$ due to degenerative changes because

00:10:45.472 --> 00:10:47.750 of delays in reaching the laboratory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:10:47.750 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.970$ There could be bacterial overgrowth and of

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:10:50.970 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.559$ course technical artifacts and contaminants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:10:53.560 --> 00:10:56.872 So I'm going to walk you through the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:10:56.872 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.989$ terminology system using six cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:10:58.990 --> 00:11:01.307 one for each of the diagnostic categories,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:01.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.210$ and then at the end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:11:02.210 --> 00:11:04.522 I'd be very pleased to take any questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}11{:}04.522 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}06.885$ during the time that we have a discussion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:06.890 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.572$ so let's start with the first case of 54

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}11{:}09.572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}12.117$ year old man with a left sided pleural

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:12.117 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.498$ effusion is a smoker and suffers from

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:11:14.498 --> 00:11:16.846 cough and chest pain for one week.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:16.846 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.054$ I will take a moment here to talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:19.054 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.227$ about the importance of macroscopic

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:21.227 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.512$ findings in serious effusion samples.

00:11:23.520 --> 00:11:25.940 Because this is frequently overlooked,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:25.940 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.217$ as soon as we get the request form and

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:11:28.217 --> 00:11:30.266 the slides we read the clinical data

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:30.266 \longrightarrow 00:11:32.569$ and we start to look at the slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:32.570 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.628$ perhaps without even turning the form

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:11:34.628 --> 00:11:37.023 over or scrolling down the screen to

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:37.023 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.943$ see what was the macroscopic appearance

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:38.943 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.723$ of this fluid or cytotechnology

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}11{:}40.723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}42.817$ colleagues work very hard in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:42.820 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.788$ laboratory to record the volume and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:11:45.788 --> 00:11:47.940 physical appearances of old samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.844$ in particular fluid samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}11{:}49.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}52.224$ and their descriptions are important

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:52.224 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.530$ and clinically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:11:53.530 --> 00:11:55.430 Meaningful so you could have,

00:11:55.430 --> 00:11:57.986 you know a stroke alert fluid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:11:57.990 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.470$ which is probably just a a transit date.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:12:00.470 --> 00:12:02.690 Or you could have apparent diffusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.658$ which is almost certainly an exit date.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:05.660 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.593$ You could have a heavily bloodstained fluid

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:12:08.593 --> 00:12:11.587 you could have Milky or chylous fluid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:11.590 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.306$ and all of these words have meanings

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:14.306 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.338$ and so it is important to look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:12:18.338 --> 00:12:21.374 macroscopic appearance of the sample and

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:21.374 \longrightarrow 00:12:23.616$ also in the light of what I've just said.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:23.620 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.021$ About the volume of sample to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:12:26.021 --> 00:12:28.239 if a sufficient sample was sent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:28.240 \dashrightarrow 00:12:30.952$ because based on a small volume sample you

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:30.952 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.139$ may not get the full representative picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:34.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.268$ The second point I want to mention

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:36.268 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.928$ on this slide again is the the fact

 $00:12:38.928 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.608$ that you should ideally examine

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:40.674 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.259$ a combination of a panda.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:12:42.260 --> 00:12:45.249 Games are for serious fluid cytology samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:45.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.082$ pretty much the same as you probably already

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}12{:}48.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}52.100$ do for FNA samples from various sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:52.100 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.372$ So it doesn't matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:12:53.372 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.962$ What the PAP stain is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}12{:}54.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}57.474$ whether it's on a direct spread or it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}12{:}57.474 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}13{:}00.659$ on a cytospin or it's a liquid based

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:00.659 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.918$ preparation such as either thin prep

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:02.918 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.682$ or show pad up app is a PAP and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}13{:}05.682 \rightarrow 00{:}13{:}07.964$ the same way your romanowsky based dye

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}13{:}07.964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}10.066$ orgainzer stain could either be a diff,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}13{:}10.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}13.030$ quik or hemo color or main may Grunwald

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:13.030 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.458$ games are preparation so as long

00:13:15.458 --> 00:13:18.606 as you are using a combination of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00{:}13{:}18.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}21.270$ romanowsky die and a PAP you should get

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:21.270 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.760$ the best information on that particular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:13:23.760 --> 00:13:25.968 Sample having said all of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:25.970 \longrightarrow 00:13:27.500$ in this particular case, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:13:27.500 --> 00:13:28.921 you probably don't even need to put

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:28.921 \longrightarrow 00:13:30.159$ this slide under the microscope,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:13:30.160 --> 00:13:32.134 because you can simply look at it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89332814619047600:13:32.140 --> 00:13:32.638 glance at it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:13:32.638 --> 00:13:33.634 hold it up to the light,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:33.640 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.960$ and say there's not much there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:13:34.960 --> 00:13:36.502 It looks like there's probably just

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476 00:13:36.502 --> 00:13:37.016 some lies. NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

00:13:37.020 --> 00:13:39.360 Red blood cells at the periphery

NOTE Confidence: 0.893328146190476

 $00:13:39.360 \longrightarrow 00:13:40.920$ of this thin prep,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:13:40.920 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.461$ and there are no major fetal cells

00:13:43.461 --> 00:13:45.673 or macrophages or any other kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:13:45.673 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.116$ of cells to give you any confidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:13:48.193 --> 00:13:50.779 that this is a representative sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:13:50.780 --> 00:13:53.768 It's probably just a traumatic aspirate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:13:53.770 --> 00:13:54.976 And therefore nondiagnostic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:13:54.976 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.986$ even on the games are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:13:56.990 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.566$ you will probably just see a red

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:13:59.566 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.102$ and white cells. Again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:01.102 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.412$ A point to mention at this step is

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:04.412 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.904$ that when you see the neutrophils and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:06.904 \longrightarrow 00:14:08.755$ lymphocytes which are probably all

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:08.755 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.891$ just part of the peripheral blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}14{:}10.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}12.512$ Don't call them inflammatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:12.512 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.930$ cells because that to a clinician

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:15.002 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.508$ breeds like oh so there is an

 $00:14:17.508 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.429$ inflammatory pathology in this sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}14{:}19.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}20.810$ These are simply white blood

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:20.810 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.190$ cells from the peripheral blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:22.190 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.695$ They're not indicative or a

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:23.695 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.899$ pathology in the pleura,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:14:24.900 --> 00:14:27.630 so you know simply calling it blood

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}14{:}27.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}29.739$ and non diagnostic is adequate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}14{:}29.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}32.295$ Rather than listing all the white blood

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:14:32.295 --> 00:14:35.489 cells that you might be seeing on the sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:35.490 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.118$ So of course the terminology systems

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}14{:}38.118 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}39.870$ are all about standardizing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:14:39.870 --> 00:14:41.646 uh, you know, reports,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:41.646 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.060$ and so the structure of a report,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:14:45.060 --> 00:14:47.405 whether it's Paris but Esther or Milan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:14:47.410 --> 00:14:49.234 follows a certain protocol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:49.234 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.970$ and so the sample report here

 $00:14:52.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:54.850$ should include an adequacy comment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:54.850 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.518$ a diagnostic category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:56.518 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.854$ and a clinical comment where appropriate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:14:59.860 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.244$ So in a case like the one I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:02.244 \longrightarrow 00:15:03.210$ just shown you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:03.210 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.870$ a sample report might read as follows

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:15:05.870 --> 00:15:08.430 evaluation limited by heavy blood staining,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:08.430 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.942$ likely non representative sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:09.942 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.069$ and it is then assigned to the non

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:13.069 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.054$ diagnostic category in the international

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:15.054 \longrightarrow 00:15:17.797$ system and as a clinical comment you

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:17.797 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.023$ would be advising for repeat sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}15{:}20.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}22.739$ and stating in your report until your

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}15{:}22.739 \longrightarrow 00{:}15{:}25.197$ clinicians begin to get used to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:15:25.197 --> 00:15:27.403 idea that they really need to try

 $00:15:27.403 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.819$ and send 50 to 75 mil volume sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}15{:}29.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}33.105$ And not just two or five mil of sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:33.105 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.780$ 'cause they may not get their answer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:35.780 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.620$ So that was nondiagnostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:37.620 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.430$ moving on to case number two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:40.430 \longrightarrow 00:15:43.046$ and here's a clinical history of a 64 year

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:43.046 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.937$ old man with liver cirrhosis and ascites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:15:45.940 --> 00:15:48.236 We've got 60 mil or straw colored

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}15{:}48.236 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}15{:}50.321$ fluid and two sided spins have

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:15:50.321 --> 00:15:52.715 been prepared a PAP and a games.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}15{:}52.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}55.735$ A combination as I said is ideal and here

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:55.735 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.499$ on this games of preparation you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:15:59.499 \longrightarrow 00:16:02.389$ some beautiful basophilic mesothelial cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}16{:}02.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}05.570$ You will appreciate their peripheral,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:05.570 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.822$ Lacy borders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:06.822 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.700$ You could appreciate.

