WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:02:29" NOTE recognizability:0.829

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.938$ Start introducing your Natalia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:07.940 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.612$ Today's grand round speaker is

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:00:10.612 --> 00:00:14.718 Natalia Buza, our very own.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:00:14.720 --> 00:00:17.879 Most of us know Natalia we work with her,

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:17.880 \longrightarrow 00:00:20.304$ we see her in the hallways

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00{:}00{:}20.304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}24.630$ and on the microscope Natalia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:24.630 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.858$ Did her medical schooling in Hungary

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:00:27.858 --> 00:00:31.318 from the University of PECS in 1999,

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:31.318 \longrightarrow 00:00:34.208$ and she joined the pathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00{:}00{:}34.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37.127$ residency program at the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00{:}00{:}37.127 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39.657$ place and after two years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:39.660 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.918$ not all year moved to complete

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:42.918 \longrightarrow 00:00:46.462$ the remaining two years of her

00:00:46.462 --> 00:00:48.998 pathology residency at National

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:48.998 \dashrightarrow 00:00:52.540$ Institute of Oncology in Budapest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:00:52.540 --> 00:00:56.536 After her training in pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:00:56.536 --> 00:00:59.560 Natalia spent a year at Tulane

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:00:59.656 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.603$ University Pathology Department

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:01:01.603 --> 00:01:05.497 as visiting physician so early on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:05.500 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.240$ Natalia had established her

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:01:08.240 --> 00:01:10.980 career path in pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00{:}01{:}10.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}15.495$ We were lucky to recruit Natalia to

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:01:15.495 --> 00:01:19.068 yell pathology residency program in 2006

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:19.068 \longrightarrow 00:01:22.344$ and Natalia finished her residency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:01:22.344 --> 00:01:24.417 Became chief resident,

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.984$ became a GY and and press fellow with

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:28.984 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.540$ Doctor Tavassoli and then in 2010

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.890$ Natalia became an assistant professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:36.890 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.253$ with US and in 2016 very quickly.

 $00:01:41.253 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.619$ She was promoted to be an

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:44.619 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.330$ associate professor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:46.330 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.646$ I first met Natalia in 2009 when

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:50.646 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.684$ Natalia was a hot seat resident.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:01:54.690 --> 00:01:57.108 And she was freaking out because

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:57.110 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.168$ someone had just asked her 15

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:01:59.168 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.025$ minutes ago to go to the head and

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:02:02.025 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.131$ neck tumor board and present the

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:02:04.206 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.396$ hair and act him aboard cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

 $00:02:06.400 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.040$ Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.657168135

00:02:08.040 --> 00:02:08.760 Anyway. NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:11.290 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.181$ Natalia is in addition also the associate

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:14.181 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.003$ director of the GY and Fellowship program

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:17.003 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.570$ and the Director of the GY and Journal Club,

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:20.570 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.834$ which is one of the best run Journal

00:02:24.834 --> 00:02:29.483 club in our department. Altogether,

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}02{:}29.483 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}33.596$ Natalia has a total of 150 publications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:33.596 \longrightarrow 00:02:37.784$ 87 of these are origonal peer

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:37.784 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.890$ reviewed papers. These include.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:41.890 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.104$ These do not include 25 book chapters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:02:46.110 --> 00:02:49.410 Is book chapters do not include

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:49.410 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.799$ 18 chapters in the Blue Book on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:54.800 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.256$ Tumors of the female genital tract and one

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:02:59.256 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.626$ chapter in the pediatric tumor blue book.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:03.630 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.725$ In addition, she has 17 case reports,

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:07.730 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.140$ three chapters in pathology outlines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.445$ and she has contributed to or written

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:15.445 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.380$ the CAP guidelines on GY and receptions

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:19.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.130$ and all of this in the last 12 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:23.130 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.298$ Because I noticed that Natalia's first

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:03:26.298 --> 00:03:29.478 paper was in 2009 with Doctor Tavassoli,

 $00:03:29.478 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.687$ so I would give a shout out not

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:32.687 \longrightarrow 00:03:34.423$ just to Natalia, but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:03:34.423 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.488$ Also to our department for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:03:37.490 --> 00:03:41.836 Making it conducive to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:03:41.836 --> 00:03:44.860 phenomenal body of achievements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261 00:03:44.860 --> 00:03:45.724 In addition, NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:03:45.724 --> 00:03:48.748 Natalia is on the editorial Board of

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}03{:}48.748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51.886$ Human Pathology and the International

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}03{:}51.886 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}54.514$ Journal of Gynecological Pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}03{:}54.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}57.888$ and she is also an ad hoc reviewer

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261 00:03:57.890 --> 00:04:01.430 in on major. NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}04{:}01.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}05.274$ Journals of pathology Natalia

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:04:05.274 --> 00:04:07.970 is prominent in Uscap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:07.970 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.518$ She is a member of the abstract.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:10.520 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.584$ She has served on the Abstract Review Board.

 $00:04:13.590 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.010$ She has served as ambassadors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}04{:}16.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18.680$ She is moderated platform sessions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261 00:04:18.680 --> 00:04:19.799 In the past. NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:19.799 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.410$ She is also a faculty mentor of

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:22.502 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.877$ the men to escape mentoring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:24.880 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.930$ Academy earlier has had several

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:27.930 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.430$ short courses at a scab running for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}04{:}32.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35.550$ I believe for four consecutive years

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:35.550 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.184$ and two of her short courses and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:40.184 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.176$ an interactive microscope session

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}04{:}43.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}48.452$ has been approved from 2022 onwards.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}04{:}48.452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}54.549$ So Natalia Natalia's eminence in US Capiz.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:04:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.540$ Very laudable. She is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:00.540 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.170$ A favored invited speaker both

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.348$ nationally and internationally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}05{:}06.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}10.502$ She has spoken in Canada and two

 $00{:}05{:}10.502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}14.108$ British societies and also in China.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}05{:}14.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}17.098$ Natalia has been invited to give

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}05{:}17.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}20.070$ grand Rounds at MD Anderson.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:20.070 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.022$ She has been a speaker at

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:05:23.022 --> 00:05:24.006 Princeton Symposium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:24.010 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.280$ one of the books that Natalia

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:27.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.806$ coauthored frozen sections in GY

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}05{:}29.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32.276$ and pathology is actually in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:32.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.873$ Smilow frozen section.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}05{:}33.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38.129$ Sweet and it's I find it extremely helpful

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

00:05:38.129 --> 00:05:41.689 when I get a GY and broken section.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:41.690 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.550$ And today's grand round is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}05{:}45.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}47.790$ Natalia is going to talk about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:47.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.560$ This is her exemplary long-term

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00:05:51.560 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.020$ work on bringing her to new.

00:05:56.020 --> 00:06:00.604 Therapy in GGY and oncology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.691064093478261

 $00{:}06{:}00.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}04.010$ with no further ado, I'm going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.680150086

 $00:06:06.160 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.960$ Give the floor to Natalia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:09.900 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.060$ Thank you so much man.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:11.060 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.559$ Due for the very kind introduction and

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:13.559 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.240$ and for this wonderful opportunity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:16.240 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.704$ it is really a special a pleasure

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:18.704 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.550$ for me to to speak in front

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00{:}06{:}21.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.685$ of my colleagues and friends,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:23.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.298$ even even though from my office.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

00:06:25.300 --> 00:06:26.578 But I I feel like I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:26.580 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.476$ I'm I see all of you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00:06:28.480 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.620$ So I'm going to start

NOTE Confidence: 0.903966018

 $00{:}06{:}30.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}32.290$ sharing my screen. Come.