 $00:16:08.700 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.018$ Perhaps there are the gaps or windows

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:12.018 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.990$ between the mesothelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:13.990 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.620$ the music penal cells show,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:15.620 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.560$ or two tone staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:16:17.560 --> 00:16:19.500 pattern of the cytoplasm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846 00:16:19.500 --> 00:16:20.246 their nuclei, NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:20.246 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.230$ or very much of the same size and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:23.316 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.860$ shape without much pleomorphism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:25.860 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.662$ and they are infiltrated by these

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}16{:}28.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}30.063$ neutrophils and lymphocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:30.070 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.059$ So there is this interaction between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:33.059 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.639$ inflammatory cells and mesothelial cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}16{:}35.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}37.440$ You can appreciate the same features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}16{:}37.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}40.492$ On the papanikolau cytospin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:40.492 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.330$ where again you are able to pay more

 $00:16:44.330 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.500$ attention to the nuclear detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}16{:}46.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}48.467$ which is the strength of the PAP

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:48.467 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.738$ stain and you will see that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:16:50.738 --> 00:16:52.438 nuclei have very smooth margins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:16:52.440 --> 00:16:54.630 The nuclear membrane is very regular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:16:54.630 --> 00:16:56.635 the chromatin is finally dispersed

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00:16:56.635 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.172$ with the presence of small multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

00:16:59.172 --> 00:17:01.472 nuclei rather than a single

NOTE Confidence: 0.868271521153846

 $00{:}17{:}01.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02.852$ large prominent nucleolus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

 $00:17:02.860 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.580$ And again, these groups are

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00:17:05.580 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.756$ infiltrated by inflammatory cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

00:17:07.760 --> 00:17:12.530 So no obvious signs of malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

 $00:17:12.530 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.438$ The sample is certainly

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00:17:14.438 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.869$ adequate for evaluation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

00:17:15.870 --> 00:17:18.000 and you saw some neutrophils,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00{:}17{:}18.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}19.624$ mesothelial cells, and lymphocytes,

 $00:17:19.624 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.634$ and so this will go into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

00:17:22.634 --> 00:17:24.638 negative for malignancy category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00:17:24.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.008$ And given that there was a history of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

00:17:27.008 --> 00:17:29.060 cirrhosis and ascites in this patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

 $00:17:29.060 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.382$ you could put in a comment about the high

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00:17:31.382 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.137$ proportion of neutrophils being present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

 $00:17:33.140 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.795$ which may represent spontaneous bacterial

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00{:}17{:}35.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37.919$ peritonitis and therefore correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902276115555556

 $00:17:37.920 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.072$ With clinical and microbiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.90227611555556

 $00:17:40.072 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.224$ findings would be advised.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:17:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.520$ So the negative for malignancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:17:46.520 --> 00:17:48.580 category you would expect to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}17{:}48.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}51.332$ see normal or the expected cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}17{:}51.332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}53.120$ populations in variable numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:17:53.120 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.570$ and these could be lymphocytes.

00:17:55.570 --> 00:17:57.700 Macrophages means a female cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}17{:}57.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.898$ neutrophils and eosinophils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:00.900 --> 00:18:01.599 Doctor Evil Chick,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:01.599 \longrightarrow 00:18:02.997$ who is one of the lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:02.997 --> 00:18:04.238 authors of the Paris system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:04.240 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.803$ was also the lead author for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}18{:}07.803 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}09.940$ negative for Malignancy Chapter

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:09.940 \longrightarrow 00:18:14.070$ and she created this awesome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.358$ algorithm for effusions and once you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:17.358 --> 00:18:20.060 separated out the inadequate ones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}18{:}20.060 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}18{:}22.230$ the remainder that are adequate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:22.230 --> 00:18:24.920 could be just broadly divided into

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:24.920 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.566$ two main categories of those having

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:27.566 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.610$ the expected cellular findings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:29.610 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.844$ Uh, and so here you would just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:32.844 --> 00:18:34.949 have variable numbers of the,

 $00{:}18{:}34.950 --> 00{:}18{:}36.050 \ \mathrm{you} \ \mathrm{know},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}18{:}36.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}38.566$ lymphocytes or mesothelial cells etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:38.566 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.778$ And on the other hand you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:40.778 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.402$ have some unexpected cellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:42.402 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.702$ and non cellular findings if

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:44.702 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.570$ you have malignant cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:46.570 --> 00:18:48.424 Obviously you've got a diagnosis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:48.424 --> 00:18:50.675 then you've got to do your ancillary

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}18{:}50.675 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}52.583$ work up to confirm the diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}18{:}52.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}55.159$ But you could also have some noncellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:18:55.159 --> 00:18:57.560 findings which do indicate a careful

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}18{:}57.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}59.615$ search in the background formula.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:18:59.620 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.858$ And see because some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:01.858 --> 00:19:03.932 non cellular findings may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:03.932 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.459$ associated with malignancy,

00:19:05.460 --> 00:19:07.188 but if you don't see malignancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}19{:}07.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}09.168$ you don't have to call the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:09.168 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.696$ sample atypical or suspicious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:10.700 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.476$ You should still sign it out as negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:13.480 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.092$ Having done a careful search to exclude

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:17.092 --> 00:19:20.628 malignancy and As for the reactive effusions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:20.630 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.920$ you could have different patterns

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:22.920 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.210$ based on the relative preponderance

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:25.283 --> 00:19:27.068 of a particular cell type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:27.068 --> 00:19:28.644 So whether it's eosinophilic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:28.644 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.826$ or lymph ascitic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:29.830 --> 00:19:32.364 You would need to state you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:32.364 \longrightarrow 00:19:34.540$ what the possible causes of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:34.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.348$ cinephilic preponderance might be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:36.348 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.608$ whether there's been a recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:38.608 --> 00:19:40.189 pleural fluid aspiration,

 $00:19:40.190 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.872$ or whether there is an allergic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:42.872 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.415$ condition in the patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:44.415 --> 00:19:46.605 And likewise as I said earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:19:46.610 --> 00:19:51.460 for lymphocytic and neutrophilic effusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:51.460 \longrightarrow 00:19:54.736$ So that's a negative for malignancy category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:54.740 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.440$ moving onto a third case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:56.440 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.330$ And here's the history of a 46

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:19:58.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.114$ year old female with a history

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:00.114 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.639$ of breast carcinoma six years

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}20{:}01.639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}03.689$ ago and now presents with cough

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:03.689 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.414$ and a small pleural effusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:20:05.420 --> 00:20:07.380 We've received 20 Miller stroke,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:07.380 \longrightarrow 00:20:10.626$ bullet fluid and sitis pins have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:10.626 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.618$ been prepared and on the side

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:20:13.618 --> 00:20:16.006 of spins at high magnification.

 $00:20:16.006 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.918$ This is times 20.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}20{:}17.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}19.978$ You have a very cellular sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:19.978 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.939$ in the background you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:21.940 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.308$ Blood and you can see quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:23.308 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.220$ a few years cinefile,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.530$ so it's possible that this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:26.530 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.460$ a repeat aspirate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:29.460 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.908$ In the center fielder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:30.908 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.080$ simply a reaction to the introduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:20:33.143 --> 00:20:35.207 of small amounts of air during

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:35.207 \longrightarrow 00:20:37.055$ the previous procedure and which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:37.055 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.105$ irritates the pleura and insights

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:20:39.105 --> 00:20:40.745 in your cinephilic reaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:40.750 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.174$ But what you also see are of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:43.174 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.080$ these means arterial cells with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:20:47.060$ the gaps or windows between them,

 $00{:}20{:}47.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49.118$ some of them showing by nucleation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:20:49.120 --> 00:20:50.401 Overall looking very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:20:50.401 --> 00:20:53.390 very bland indeed and then also some

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:53.465 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.027$ other cells which by their association

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:20:56.027 \longrightarrow 00:20:58.797$ with the same group of material

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00{:}20{:}58.797 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}01.267$ cells are probably just degenerate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:21:01.270 --> 00:21:03.394 But they all showing micro valuation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:21:03.394 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.825$ of the cytoplasm and and so you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:21:05.825 \longrightarrow 00:21:07.984$ there's some doubt in your mind given

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:21:07.984 \longrightarrow 00:21:09.809$ the history of breast carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

 $00:21:09.810 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.974$ should I really worry

NOTE Confidence: 0.8744905425

00:21:10.974 --> 00:21:12.720 about these or can I write

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:12.790 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.310$ these off as degenerative

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:14.310 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.830$ changes in medial cells?

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:21:15.830 --> 00:21:17.792 And then you look at your thin prep PAP?

00:21:17.800 --> 00:21:20.013 And again you see this population

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}21{:}20.013 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}22.578$ of likely means arterial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:22.580 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.783$ but scattered within.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:23.783 \longrightarrow 00:21:26.189$ These are also some cells which

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:26.189 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.778$ draw your attention because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:21:28.778 --> 00:21:30.890 have slightly prominent nucleoli.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:30.890 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.715$ Although the nuclear chromatin overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:32.715 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.924$ is not cause and so you're not strongly

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:35.924 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.124$ suspicious that these are malignant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:38.130 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.356$ you believe that these amazing serial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:40.360 \longrightarrow 00:21:43.360$ but there is a clinical history

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:43.360 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.425$ that is making you pause and wonder

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:46.425 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.980$ whether you need to investigate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:21:48.980 --> 00:21:50.808 sample further through ancillary

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:21:50.808 --> 00:21:53.278 tests to exclude the possibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:21:53.278 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.505$ of small volume metastases from the

 $00:21:56.505 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.729$ known previous breast carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}21{:}58.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}01.258$ and so that is the sort of clinical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:01.260 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.032$ Scenario or setting for the use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:04.032 \longrightarrow 00:22:06.628$ the atypical category when you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:06.628 --> 00:22:08.408 occasional body preserved cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:08.408 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.670$ with some nuclear enlargement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:10.670 --> 00:22:12.734 subtle changes like hyperchromasia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:12.734 \longrightarrow 00:22:15.314$ but no obvious chromatin and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:15.314 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.559$ nuclear membrane abnormalities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:17.560 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.295$ You believe that these are

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:19.295 --> 00:22:20.336 lightly degenerated macrophages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:20.340 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.945$ amazing theater cells and you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}22{:}22.945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}26.151$ performing ancillary tests to exclude the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:26.151 --> 00:22:28.756 possibility of metastatic cost Sonoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:28.760 --> 00:22:31.310 So you do your epithelial markers

 $00:22:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.585$ and mesothelial markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:32.590 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.906$ And you can then downgrade the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:34.906 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.330$ sample to negative for malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:37.330 \longrightarrow 00:22:38.642$ Once the epithelial markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:38.642 \longrightarrow 00:22:40.282$ are shown to be negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:40.290 --> 00:22:42.684 So in this case you prepare a cell block

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:42.684 --> 00:22:45.423 and again all you see or miso thi lio cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:45.430 \longrightarrow 00:22:48.220$ macrophages some fiber in a few

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:48.220 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.080$ lymphocytes and your epithelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:22:50.159 --> 00:22:53.648 markers come back negative and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}22{:}53.648 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}22{:}57.620$ the atypical category really is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:22:57.620 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.320$ uncommonly used category in effusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:00.320 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.544$ Some experience title pathologists

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:01.544 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.074$ don't like to use it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222 00:23:03.080 --> 00:23:03.720 At all, NOTE Confidence: 0.86873029222222200:23:03.720 --> 00:23:04.680 and in fact,

 $00{:}23{:}04.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}07.096$ one of the biggest questions for me for

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}23{:}07.096 \to 00{:}23{:}09.019$ this particular terminology system was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:09.020 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.246$ could we simply just collapse the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:23:11.246 --> 00:23:12.730 atypia and suspicious category