NOTE Confidence: 0.55535537

 $00:06:34.610 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.498$ OK. Can you see it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:06:39.840 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.746$ Yep alright so as mentioned mentioned,

 $00:06:43.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.166$ this has been really a long term work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:06:47.170 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.190$ I've been working on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:06:50.190 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.350$ Or two in under meteor cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:06:52.350 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.749$ for the past twelve years or so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:06:54.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.822$ and today, I'm going to give you an

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}06{:}57.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}00.679$ overview of the current status and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:00.679 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.179$ future directions on this topic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:03.180 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.048$ First I'll start with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:06.050 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.660$ Brief overview of the Congo

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:08.660 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.748$ pathologic features of endometrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}07{:}10.748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}13.243$ serous carcinoma for those of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:13.243 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.288$ not in GY and pathology and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}07{:}16.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}19.732$ give a historical overview of prior

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:19.732 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.610$ studies and trials and and her to

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:07:23.610 --> 00:07:26.945 anonymity of cancer and compare the

 $00:07:26.945 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.455$ features of her two expression and

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:30.455 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.232$ amplification with the with those that

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:33.232 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.799$ we know of breast and gastric cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:36.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.934$ And finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:37.934 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.202$ I'll give practical recommendations

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:40.202 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.450$ and talk about future directions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:43.450 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.142$ So to start off, going back to the 1980s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:07:47.142 --> 00:07:49.602 two Seminole papers were published

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:49.602 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.570$ about the same time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:51.570 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.030$ one from a pathology group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}07{:}54.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}55.850$ Doctors Kempson and Hendrickson

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:07:55.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.125$ described for the first time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:07:58.130 --> 00:08:00.685 This tumor type uterine papillary

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:08:00.685 --> 00:08:01.707 serous carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:01.710 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.920$ which they recognized as a highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:08:08.430$ malignant form of endometrial adenocarcinoma.

00:08:08.430 --> 00:08:11.430 At the same time, Jan Bachman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:11.430 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.320$ a physician.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:08:14.320 --> 00:08:17.800 From gynecologist from the Soviet Union,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:17.800 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.275$ published the clinical features that

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:20.275 \longrightarrow 00:08:23.230$ he noticed that and meteor cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:23.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.570$ really has to drastically different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:08:27.570 --> 00:08:29.340 Uniquely different that the genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}08{:}29.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}31.426$ types and he called them type

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:31.426 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.744$ one and type two type 1 being the

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:34.744 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.068$ more indolent form associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:08:37.068 --> 00:08:38.918 with estrogen access.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:38.918 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.670$ Compared with Type 2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:08:41.670 --> 00:08:43.915 which would include uterine serous

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:08:43.915 --> 00:08:46.736 carcinomas that had a much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:46.736 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.231$ aggressive behavior and had no

 $00:08:49.231 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.448$ association with estrogen access in patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:53.450 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.292$ Later on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:54.292 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.268$ it was recognized that these tumors actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:57.268 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.508$ can have other architectural patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:08:59.510 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.406$ not just the capillary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}09{:}01.406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}03.776$ although it's commonly seen here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:03.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.138$ you can see in the upper

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:09:06.138 --> 00:09:07.317 left corner papillary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}09{:}07.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}09.553$ but they can also have a glandular

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:09.553 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.080$ pattern or solid pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00{:}09{:}11.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}12.910$ and so the terminology changed

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:12.910 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.729$ over the years and now we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:15.729 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.097$ the preferred terminology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:17.100 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.364$ Is endometrial serous carcinoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:19.364 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.628$ or uterine serous carcinoma?

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:21.630 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.410$ I also put a higher.

 $00:09:23.410 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.601$ Image higher magnification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

00:09:24.601 --> 00:09:27.380 Image here for you to see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:27.451 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.846$ nuclear features which are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:29.846 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.762$ important and a characteristic

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:31.770 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.725$ finding that helps recognize this

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:33.725 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.715$ tumor type as a very high nuclear

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:36.715 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.105$ to cytoplasmic ratio mark nuclear

NOTE Confidence: 0.847580505

 $00:09:39.105 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.779$ tipiya and frequent mitotic figures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:09:43.870 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.990$ These tumors can only can also

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:09:46.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.238$ be a very subtle and and present

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:09:50.238 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.902$ in a in a an early form of 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:09:54.902 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.606$ associated with endometrial polyps.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00{:}09{:}57.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}59.955$ Sometimes just signing the surface

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00{:}09{:}59.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}02.932$ of the endometrium or lining the

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:02.932 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.136$ pre-existing and demetria glands,

 $00:10:05.140 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.409$ and this has been termed a somewhat

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

00:10:08.410 --> 00:10:10.990 miss miss leading or potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:10.990 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.054$ misleading term of serious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:13.060 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.745$ Intrepid serial carcinoma or serious

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:15.745 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.893$ endometrial intrepid serial carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:17.900 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.684$ which is not really an insight to lesion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:20.690 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.091$ It has already the same capacity for

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

00:10:23.091 --> 00:10:26.200 spread as a full blown serous carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:26.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.055$ so that's another interesting feature

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:29.055 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.210$ about this tumor and another characteristic

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:33.210 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.826$ finding is that very often more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:36.826 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.874$ 95% of tumors are associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.799709588888889

 $00:10:39.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.490$ P53 mutations which can be used.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550654755

 $00:10:44.580 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.520$ With the immunohistochemical work up

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550654755

 $00:10:46.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.616$ and here is an example of showing an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550654755

 $00:10:49.616 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.150$ apparent staining in one of these tumors.

 $00:10:54.650 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.639$ So clinically, again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

 $00:10:56.639 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.820$ often these women are post menopausal in the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

 $00:11:01.820 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.260$ Older post menopausal age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

00:11:05.260 --> 00:11:08.760 Designing with post menopausal bleeding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

 $00:11:08.760 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.902$ Most importantly, they have a poor

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

 $00:11:10.902 \longrightarrow 00:11:13.180$ prognosis and a five and 10 year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

00:11:13.180 --> 00:11:16.100 Overall survival is only 36%

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

 $00:11:16.100 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.560$ and 18% for these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

00:11:18.560 --> 00:11:21.014 and that's mostly due to poor

NOTE Confidence: 0.746053631818182

 $00:11:21.014 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.650$ response to traditional chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:11:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.732$ Despite the advances in

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:26.732 --> 00:11:28.484 cancer treatment and many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:28.490 --> 00:11:30.278 many other tumor types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:30.278 --> 00:11:34.142 there hasn't really been a lot of changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:34.142 --> 00:11:36.602 and the chronicle of Behavior,

00:11:36.602 --> 00:11:38.972 clinical outcome of these tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:38.972 --> 00:11:42.060 looking back into a study in 2006,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:11:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:11:44.951$ you can see that they have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:11:44.951 \longrightarrow 00:11:46.600$ disproportionately high mortality rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:46.600 --> 00:11:49.869 Only 10% of tumors are serious carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:49.870 --> 00:11:54.064 and yet almost 40% of the cancer deaths are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:11:54.070 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.760$ Related to this tumor type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:56.760 --> 00:11:59.896 And even compared to other high grade tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:11:59.900 --> 00:12:02.000 agreed, three endometrioid or clear cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:12:02.000 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.140$ they still do worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:12:04.140 --> 00:12:07.350 And Fast forward to 2015 again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00{:}12{:}07.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09.030$ compared to other tumor types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00{:}12{:}09.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}11.770$ serous carcinomas have diverse recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:12:11.770 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.250$ free and distant metastasis free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:12:15.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.861$ And even the most recent studies from

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

00:12:17.861 --> 00:12:20.913 the PORTEK 3 and from the Memorial

 $00:12:20.913 \longrightarrow 00:12:23.691$ Sloan Kettering showed that these tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00{:}12{:}23.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26.309$ have the most aggressive behavior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00{:}12{:}26.310 \to 00{:}12{:}28.921$ even compared to other P53 mutant tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.78360741375

 $00:12:28.921 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.739$ or compared to other high grade tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:12:34.500 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.685$ Some we learned a lot about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:12:37.685 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.960$ molecular characteristics of endometrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:12:39.960 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.360$ carcinoma's over the past decade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00{:}12{:}43.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}46.558$ The seminal paper from the TCA