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:23:12.794 --> 00:23:15.298 into one and do away with it appear

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:23:15.298 --> 00:23:16.944 completely because they just didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:16.944 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.858$ seem to be good diagnostic criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:18.858 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.406$ in literature for a for a tipiya.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222200:23:21.410 --> 00:23:21.833 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:21.833 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.371$ before we embarked on the project

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:24.371 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.895$ and our literature search,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}23{:}25.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}28.450$ we conducted a survey which was sent

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}23{:}28.521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}30.627$ out by the University of Wisconsin

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:30.630 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.546$ doctor Dan Curtis's department.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:32.546 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.420$ And we got about 600 respondents

00:23:35.495 --> 00:23:38.057 telling us that they would like us

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}23{:}38.057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}40.660$ to include the tipiya category in

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:40.660 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.160$ the terminology system because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:42.160 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.467$ do use it and they have clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:44.467 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.549$ circumstances in which they use it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.410$ And so for the time being,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:48.410 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.300$ we decided to include it in

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:50.300 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.245$ the terminology system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}23{:}51.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}53.301$ But we're going to watch its progress

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:53.301 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.108$ and the performance of this category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}23{:}55.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}56.814$ What was becoming increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:23:56.814 \longrightarrow 00:23:59.370$ apparent from the survey was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:23:59.445 --> 00:24:01.776 in our minds we are following the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}24{:}01.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}03.980$ two step process for the atypical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:03.980 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.242$ And suspicious cases where we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:06.242 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.527$ putting a case aside while we

00:24:08.527 --> 00:24:10.633 were doing the ancillary work up

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:10.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.815$ and some colleagues were actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

00:24:12.815 --> 00:24:14.555 issuing a preliminary report,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:14.560 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.858$ which is of course optional and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:16.858 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.218$ not mandated by the international

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:19.218 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.555$ system simply to give them the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:22.555 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.140$ time to assess this sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:25.140 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.982$ And in order to prevent, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:27.982 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.506$ clinical queries and emails,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00{:}24{:}29.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}32.166$ and you know where's the result to put

NOTE Confidence: 0.868730292222222

 $00:24:32.166 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.490$ something out there for the clinicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:24:34.490 --> 00:24:37.055 To receive to say we're working on this case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}24{:}37.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38.660$ there's something odd about it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:24:38.660 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.680$ and we need a little bit more time to come

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:24:42.785 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.425$ to a final conclusion about this case.

 $00:24:46.430 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.485$ And so the diagnostic algorithm

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}24{:}48.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}50.540$ for the atypical category really

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:24:50.609 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.304$ is that you you're you perform a

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:24:53.304 --> 00:24:54.980 preliminary assessment over tipiya,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:24:54.980 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.494$ and then if your immuno chemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:24:57.494 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.623$ demonstrates these atypical cells to

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:24:59.623 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.563$ be just macrophages or mesothelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:25:01.563 --> 00:25:03.534 cells you just downgrade that

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:03.534 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.676$ report to a negative for malignancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:05.680 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.006$ in a small number of cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:07.010 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.878$ If the immuno chemistry demonstrates that

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:09.878 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.409$ the atypical cells are epithelial then you

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:13.409 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.493$ can upgrade your diagnosis too suspicious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:16.500 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.745$ Or malignant secondary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:25:17.745 --> 00:25:21.437 And then you would be left with a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}25{:}21.437 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23.996$ small number of cases where there are

 $00:25:23.996 \longrightarrow 00:25:25.524$ insufficient representative cells or

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}25{:}25.524 \to 00{:}25{:}28.078$ the you know chemistry is equivocal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}25{:}28.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31.104$ and so you reduce the burden of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:31.104 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.416$ cases that you would sign out as that

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:25:34.416 --> 00:25:36.890 appear on serious fluid cytology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:25:36.890 --> 00:25:40.481 And so that is the kind of reasoning behind

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:40.481 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.709$ both the tibia and as I will show you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:25:43.710 --> 00:25:44.985 the suspicious category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:44.985 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.685$ In my next case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:46.690 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.881$ a 68 year old man with pleural

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}25{:}48.881 \rightarrow 00{:}25{:}50.890$ fluid history of lung carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}25{:}50.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53.690$ 30 mil of blood tinged fluid is received.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}25{:}53.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58.742$ And here on the map you can appreciate

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:25:58.742 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.430$ that there are just two cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}26{:}01.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03.794$ but these two cells stand out

 $00:26:03.794 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.799$ in the background because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:05.799 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.589$ are much larger than the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:07.590 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.926$ Inflammatory cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:08.926 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.598$ the UM, the macrophages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:11.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:13.880$ and the means of teal cells in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:13.880 \longrightarrow 00:26:15.700$ background on the games are again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:15.700 --> 00:26:18.577 You see that these nuclei, or quite large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:18.577 --> 00:26:21.300 irregular and again the cells are much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}26{:}21.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}23.925$ much louder than the surrounding

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:23.925 --> 00:26:25.500 lymphocytes and macrophages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:25.500 \longrightarrow 00:26:26.870$ and made me feel cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:26.870 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.166$ So these three cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:28.166 --> 00:26:29.138 or you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:29.140 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.030$ on the PAP and on the games

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:31.030 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.140$ are or to an experienced I at

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}26{:}34.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}36.060$ least suspicious for malignancy.

 $00:26:36.060 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.044$ Depending on your experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:38.044 \longrightarrow 00:26:39.036$ And expertise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:39.040 --> 00:26:41.092 Of course, you could say I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:41.092 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.460$ pretty sure that's malignant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667 00:26:42.460 --> 00:26:42.816 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667 00:26:42.816 --> 00:26:43.528 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:43.528 --> 00:26:46.020 but I need to do my immunostains

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:46.098 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.590$ to be able to just confirm that

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}26{:}48.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}51.100$ these cells are indeed epithelial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}26{:}51.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53.774$ Before I make a diagnosis of metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:26:53.774 --> 00:26:56.700 cost Sonoma in this particular patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:56.700 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.998$ And so you were suspicious while

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:26:58.998 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.060$ you were appreciating just the uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}27{:}01.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}02.530$ the cytological appearances.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:02.530 --> 00:27:04.980 But you needed backup from

 $00:27:04.980 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.590$ your ancillary work up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}27{:}06.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}09.400$ To upgrade the diagnosis from

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:09.400 --> 00:27:11.086 suspicious to malignant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:11.090 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.406$ and so the suspicious scenarios in

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:13.406 \longrightarrow 00:27:15.726$ serous fluid cytology is where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:15.726 --> 00:27:17.844 have either small numbers of cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:17.844 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.075$ or groups with nuclear pleomorphism

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:20.075 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.011$ that require ancillary tests

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}27{:}22.011 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}24.048$ for confirmation of malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:24.048 \longrightarrow 00:27:27.516$ Sometimes you may have cells with

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00{:}27{:}27.516 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}27{:}29.250$ relatively bland appearances

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:29.329 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.969$ or mild plum Orphism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:30.970 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.690$ They may even be numerous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:32.690 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.330$ but they look very bland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:34.330 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.745$ or they may be simply in small.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:36.750 --> 00:27:38.862 Numbers like we talked about in

 $00:27:38.862 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.164$ the case of breast or another

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:41.164 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.618$ scenario where you have music in

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:43.618 --> 00:27:45.802 the background but very few or

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:45.802 --> 00:27:47.746 no cells or very bland looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:47.750 --> 00:27:50.060 cells in a scitic fluid in say

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:50.060 --> 00:27:51.600 a pseudomyxoma pair tonight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

00:27:51.600 --> 00:27:53.672 But in the absence of cells you can't

NOTE Confidence: 0.906536946666667

 $00:27:53.672 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.617$ really make a diagnosis of malignancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:27:55.620 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.310$ but you could certainly raise

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}27{:}58.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}00.525$ the suspicion of pseudomyxoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:28:00.525 --> 00:28:04.095 based simply on the museum scene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}28{:}04.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}05.688$ lymph ascitic effusions with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}28{:}05.688 \operatorname{{--}{>}} 00{:}28{:}06.879$ the monotonous population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.519$ Again, would need a an ancillary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:09.520 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.232$ Work up to confirm the diagnosis of lymphoma

00:28:12.232 --> 00:28:14.580 or exclude the diagnosis of lymphoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:14.580 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.449$ and so again till you get the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:28:16.449 --> 00:28:18.379 results of your ancillary work up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:18.380 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.536$ You could put that into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:28:21.536 --> 00:28:23.114 suspicious category provisionally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.178$ And so similar to the algorithm for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:25.178 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.329$ atypia in the suspicious category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:28:27.330 --> 00:28:29.910 Again, we are basically worried

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:29.910 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.249$ about a small number of cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:33.249 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.877$ or preliminary assessment is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:35.880 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.058$ In the favor of malignancy rather

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:38.058 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.485$ than in favor of benign as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:40.485 \longrightarrow 00:28:42.720$ opposed to the atypical category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:42.720 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.205$ And then once you do your immunostains

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:28:45.205 --> 00:28:47.264 you confirm malignancy and your final

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:47.264 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.427$ report would be malignant and so again

 $00:28:49.488 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.680$ you would be only left with a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:51.680 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.355$ small number of cases where there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:54.355 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.480$ insufficient material or the immuno

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:28:56.562 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.160$ chemistry is not supportive of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}28{:}59.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}01.687$ diagnosis where you would be left

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:01.687 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.802$ with a suspicious category as the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:03.802 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.210$ final diagnosis and you could of course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.630$ Just request further sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:08.630 \longrightarrow 00:29:11.050$ to confirm the diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}29{:}11.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}12.890$ At this point I would just take a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}29{:}12.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}14.664$ moment to talk about answer retesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:14.664 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.853$ of lung padmakar Sonoma in this case

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}29{:}16.853 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}18.533$ because in such a case you might

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:18.533 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.820$ be able to arrive at the diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:20.820 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.260$ of metastatic lung carcinoma.

00:29:22.260 --> 00:29:25.445 A once you've done your TTF one immunostain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:29:25.445 --> 00:29:28.175 but you may not have sufficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:28.175 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.339$ material remaining for PDL 1 alpenrose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:30.339 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.673$ and for doing your next generation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:29:32.673 --> 00:29:34.746 sequencing which may be needed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:34.746 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.018$ for targeted chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:36.020 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.352$ In this particular case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:37.352 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.278$ and so my plea to you is to restrict the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}29{:}41.278 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}29{:}43.206$ Amount of immuno chemistry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:29:43.210 --> 00:29:45.510 You perform in a posse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}29{:}45.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}48.180$ cellular samples or samples that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:48.180 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.450$ small numbers of malignant cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:29:50.450 --> 00:29:52.442 Because you really want to try

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:52.442 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.606$ and conserve material as far as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:29:54.606 --> 00:29:56.138 possible for molecular testing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:29:56.140 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.268$ it may still not be possible given

 $00:29:58.268 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.288$ on the small number of malignant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:00.288 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.023$ cells in such a sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:02.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.174$ but at least we should not exhaust all

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:05.174 \longrightarrow 00:30:07.908$ of our cells doing immuno chemistry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:30:07.908 --> 00:30:09.856 So just to summarize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:09.860 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.380$ the difference between the atypical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:30:11.380 --> 00:30:13.168 In suspicious categories in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}13.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}14.509$ the international system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:14.510 \dashrightarrow 00:30:18.302$ in the atypical category we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:18.302 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.198$ subtle psychological abnormalities

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}20.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}22.733$ where we think we're dealing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:22.733 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.993$ with a benign cell type,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}25.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}28.300$ but we can't completely or confidently

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:28.300 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.500$ exclude malignancy because there

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:30.577 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.899$ may be a clinical factor that

 $00:30:32.899 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.130$ is influencing us to exclude it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}35.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}37.510$ But you do expect in the vast

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}37.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}39.552$ majority of cases that the outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:39.552 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.530$ would be benign and so the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:41.530 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.660$ Suggested risk of malignancy in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:43.660 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.919$ category is to the tune of 20%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:45.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.358$ This needs to be borne out by future data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:30:49.360 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.446$ but we would like to maintain a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:30:51.446 --> 00:30:53.497 good degree of separation from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

00:30:53.497 --> 00:30:56.300 suspicious category with a sort of a 20.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}56.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}58.496$ 80 split for the suspicious category

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00{:}30{:}58.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01.403$ so that in in the suspicious category

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:31:01.403 \longrightarrow 00:31:04.581$ we really expect that the outcome will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:31:04.662 \longrightarrow 00:31:07.398$ be usually be malignant because we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:31:07.398 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.410$ favored an epithelial origin of the cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:31:10.410 \longrightarrow 00:31:13.750$ but we just needed more of the same,

 $00:31:13.750 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.865$ so it's a quantitative factor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8879503675

 $00:31:15.865 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.557$ in the suspicious category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:17.560 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.912$ whereas it could be a qualitative

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:31:19.912 --> 00:31:21.907 factor in the atypical category

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:21.907 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.049$ where the cells that you see

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:24.049 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.660$ simply do not fulfill the criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:31:26.660 --> 00:31:29.384 Or high grade malignancy and therefore

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:29.384 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.250$ you are being cautious and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:32.250 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.996$ erring on the side of caution

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:33.996 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.730$ and calling it a typical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:31:35.730 --> 00:31:37.705 Whereas in suspicious you're fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:37.705 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.410$ confident that if you had another 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}31{:}40.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}43.050$ cells or if the ancillary work up proves

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:43.121 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.647$ these suspicious cells to be malignant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:45.650 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.660$ then you would be shown to be

 $00:31:48.660 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.100$ correct in your assessment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}31{:}51.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}53.036$ OK, moving on to the last two cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.800$ then #5 is a 68 year old man with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:55.888 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.654$ history of exposure to asbestos and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:31:59.654 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.060$ unilateral hemorrhagic pleural effusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:02.060 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.228$ 80 mil of blood fluid with a clot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044 00:32:05.230 --> 00:32:05.706 And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:05.706 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.372$ I'm just going to take a moment

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:07.372 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.414$ to say that if there is a cloth

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:09.414 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.590$ present within the sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}32{:}10.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}12.930$ the lab should really automatically

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:32:12.930 --> 00:32:15.708 process it because it's very likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:15.708 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.240$ that the cytospin's may not contain the

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:18.240 \longrightarrow 00:32:21.160$ material that it is trapped within the cloth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:32:21.160 --> 00:32:23.825 And so getting additional value

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}32{:}23.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}26.465$ from processing the cloth should

00:32:26.465 --> 00:32:28.990 almost be an automatic procedure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:28.990 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.372$ whereas if you there isn't a

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}32{:}31.372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}34.007$ spontaneous clot and you want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:32:34.007 --> 00:32:36.417 perform additional ancillary work up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:36.420 \dashrightarrow 00:32:38.933$ you could request a cell block from

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:38.933 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.936$ the sample whereby you're actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:40.936 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.066$ adding thrombin or other chemicals

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}32{:}43.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}45.719$ to the sample to precipitate a clot

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:45.719 \dashrightarrow 00:32:48.298$ from which you can then cut sections

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:32:48.298 --> 00:32:50.770 and perform immuno chemistry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:50.770 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.010$ So of course you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:52.010 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.081$ The history there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}32{:}53.081 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}55.580$ you know is a very directed one

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:55.658 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.088$ and it is about mesothelial cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:58.090 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.062$ And here is this,

 $00:32:59.062 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.548$ you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:32:59.550 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.614$ really happy looking miso thi deal

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:01.614 \longrightarrow 00:33:03.877$ cell that's bursting at the edges with

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:03.877 --> 00:33:06.210 you know it's this sort of Lacy skirt,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.482$ like peripheral blips.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:07.482 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.602$ It's got the sub membranous

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:09.602 --> 00:33:10.450 glycogen vacuoles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:10.450 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.580$ It's got the two tone staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:12.580 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.645$ of the cytoplasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:13.650 --> 00:33:16.344 It's got a relatively bland looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:16.344 \longrightarrow 00:33:19.447$ nucleus which is showing a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:19.447 --> 00:33:21.289 low nucleocytoplasmic ratio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:21.290 \longrightarrow 00:33:22.734$ You know, there there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:22.734 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.539$ Chromatin and the nuclear membrane,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:33:25.812$ or look relatively smooth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:25.812 --> 00:33:28.158 but by looking at it you can't

 $00:33:28.158 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.028$ always tell whether this means

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:30.028 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.399$ ethereal cell is benign or malignant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:32.400 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.346$ and that is the challenge of

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:35.346 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.328$ mesothelial proliferations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044 00:33:36.330 --> 00:33:37.600 Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:37.600 --> 00:33:40.775 there are features like hypercellularity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:40.780 --> 00:33:43.902 and you know if you have presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:43.902 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.882$ of significant pleomorphism abnormal

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:45.882 --> 00:33:48.687 mitotic figures in mesothelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}33{:}48.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}50.748$ then of course you could suspect me

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:50.748 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.378$ the thielemier straight away based on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:52.380 --> 00:33:52.910 Morphology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}33{:}52.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}56.090$ but usually it is quite difficult

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:33:56.090 --> 00:33:58.480 because the morphology of medial

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:33:58.480 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.986$ cells can be very very bland even

 $00:34:00.986 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.459$ in neoplastic proliferations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:03.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:07.030$ but they also tend to be relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:07.030 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.852$ monomorphic from one cell to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:09.852 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.652$ next from 1 nucleus to the next,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:12.660 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.445$ and from one group to the next.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:34:14.450 --> 00:34:17.159 The groups are typically very equal sized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:34:17.160 --> 00:34:18.618 unlike in adenocarcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:34:18.618 --> 00:34:21.534 and of course at high magnification

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:21.534 \longrightarrow 00:34:22.899$ they will still.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

00:34:22.900 --> 00:34:25.276 Then the properties of mesothelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}34{:}25.280 \to 00{:}34{:}27.308$ which are the gaps or windows

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:27.308 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.322$ between the cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:28.330 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.780$ the clasping feature of mesothelial cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:31.780 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.192$ They may begin to show very

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00:34:34.192 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.398$ prominent single cherry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924029463913044

 $00{:}34{:}35.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}37.850$ red large nucleoli which would

 $00:34:37.850 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.300$ alert you to the possibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}34{:}40.389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}43.100$ of mesothelioma. But you are going

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:43.100 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.170$ to need your ancillary work up

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:45.170 \longrightarrow 00:34:48.140$ to confirm the diagnosis on say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:48.140 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.904$ a cell block and again you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:49.904 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.312$ appreciate all of those features

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:51.312 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.088$ of major female cells in this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:53.090 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.204$ Cell block here and so this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}34{:}55.204 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}57.654$ really the the panel that will help

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}34{:}57.654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}59.868$ you arrive at the conclusion about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:34:59.936 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.946$ what the nature of this means.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}35{:}01.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}03.279$ Ethereal proliferation is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}35{:}03.279 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}05.937$ Is it just reactive and therefore

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:35:05.937 --> 00:35:08.453 to be put in the negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:08.453 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.049$ for malignancy category and.

00:35:10.050 --> 00:35:11.283 For this, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:11.283 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.730$ this is a suggested and commonly used panel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:35:14.730 --> 00:35:16.585 Immuno chemistry certainly in Europe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:16.585 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.880$ and other parts of the world.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:35:18.880 --> 00:35:21.670 Desmin is very frequently used thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:35:21.670 --> 00:35:25.045 it is quite variably used in the states,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:25.045 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.295$ but we certainly find it very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:27.295 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.007$ valuable because Desmond retains its

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}35{:}30.007 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}32.271$ cytoplasmic positivity in reactive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:32.271 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.318$ mesothelial cells and it is lost in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}35{:}35.318 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}37.158$ a high proportion of mesotheliomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:37.160 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.216$ epithelial membrane antigen shows a dense,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:35:41.220 --> 00:35:44.140 very thick membranous staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:44.140 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.600$ in mesothelioma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.384$ Which is not seen in mesothelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:48.384 \longrightarrow 00:35:49.776$ reactive medial cells,

 $00:35:49.780 \longrightarrow 00:35:52.748$ and it will show a diffuse cytoplasmic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}35{:}52.748 {\: -->\:} 00{:}35{:}54.020$ staining in a denocarcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:54.020 \longrightarrow 00:35:55.788$ So it you know this is one stain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:55.788 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.479$ that can help you distinguish

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:35:57.479 \longrightarrow 00:35:58.667$ between reactive means.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:35:58.670 --> 00:36:00.200 Arterial cells, miso, thi Lio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:00.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.277$ Mars and adenocarcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:01.277 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.790$ but of course we are now in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:03.861 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.415$ the day and age of BAP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:36:05.420 --> 00:36:08.860 One bracket associated protein one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:08.860 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.960$ the loss of which is associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:10.960 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.240$ a very high proportion of medium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:36:13.240 --> 00:36:16.370 As you know 80 to 90% of me is a theomars.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:16.370 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.410$ Will show a loss of nuclear

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:18.410 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.631$ staining with BAP one which will

00:36:20.631 --> 00:36:22.977 be retained in a reactive measure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}36{:}22.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}25.660$ Theal cells and also interestingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:36:25.660 --> 00:36:27.268 in lung adenocarcinomas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.867$ So if BAP one is included in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:36:29.867 --> 00:36:32.070 your panel and it is positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:36:32.070 --> 00:36:33.895 it's almost certainly not miso,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:33.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.308$ thi Lio Ma and your panel here could

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:36.308 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.919$ then help you distinguish between an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}36{:}38.919 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}40.675$ adenocarcinoma and mesothelioma and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:36:40.675 --> 00:36:43.970 back one is quite helpful in that regard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}36{:}43.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}46.430$ but of course you know ancillary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}36{:}46.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}49.712$ Testings using fish or mtap and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:49.712 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.082$ P16 deletions are the ones which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:53.082 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.304$ you know will clinch the diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:56.304 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.058$ in the equivocal cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:36:58.058 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.770$ and so this is the panel which I

 $00:37:00.843 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.585$ would recommend and is recommended in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}37{:}03.585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}06.092$ the international system for sorting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:06.092 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.528$ out your mesothelial proliferations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}37{:}08.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}11.183$ I won't read out this slide to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:11.183 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.890$ you of ancillary tests,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:12.890 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.920$ but just to say that a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:37:14.920 --> 00:37:16.700 place to start if you have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:16.700 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.972$ A differential diagnosis of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:18.972 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.244$ amazing theal proliferation versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:21.250 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.590$ carcinoma used to good miso,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:24.590 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.480$ thi lie and epithelial marker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}37{:}26.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}28.520$ and a macrophage marker user panel

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}37{:}28.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}30.979$ that works well in your laboratory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:37:30.980 --> 00:37:31.353 Historically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:31.353 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.337$ if it's worked well for you know years

 $00:37:34.337 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.880$ and years and there's no reason to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:36.880 \dashrightarrow 00:37:38.754$ think of switching to something else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:38.754 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.148$ But bear in mind that there are some

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:41.148 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.628$ very good adenocarcinomas that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:37:42.628 --> 00:37:44.924 coming up all the time and perhaps one

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:44.924 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.748$ of these could replace some of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:46.748 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.152$ Older ones that you may have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:48.152 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.570$ been using in the laboratory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:49.570 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.794$ I'll come to the site specific markers later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00:37:51.800 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.187$ but also to alert you to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

 $00{:}37{:}54.187 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}57.149$ fact that there can be an overlap

NOTE Confidence: 0.8599958175

00:37:57.149 --> 00:37:59.009 with certain immunostains like

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:37:59.010 \dashrightarrow 00:38:02.538$ WT1 GATA 3 which can overlap between

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:02.538 \longrightarrow 00:38:05.250$ carcinomas and mesothelial proliferation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:05.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.518$ So you do need to be aware

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:38:07.518 --> 00:38:08.490 of published literature,

 $00:38:08.490 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.549$ and of course the importance of clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:11.549 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.780$ correlation and every single case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:13.780 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.904$ But by and large you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:15.904 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.966$ perform answer retests.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:16.970 \dashrightarrow 00:38:20.018$ To resolve the dilemma between Mesothelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:20.018 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.050$ proliferations and metastatic carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:22.050 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.633$ So a sample report for a MISO thi live

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:24.633 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.152$ proliferation in the international

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}38{:}26.152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}28.112$ system would read something like

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:38:28.112 --> 00:38:29.780 this satisfactory for evaluation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:29.780 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.090$ you would give a brief description

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:32.090 \longrightarrow 00:38:33.630$ of the cellular findings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}38{:}33.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}35.370$ the fact that immunostains have

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:35.370 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.762$ been requested for confirmation

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:36.762 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.060$ either on the cell block.

 $00:38:38.060 \longrightarrow 00:38:39.908$ Of course, if there is an accompanying

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}38{:}39.908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}41.570$ biopsy in the same department,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:41.570 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.175$ there probably is no need to replicate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:45.180 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.276$ The same immunol work up on two different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:38:48.280 --> 00:38:51.045 Uh, you know specimens and you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:51.045 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.470$ just do them on either one of those two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:54.470 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.220$ and then if the immunostains

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.920$ are confirmatory,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:38:56.920 \longrightarrow 00:38:59.968$ you can have a final diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:38:59.968 --> 00:39:01.492 of malignant primary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:01.500 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.868$ which is means a theory OMA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:02.870 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.146$ And of course always always advise

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}39{:}06.146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}07.784$ clinical correlation because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:07.790 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.938$ Radial radiological appearance is

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:09.938 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.532$ and the biopsy confirmation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:12.532 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.496$ invasive mesothelioma is still

 $00:39:14.496 \longrightarrow 00:39:17.260$ the gold standard for diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:17.260 \longrightarrow 00:39:21.284$ but it can be achieved with cytology with

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:21.284 \longrightarrow 00:39:24.360$ a confirmatory panel of immunostains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:39:24.360 --> 00:39:26.250 Anything that falls short of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:26.250 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.884$ mark should be called either

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:27.884 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.089$ suspicious or just left at a typical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.362$ So if you've got,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}39{:}31.362 --> 00{:}39{:}33.270$ you know some classic morphological features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:33.270 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.808$ but the immunostains are not confirm

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:35.808 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.639$ atory step back and advise biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:38.640 \longrightarrow 00:39:41.250$ Advised correlation with clinical and

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:39:43.860$ radiological findings discussed at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}39{:}43.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}45.761$ clinical meetings or multidisciplinary

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:45.761 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.309$ meetings as we call them here in the UK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:39:49.310 --> 00:39:50.399 And of course,

 $00:39:50.399 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.577$ if the morphology is not classic

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}39{:}52.577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}54.694$ and the immunostains are not

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:54.694 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.214$ confirm atory either then you stop

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:57.287 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.977$ at a typical musical proliferation

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:39:59.977 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.129$ and advise further investigation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:02.130 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.115$ So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:40:03.115 --> 00:40:04.100 uhm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}40{:}04.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}06.540$ A recognizable abnormal cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:06.540 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.590$ population should be present and

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:09.590 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.825$ adequate for a robust diagnosis on

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}40{:}12.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}15.355$ which clinical management may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:15.444 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.552$ based in the malignant categories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:40:17.552 --> 00:40:20.060 The cell types should be specified

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:20.135 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.225$ either on morphology alone or

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:40:22.225 --> 00:40:24.315 supported by immuno chemistry and

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}40{:}24.389 \rightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.762$ which would allow you to reach a

 $00:40:26.762 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.208$ final diagnosis by the mesothelioma or

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}40{:}29.208 \to 00{:}40{:}31.048$ metastatic cost. Sonoma lymphoma etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}40{:}31.048 \longrightarrow 00{:}40{:}33.120$ And of course you would need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:33.179 \longrightarrow 00:40:34.088$ do some primary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.045$ Organ site investigation in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:37.045 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.996$ of adenocarcinomas, which is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909 00:40:38.996 --> 00:40:39.762 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:39.762 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.380$ not something that you can do for

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}40{:}42.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}45.815$ melanomas or small cell carcinoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:45.815 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.876$ or squamous customers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:47.880 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.298$ So final case then discussions case

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:40:50.298 --> 00:40:54.290 number 6 the 45 year old female with ascites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:54.290 \longrightarrow 00:40:57.008$ 35 mil of bloodstained fluid and

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:40:57.008 --> 00:40:59.460 of course you know I'm sure this

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:40:59.460 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.692$ is a spot diagnosis.

 $00:41:00.700 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.095$ For those of you with experience in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:04.100 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.776$ Cyto pathology we have got large three

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:08.776 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.499$ dimensional variable sized cohesive

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:11.499 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.104$ clusters of the malignant epithelioid cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:16.104 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.858$ displaying course abundant

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:18.858 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.610$ cytoplasmic vacuolation nuclear

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:41:21.610 --> 00:41:23.430 hyperchromasia irregularity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:41:23.430 --> 00:41:26.160 high NC ratio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:26.160 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.822$ and variation of the nucleus size

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:27.822 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.511$ and shape from one group and

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}41{:}29.511 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}30.806$ one nucleus to the next,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:30.810 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.868$ which is not a feature of

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00{:}41{:}32.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}34.240$ mesothelioma as I said.

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909 00:41:34.240 --> 00:41:34.641 Earlier. NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

00:41:34.641 --> 00:41:37.448 And again on the games are you

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:37.448 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.267$ have the same features the large

00:41:40.267 --> 00:41:41.788 groups tightly cohesive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.719505629090909

 $00:41:41.788 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.816$ no gaps or windows,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:41:43.820 --> 00:41:46.550 unlike me, they feel proliferations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:41:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.016$ and these may be infiltrated by

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:41:49.020 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.444$ lymphocytes and and neutrophils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:41:52.444 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.333$ But then. In the background,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:41:55.333 --> 00:41:59.909 you still have some uh lymphocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:41:59.910 --> 00:42:02.676 A4 size comparison. Once you do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:42:02.680 --> 00:42:04.318 your cell block or your plot section,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:04.320 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.686$ you will be able to appreciate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}42{:}06.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}08.518$ microarchitecture of these groups as

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}42{:}08.518 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}10.418$ well with little glandular formations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}42{:}10.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}12.610$ Or perhaps some signet ring cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:42:12.610 --> 00:42:14.948 And once you do your TTF one

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:14.948 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.660$ stain and it comes back positive,

 $00:42:17.660 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.422$ you have confirmation of metastatic cost

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:21.422 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.470$ Sonoma adenocarcinoma from the lung.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:24.470 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.424$ And so this isn't an ever growing

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:27.424 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.840$ list of site specific markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:42:31.840 --> 00:42:33.211 And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:33.211 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.410$ this is again constantly renewed and updated

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:36.492 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.327$ as some of the older markers become.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:42:39.330 --> 00:42:40.950 You know less favorable because

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}42{:}40.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}42.570$ there are increasing numbers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:42.624 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.628$ studies that show that they're not

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}42{:}44.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}46.330$ particularly specific to those sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:46.330 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.668$ and as new emerging markers turn up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:49.668 \longrightarrow 00:42:52.522$ but this is a sort of a rough guide

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:52.522 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.518$ to ascertaining the primaries

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:54.518 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.440$ with adenocarcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:42:55.440 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.530$ and so a sample report for such a case is,

 $00:42:59.530 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.763$ again as follows.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}43{:}00.763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}02.407$ You gave your description.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:02.410 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.100$ You assign it to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:04.100 --> 00:43:05.114 malignant secondary category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:05.120 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.658$ and then you perform your immunostains

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:07.658 --> 00:43:09.760 to ascertain the primary site.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:09.760 \longrightarrow 00:43:11.170$ So my last couple of slides,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:11.170 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.306$ diagnostic categories linking to

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:13.306 \longrightarrow 00:43:15.976$ clinical management once on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:15.976 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.493$ routine preparations and stains you

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:18.493 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.546$ make final call of nondiagnostic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}43{:}20.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}22.910$ Then of course you would ask

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:22.985 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.369$ for a repeat sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:24.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.159$ ideally 50 to 75 mil if it is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:28.159 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.171$ negative for malignancy sample then the

00:43:31.171 --> 00:43:33.193 patient might be discharged or simply.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:33.200 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.800$ Clinically followed up if it is in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:35.800 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.357$ Gray zone of a tipiya and suspicious,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:38.360 --> 00:43:41.097 you need your ancillary work up and

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:41.097 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.929$ correlation with biopsy and clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:42.929 --> 00:43:45.265 data to try and push as many of

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:45.334 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.602$ the atypical into negative and as

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:47.602 --> 00:43:49.467 many of suspicious into malignant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:49.467 --> 00:43:50.161 Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:50.161 --> 00:43:52.243 for the malignant category you would

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}43{:}52.243 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}54.309$ be performing ancillary testing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:43:54.310 --> 00:43:57.240 not necessarily to confirm malignancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:43:57.240 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.790$ but to establish the primary site

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}43{:}59.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}02.265$ of origin and also prognostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:02.265 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.347$ and predictive markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:04.350 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.890$ Just as the you know,

 $00{:}44{:}05.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}07.282$ manuscript last year was

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:07.282 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.370$ about to go to the publishers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:44:09.370 --> 00:44:12.234 I came across this a great article by

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:12.234 \longrightarrow 00:44:14.717$ Doctor Farahani and Doctor Bellotte

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:44:14.717 --> 00:44:16.409 in diagnostic psychopathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:16.410 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.147$ the journal and they looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:19.147 \longrightarrow 00:44:21.843$ historic data before the publication of

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:44:21.843 --> 00:44:24.735 the Serious of Fluids Phytopathology book,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:24.740 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.734$ of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:25.734 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.716$ which looked at the risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:44:28.716 --> 00:44:31.219 malignancy across the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:31.219 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.059$ diagnostic categories as reported.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}44{:}34.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}37.490$ In literature Pre TS and what was

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}44{:}37.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}40.644$ noticeable was how high the risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:40.644 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.812$ of malignancy was in the atypical

 $00:44:43.812 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.362$ category and that is probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:46.362 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.248$ because there is a big overlap

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:49.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:51.385$ between the atypical and suspicious

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:51.385 \longrightarrow 00:44:53.520$ categories and with the application

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:53.585 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.028$ of appropriate criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:44:55.030 --> 00:44:57.178 Perhaps the risk of malignancy in

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}44{:}57.178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}58.969$ this category will move closer

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:44:58.969 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.992$ to that of the negative and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00{:}45{:}00.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}03.039$ or the suspicious category would

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:45:03.039 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.907$ move closer to malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:45:04.910 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.983$ And this separation of the risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:45:07.983 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.864$ malignancy between the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:45:09.864 \longrightarrow 00:45:12.732$ categories is the basis for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:45:12.732 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.551$ justification of any reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

00:45:14.551 --> 00:45:17.218 terminology system, be it the faster Milan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.711948202

 $00:45:17.220 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.398$ Paris or the international systems and.

 $00:45:20.398 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.170$ And so this really is the data that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00{:}45{:}23.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}26.015$ would be hoping that you will be

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00:45:26.015 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.882$ collecting through auditing your cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00:45:28.882 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.354$ prospectively and retrospectively to

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00{:}45{:}31.354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}34.909$ see you know before and after that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

00:45:34.909 --> 00:45:37.912 Number of cases and the risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

00:45:37.912 --> 00:45:40.499 malignancy that you put into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00:45:40.499 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.971$ uh into into the reporting system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

00:45:42.980 --> 00:45:44.900 So with that I thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

00:45:44.900 --> 00:45:48.308 I am going to stop sharing my screen

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00{:}45{:}48.308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}51.810$ and I am available to take any.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00:45:51.810 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.568$ Questions or comments from the audience?

NOTE Confidence: 0.899240065

 $00:45:53.570 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.478$ Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:45:54.970 --> 00:45:58.210 Thank you so much Ashish is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:45:58.210 --> 00:46:00.310 Wonderful, I really like it.

 $00:46:00.310 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.930$ It's many, many questions in

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:01.930 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.000$ my mind has been addressed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:04.000 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.912$ so while the people are preparing their

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:06.912 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.429$ question so maybe I can ask you too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:09.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.368$ Small question. Actually one of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:46:12.368 --> 00:46:14.804 It's related to your last page,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:14.810 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.680$ so the the risk of malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:18.680 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.285$ The risk of malignancy in

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:46:21.285 --> 00:46:23.369 negative for malignancy category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:46:23.370 --> 00:46:30.160 According to my manager Palaj if about 20%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:46:30.160 --> 00:46:32.692 Well, he was 20% meaning if

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:32.692 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.560$ we say negative malignancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

 $00:46:34.560 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.137$ one in every five we are wrong.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:46:38.140 --> 00:46:40.158 So what in your mind, this, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804291911666667

00:46:40.158 --> 00:46:43.400 for this negative mallegni should be?

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}46{:}43.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}45.296$ Absolutely, that that's a great question.

 $00:46:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:46:48.276$ Peter and I think what we have looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}46{:}48.276 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}51.825$ at in that table is the historic data

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:46:51.825 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.920$ of how we have over the last 50 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:46:55.920 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.986$ reported serious fluid cyto pathology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}46{:}58.986 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}02.197$ what the clinical outcomes of these cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:47:02.197 --> 00:47:05.370 have been if we but we don't know what

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:05.370 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.987$ the sample volumes of these cases were,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:07.990 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.182$ we don't know whether they would have

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:11.182 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.480$ fulfilled the the sort of site, the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}47{:}15.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}19.135$ The criteria for good cellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:47:19.135 --> 00:47:20.616 preservation and celularity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:20.616 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.481$ as suggested by the international

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:22.481 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.765$ system so we don't have that

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:47:24.765 --> 00:47:26.605 data in this reported literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:47:26.610 --> 00:47:28.578 and that I hope, will be the strength

00:47:28.578 --> 00:47:30.299 of the system going forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:30.300 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.520$ Once we link this risk of malignancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:33.520 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.470$ to volume and to sell content,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:36.470 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.835$ we might have a clearer picture to

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:37.835 \longrightarrow 00:47:39.418$ be able to say to our clinicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:47:39.420 --> 00:47:41.976 Well, if you send us a 5 mil sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:41.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.759$ the risk of malignancy could be considerably.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:44.760 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.050$ Different to when you send

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}47{:}46.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}48.180$ us a 50 to 75 mill sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:48.180 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.076$ but the problem there is of course that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:51.080 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.922$ uh, the follow up of patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:53.922 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.402$ negative cytology is typically very

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:47:56.402 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.357$ difficult across all terminology systems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:47:59.360 --> 00:48:00.605 Whether it's urine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:00.605 --> 00:48:01.850 cytology or FNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:01.850 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.266$ cytology the patients who have any fusion

00:48:05.266 --> 00:48:07.850 that resolves do not have any Histology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}48{:}07.850 \longrightarrow 00{:}48{:}09.740$ may not have much clinical follow up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:09.740 --> 00:48:12.344 and so you're left with this kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:12.344 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.760$ of no follow up of these cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}48{:}14.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}16.454$ Or this kind of imagined follow up

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:16.454 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.349$ that we show that they were all

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:18.349 --> 00:48:20.017 right because they didn't come back

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:20.075 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.825$ to us with malignancy in the next.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:21.830 --> 00:48:23.378 You know, two or three years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}48{:}23.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.781$ so we need to agree to certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}48{:}25.781 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}27.491$ surrogate markers and goal posts

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:27.491 --> 00:48:29.923 and we don't know what those are in

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00{:}48{:}29.989 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}32.169$ terms of the negative categories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:32.170 --> 00:48:34.382 So that's a great question in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:34.382 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.818$ of calculating the sensitivity

 $00:48:35.818 \longrightarrow 00:48:37.928$ and the negative predictive value

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:37.928 --> 00:48:39.616 over serious fluid sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:39.620 --> 00:48:41.498 We don't really have great data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:41.500 \longrightarrow 00:48:44.632$ but I suspect it would be linked to volume.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

 $00:48:44.632 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.796$ And a sample quality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:46.800 --> 00:48:47.958 Thank you for a great question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89621088

00:48:47.960 --> 00:48:48.340 Peter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00:48:48.760 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.226$ thank you. Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00:48:51.230 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.890$ Uh, another question from my end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00:48:54.890 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.390$ Is that special staying for P16 so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00{:}48{:}59.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}02.634$ P-16 you agree with a fish analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

00:49:02.634 --> 00:49:05.619 kind of fish usually is pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00:49:05.619 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.524$ challenging for cytology sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00{:}49{:}08.524 \to 00{:}49{:}12.159$ and many people like immunostains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

00:49:12.160 --> 00:49:15.624 And I see this debating like animal Stampede.

NOTE Confidence: 0.974079741666667

 $00:49:15.630 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.730$ 16 How you know how useful?

00:49:17.730 --> 00:49:20.460 How placable was your position here?

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:21.950 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.606$ So thank you. Another great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:23.610 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.500$ Very very specialist and technical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:28.500 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.900$ I have to say the published data really

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:49:32.900 --> 00:49:38.860 mostly supports using P-16 mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:49:38.860 --> 00:49:40.510 you know, so we're not talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:40.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:41.950$ about the wild type P-16.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}49{:}41.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}44.005$ We're talking about the mutated

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:44.005 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.794$ P-16 demonstrated by fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:45.794 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.542$ So if you're using the appropriate

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:49:48.542 --> 00:49:50.481 immuno chemistry, of course not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:50.481 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.616$ For the wild type P-16,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:49:51.620 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.912$ but for for the mutated one you

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}49{:}55.912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}58.504$ should get you know good data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:49:58.510 --> 00:50:00.883 And I think that is something that

 $00:50:00.883 \longrightarrow 00:50:03.746$ we want to see more work done on

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}50{:}03.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}06.647$ before it can be accepted as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:06.647 \longrightarrow 00:50:08.228$ recommended clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:08.230 --> 00:50:09.277 You're absolutely right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:09.277 --> 00:50:11.720 there is a growing body of evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:11.784 \longrightarrow 00:50:13.982$ and data that is suggesting that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:13.982 --> 00:50:15.985 could perhaps just do immuno chemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}50{:}15.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.309$ rather than fish and that would solve

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}50{:}18.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}20.165$ a big problem because as you say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:20.170 --> 00:50:22.750 access to cytogenetics and fish

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:22.750 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.686$ is not easy for all laboratories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:25.686 --> 00:50:28.100 You know we're lucky to work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}50{:}28.100 \to 00{:}50{:}29.590$ institutions where we do have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:29.590 --> 00:50:31.966 As to genetics and ancillary tests,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:31.970 --> 00:50:33.866 uh, but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:33.866 \longrightarrow 00:50:35.762$ we these international terminology

00:50:35.762 --> 00:50:39.600 systems are meant to be used by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:50:41.007$ global psychopathology community,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:41.010 --> 00:50:42.768 and if we set our benchmark,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:42.770 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.763$ which is unachievable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:43.763 \longrightarrow 00:50:46.080$ then the project sort of loses its

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:46.139 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.050$ value because we've set the bar so

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:48.050 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.667$ high that it is completely unachievable by,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333 00:50:50.670 --> 00:50:51.496 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:51.496 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.974$ by the vast majority of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:50:53.974 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.930$ colleagues practicing cyto pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:55.930 --> 00:50:58.162 So I think we do have to be realistic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333 00:50:58.170 --> 00:50:59.940 I think. NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:50:59.940 --> 00:51:02.817 Using that and that's why I emphasized

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:51:02.817 --> 00:51:06.131 so much the use of you know commonly

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:06.131 \longrightarrow 00:51:09.058$ used immunochemical immuno histo and

 $00:51:09.058 \longrightarrow 00:51:11.586$ cytochemical panels that include

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:11.586 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.408$ desmin and epithelial membrane antigen

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}51{:}14.408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}18.340$ and bap one which it is easier for a

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:18.340 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.900$ smaller psychopathology laboratory

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}51{:}19.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}22.500$ to standardize and validate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:22.500 \longrightarrow 00:51:25.068$ be able to perform reproducibly

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:25.068 \longrightarrow 00:51:27.493$ and accurately within their own

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}51{:}27.493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}30.010$ laboratory or at least have access.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:30.010 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.856$ To the immunostains,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:30.856 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.188$ but I know there are parts of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:51:33.188 --> 00:51:34.028 world where, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:34.028 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.980$ the diagnosis of MISO?

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:34.980 \longrightarrow 00:51:37.996$ Thi Lio Ma actually is just based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}51{:}37.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}40.504$ cyto morphology and perhaps some immuno

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:40.504 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.024$ cytochemical stains like oil red O

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:43.030 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.110$ positive iti in in in in mesothelioma.

 $00:51:46.110 \longrightarrow 00:51:48.665$ And that was a great point that

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:48.665 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.435$ Professor Claire Michael who's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}51{:}50.435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}52.306$ lead chapter also for me the helium

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:52.306 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.842$ appointed out and she said you

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:51:53.842 --> 00:51:56.604 know we should try and find good

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:51:56.604 --> 00:51:59.684 cheap and easy stains for you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:51:59.684 \longrightarrow 00:52:00.201$ mesothelioma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}52{:}00.201 --> 00{:}52{:}02.786$ Because not every body will have

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}52{:}02.786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}05.712$ access to cytogenetics and to even

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}52{:}05.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}09.189$ immuno chemistry and to you know some

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:52:09.189 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.893$ colleagues practicing in constrained

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:52:11.893 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.710$ resources just histochemistry with

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}52{:}13.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}16.370$ oil red O and some other immunity

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:52:16.441 --> 00:52:18.919 and some other stains could be very

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

00:52:18.919 --> 00:52:21.072 very beneficial in the context of

 $00:52:21.072 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.777$ a good strong clinical suspicion

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00{:}52{:}22.777 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}24.534$ of a mesothelioma for instance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:52:24.534 \longrightarrow 00:52:26.682$ So thank you for bringing up

NOTE Confidence: 0.837158753333333

 $00:52:26.682 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.540$ that very pertinent question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86478304555555

 $00:52:28.980 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.390$ Thank you, thank you thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.86478304555555

 $00:52:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:52:32.070$ I have a question. Copying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94591886

 $00:52:37.420 \longrightarrow 00:52:39.380$ OK, can you hear me now?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94591886

 $00:52:39.380 \longrightarrow 00:52:41.530$ Yeah yeah OK alright

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}52{:}43.780 \longrightarrow 00{:}52{:}49.160$ thanks for your great this great talk so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:52:49.160 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.760$ So based on this you know that international

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}52{:}52.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}56.734$ reporting systems and since we know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:52:56.734 \longrightarrow 00:53:00.414$ recommend the volume of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:00.420 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.850$ specimen is you know 75.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:04.850 --> 00:53:07.430 Uh CC, which is you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.018$ largely based on the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:10.018 \dashrightarrow 00:53:12.606$ The Hopkins study recommended.

 $00:53:12.610 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.635$ But there's other study out

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:14.635 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.255$ there in the literatures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:16.260 --> 00:53:19.240 They actually recommend larger variance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:19.240 --> 00:53:22.778 you know, talk about 200 or 250 miles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:22.778 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.621$ and you know in in the age now is

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:27.621 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.540$ proficient precision medicines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:30.540 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.340$ You know a lot this specimen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:32.340 --> 00:53:34.460 Not only you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}53{:}34.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}37.011$ Rick required health diagnostic work

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:37.011 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.930$ up also for the answering tests which

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:40.005 --> 00:53:42.650 may guide clinical management patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:42.650 --> 00:53:43.854 So I just wonder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}53{:}43.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}46.928$ you know for this kind of system out there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}53{:}46.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}50.010$ you kind of flat out recommended you

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:53:50.010 --> 00:53:55.328 know 75 mil specimen weather you know.

 $00:53:55.330 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.255$ You know whether you're consider

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:57.255 \longrightarrow 00:53:59.580$ you know whether this you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:53:59.580 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.770$ particularly in the setting of the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:01.770 --> 00:54:04.750 you know malignancy and weather,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:04.750 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.860$ has any room.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:05.860 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.906$ You know I, because the the the one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:10.910 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.366$ The issue would be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:12.366 --> 00:54:14.922 you know clinical thing and look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:14.922 --> 00:54:17.274 the old you are you even you are

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:17.274 \longrightarrow 00:54:19.441$ report you are sitting recommended

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}54{:}19.441 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}22.086$ only 75 and mail you know specimen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:22.090 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.085$ So that's one one of my question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}54{:}24.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}25.670$ The other question I had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:25.670 --> 00:54:26.710 One day I notice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.72140775142857200:54:26.710 --> 00:54:27.230 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:27.230 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.792$ in this system you don't have a

00:54:29.792 --> 00:54:32.702 category you know call for new problem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:32.702 \longrightarrow 00:54:35.983$ which many other system has this category

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:35.983 --> 00:54:39.783 robust sister you know Milan and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:39.790 --> 00:54:41.248 PSC, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}54{:}41.248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}44.164$ and because particularly you talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:44.164 \longrightarrow 00:54:47.925$ one the sample you you talk about in your,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.114$ you know presentation is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}54{:}50.114 --> 00{:}54{:}53.025$ You know pseudo makes Soma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:54:53.025 --> 00:54:56.050 which you know you ****.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}54{:}56.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}58.612$ Basically you see them using or

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:54:58.612 \longrightarrow 00:55:00.950$ missing like material without without,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572 00:55:00.950 --> 00:55:01.946 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:01.946 \longrightarrow 00:55:04.824$ without absolute component you put in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:04.824 \longrightarrow 00:55:07.486$ category called suspicious for malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:55:07.486 --> 00:55:10.552 The same issue will be also raised

00:55:10.552 --> 00:55:13.490 for like a borderline tumors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}55{:}13.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}16.710$ which also shows this kind of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:55:16.710 --> 00:55:20.520 know sales or material in your.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

00:55:20.520 --> 00:55:23.176 Uh, and aside, is opera Tonio you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:23.180 \longrightarrow 00:55:24.509$ public watch specimen?

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:24.509 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.724$ So, because this particular category

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:26.724 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.180$ is switched from Milligan and carry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00.55.29.180 \longrightarrow 00.55.31.900$ the risk is about 80%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:31.900 \longrightarrow 00:55:34.035$ so I don't know how this will

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:34.035 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.470$ have any clinical impact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}55{:}35.470 --> 00{:}55{:}37.000$ How you do on clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00{:}55{:}37.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}39.475$ because basically there's no surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:39.475 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.455$ diagnosis clad out malignancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:41.460 \longrightarrow 00:55:43.800$ but you called speech for Magnus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572 00:55:43.800 --> 00:55:44.632 Thank you. NOTE Confidence: 0.721407751428572

 $00:55:44.632 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.048$ Yeah,

 $00:55:45.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:46.054$ great questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:55:46.054 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.678$ I'll try and be brief in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}55{:}47.678 \longrightarrow 00{:}55{:}50.310$ interest of time, but I acknowledge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:55:50.310 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.460$ The limitations of the data that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:55:54.460 \longrightarrow 00:55:57.584$ have at the moment at the time of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:55:57.584 --> 00:55:59.039 publication of the first edition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:55:59.040 \longrightarrow 00:56:02.184$ but what it has done is opened up

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:02.190 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.795$ this conversation that we're having

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:04.795 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.955$ today and which is what I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:07.955 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.205$ asked at the European Congress of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:56:10.205 --> 00:56:12.447 Psychology in in Poland just last

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}56{:}12.447 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}14.876$ week where we had a whole session

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}56{:}14.954 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}17.288$ devoted to a tipiya versus NEO

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:56:17.288 --> 00:56:19.218 plasm in serious effusion cytology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:19.218 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.322$ Well seriously, in.

00:56:20.322 --> 00:56:21.426 All specimen doubts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:56:21.430 --> 00:56:24.380 but also addressing serious fluids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:24.380 \longrightarrow 00:56:25.976$ and that's a great question about

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:56:25.976 --> 00:56:27.350 taking your second question first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:27.350 \longrightarrow 00:56:28.911$ and I'll go back to the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:28.911 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.420$ time in a moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:31.420 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.325$ So the new plasm category for fluids

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:34.325 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.390$ is is quite a tricky one to use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}56{:}37.390 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}56{:}39.014$ It will be very rarely used and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:39.014 \longrightarrow 00:56:40.646$ in the kind of scenarios where

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}56{:}40.646 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}56{:}42.398$ you pointed out you know you've

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:42.398 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.780$ got mucinous material and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:43.780 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.593$ know it could be a NEO plasm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:56:45.593 --> 00:56:47.364 which may or may not be malignant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:47.370 \longrightarrow 00:56:49.032$ and so you know should that

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:49.032 \longrightarrow 00:56:50.750$ go into the tipiya category.

00:56:50.750 --> 00:56:52.328 Should that go into suspicious category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}56{:}52.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}54.818$ should that be in a NEO plasm category,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.088$ I think at the moment what

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:57.088 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.420$ we are suggesting is that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:56:59.420 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.260$ put the query new plasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:57:01.260 --> 00:57:03.350 The bland neoplasms including the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:03.350 \longrightarrow 00:57:06.087$ borderline tumors into the atropia of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}57{:}06.087 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}07.839$ undetermined significance category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}57{:}07.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}10.584$ So that is your sort of surrogate

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:10.584 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.969$ new plasm category for the moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:12.970 \dashrightarrow 00:57:15.778$ Let's see by the time of the second edition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:15.780 \longrightarrow 00:57:17.160$ in four or five years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}57{:}17.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}20.478$ if there is enough data out there

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}57{:}20.478 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}57{:}23.219$ to justify having an additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:23.219 \longrightarrow 00:57:25.058$ NEO plasm category.

00:57:25.060 --> 00:57:26.200 In addition to ATYPIA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:26.200 \longrightarrow 00:57:28.240$ we would be very much prepared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:28.240 \longrightarrow 00:57:31.408$ consider it. So that is a great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:57:31.410 --> 00:57:33.534 But it wasn't something that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:33.534 \longrightarrow 00:57:35.999$ had enough data on to be able

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}57{:}35.999 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}37.937$ to address in the first issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:37.940 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.148$ In the first edition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:57:39.148 --> 00:57:41.636 and so we have actually just put them

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:57:41.636 --> 00:57:44.100 or suggest that we put those under tipiya,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:44.100 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.669$ but the discussion that we had in

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:46.669 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.412$ Poland was that a tip here actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:49.412 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.752$ includes the kind of cases which

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:51.829 \longrightarrow 00:57:55.125$ probably sit better in a NEO plasm category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:55.130 \longrightarrow 00:57:56.555$ Also, for instance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:57:56.555 --> 00:57:58.455 benign music Thielen preparations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:57:58.460 \longrightarrow 00:58:00.620$ though well differentiated papillary miso?

 $00:58:00.620 \longrightarrow 00:58:01.781$ Thi lio ma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:58:01.781 --> 00:58:03.716 Or the localized musically OMERS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:03.720 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.520$ which are essentially benign tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:05.520 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.638$ Should they all be called miso?

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:07.640 \longrightarrow 00:58:08.951$ Thi Lio Ma's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}58{:}08.951 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}12.458$ where do you know a typical or benign

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:58:12.458 --> 00:58:15.146 mesothelial proliferations go in the system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}58{:}15.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}16.655$ so those were all questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:58:16.655 --> 00:58:18.160 that are now being raised,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:18.160 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.387$ and we hope that we will have

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:21.387 \longrightarrow 00:58:23.565$ more data in in the next few

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:23.565 \longrightarrow 00:58:25.689$ years to be able to answer that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00{:}58{:}25.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}28.182$ Going back to your first question in

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:28.182 \longrightarrow 00:58:30.800$ terms of volumes of recommended sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:58:30.800 --> 00:58:32.726 Again at the time of publication,

00:58:32.730 --> 00:58:35.274 we had a good study which you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

00:58:35.274 --> 00:58:38.019 was based on a very large sample size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:58:39.550$ and so we've gone with it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:39.550 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.850$ And since the publication of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:41.850 \longrightarrow 00:58:43.230$ the international system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00.58:43.230 \longrightarrow 00.58:45.456$ and even while it was in publication,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:45.460 \longrightarrow 00:58:47.626$ there was a whole flurry of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870563601666666

 $00:58:47.626 \longrightarrow 00:58:49.070$ articles that suggested different

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:58:49.136 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.672$ volumes, some smaller volumes

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:58:50.672 \longrightarrow 00:58:52.088$ and some higher volumes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00{:}58{:}52.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}56.260$ which in their institutional data was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:58:56.260 \longrightarrow 00:58:58.535$ A better marker for the sub you

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:58:58.535 --> 00:59:00.990 know for for the optimal volume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:00.990 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.238$ and I think there will be an institutional

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:04.238 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.588$ bias depending on whether you work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:06.588 \longrightarrow 00:59:09.088$ a Cancer Center or whether you work

 $00:59:09.088 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.380$ in a Community Hospital because your

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00{:}59{:}11.455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}13.707$ case load is completely different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:13.710 --> 00:59:15.852 You're you know the sample volumes

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:15.852 --> 00:59:18.407 that you might get in a Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:18.407 --> 00:59:20.519 Center may be small volume samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:20.520 --> 00:59:23.286 but they're all almost positive samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:23.290 --> 00:59:24.907 so you know that they're not being

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:24.907 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.809$ sent to you for making a diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00{:}59{:}26.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}28.808$ You already know the diagnosis they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00{:}59{:}28.808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}30.731$ actually sending you the sample just

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:30.731 --> 00:59:32.883 for the ancillary World Cup and as long

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:32.941 \longrightarrow 00:59:34.949$ as the sample is high in cell content,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:34.950 \longrightarrow 00:59:37.414$ it doesn't matter whether it is 50

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:37.414 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.320$ mil or it's 75 mil or it's 200 mil.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:40.320 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.232$ So the 75 mil optimal volume sample

 $00:59:43.232 \longrightarrow 00:59:46.261$ was really based on that curve which

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:46.261 --> 00:59:48.805 showed that once you have reached

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:48.889 \longrightarrow 00:59:51.710$ the 50 to 75 mil mark after that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:51.710 --> 00:59:54.350 there is no particular advantage

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:54.350 \longrightarrow 00:59:56.900$ because if the sample is negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

00:59:56.900 --> 00:59:58.447 It is probably going to be negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:58.450 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.880$ even if it's 200 mill.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $00:59:59.880 \longrightarrow 01:00:03.039$ That is where you know that data came from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01:00:03.040 \longrightarrow 01:00:04.996$ but the converse is also true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

01:00:05.000 --> 01:00:07.900 You might, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01{:}00{:}07.900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}09.760$ have a sample that's really really

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01{:}00{:}09.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}11.960$ cellular and rich in malignant cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

01:00:11.960 --> 01:00:13.822 for which you could get away with

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

01:00:13.822 --> 01:00:15.070 a much smaller sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01:00:15.070 \longrightarrow 01:00:17.702$ So I think the it's opened up

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

01:00:17.702 --> 01:00:19.429 a conversation around volumes

 $01:00:19.429 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.980$ around cell content,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01{:}00{:}20.980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}23.647$ and I think there is quite a lot of work to

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01:00:23.647 \longrightarrow 01:00:25.919$ be done before the 2nd edition comes out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01:00:25.920 \longrightarrow 01:00:26.679$ but they're all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

01:00:26.679 --> 01:00:28.197 Things that I'm taking on board

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

 $01:00:28.197 \longrightarrow 01:00:29.510$ from our discussion today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727

01:00:29.510 --> 01:00:30.742 So thank you very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915392737272727 01:00:30.742 --> 01:00:31.358 very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

 $01:00:32.430 \longrightarrow 01:00:34.134$ Thank you, thank you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

 $01:00:34.134 \longrightarrow 01:00:37.680$ uh, any more questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

01:00:37.680 --> 01:00:40.431 So send I think Doctor Lu will

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

01:00:40.431 --> 01:00:44.760 have a separate zoom meeting, yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

01:00:44.760 --> 01:00:46.079 So thank you so much, Ashish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

 $01{:}00{:}46.079 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}48.950$ So it's very nice to meet you and like

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

 $01:00:49.022 \longrightarrow 01:00:51.514$ you say we have so many discussions.

 $01{:}00{:}51.520 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}53.500$ Kind of good discussion and we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.806994687

 $01{:}00{:}53.500 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}55.749$ looking forward to your second edition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:00:56.510 \longrightarrow 01:00:58.118$ Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:00:58.120 \longrightarrow 01:00:59.312$ Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:00:59.312 \longrightarrow 01:01:00.896$ It's been a great honor and

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:01:00.896 \longrightarrow 01:01:02.370$ privilege to be able to talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:01:02.370 \longrightarrow 01:01:03.294$ to you this afternoon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:01:03.300 \longrightarrow 01:01:05.540$ Many Many thanks again for inviting me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972664305

 $01:01:05.540 \longrightarrow 01:01:07.000$ Thank you, thank you.