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:12:46.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.500$ identified 4 molecular subgroups and

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:12:50.500 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.810$ the one that series carcinomas belong

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:12:52.810 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.079$ to as the so called copy number,

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

00:12:55.080 --> 00:12:58.720 high or serious like group which is which

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00{:}12{:}58.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01.498$ contains most of the serous carcinomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:01.498 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.490$ and is enriched in P53 mutations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:04.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.700$ Also interestingly,

00:13:05.700 --> 00:13:10.770 you can see that many of these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00{:}13{:}10.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}12.898$ actually, I think on my next slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:12.900 \longrightarrow 00:13:18.116$ is that 25% of them also showed herb

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:18.116 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.240$ two amplification by sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

00:13:21.240 --> 00:13:23.630 Abandoned at the same time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

00:13:23.630 --> 00:13:27.630 Doctor Santini's group also published.

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455 00:13:27.630 --> 00:13:30.190 Study on. NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:30.190 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.738$ Sequencing of serous carcinomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:32.738 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.453$ and found that 44% of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.753757874545455

 $00:13:36.453 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.256$ showed Erbitux amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:13:40.390 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.945$ Soum this is really a

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:13:42.945 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.478$ wonderful the rapeutic target.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:13:44.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.308$ It's been recognized in other tumor types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:13:47.310 \longrightarrow 00:13:49.662$ and there are so many potential drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:13:49.662 --> 00:13:52.659 that can be used to target this pathway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}13{:}52.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}55.066$ and this cartoon is not even

 $00:13:55.066 \longrightarrow 00:13:57.180$ that recent is from 2018,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}13{:}57.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}59.420$ but you can see the variety of drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:13:59.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.370$ that are available in addition to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:02.370 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.414$ earliest ones that blocked the ****

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:05.414 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.037$ dimerization or heterodimerization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}14{:}07.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}09.036$ trastuzumab, pertuzumab there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:09.036 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.030$ now other drugs targeting the tires.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}14{:}12.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}14.826$ And kinase domain of the receptor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:14.830 \longrightarrow 00:14:20.150$ There are other therapeutic approaches.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:14:20.150 --> 00:14:21.536 To use antibody,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}14{:}21.536 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}23.846$ drug conjugates and then even

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:14:23.846 --> 00:14:25.890 more recent developments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}14{:}25.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}27.186$ using bispecific antibodies

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:27.186 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.346$ or vaccines and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:29.350 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.734$ So there is really a variety of of.

 $00:14:33.740 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.508$ Drugs available to to be taken advantage of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:39.510 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.766$ So let's look at what happened

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:14:41.766 --> 00:14:44.200 in other tumor types and targeted

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:44.200 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.744$ her two treatment over the years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:14:46.750 --> 00:14:48.970 It's been a long, long history,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}14{:}48.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}51.698$ so going back to 1998 I was still

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:14:51.698 --> 00:14:53.834 in medical school, went resume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:53.834 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.306$ it was first approved by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:14:56.306 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.399$ FDA for breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:14:58.400 --> 00:15:00.730 Dan, with a little gap, other drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}15{:}00.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04.490$ or have also been approved for breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:04.490 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.126$ and in 2010 trust.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}15{:}06.126 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}08.171$ Susan Webb was also approved

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:08.171 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.870$ for gastric cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:09.870 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.634$ So then since then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:11.634 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.952$ many other antibody,

 $00{:}15{:}12.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}15.112$ drug conjugates and other drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:15:15.112 --> 00:15:17.190 have been approved as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:17.190 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.536$ on the bottom of the diagram.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:19.540 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.180$ This is what happened in under media cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:22.180 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.108$ There was one trial that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:25.108 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.720$ will talk a little more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:27.720 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.710$ And a little bit about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:30.710 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.176$ as is the JIOJI trial that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:33.176 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.920$ was published in 2010 and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:36.920 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.020$ After that it took so many years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:15:39.020 --> 00:15:39.445 Finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}15{:}39.445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}42.845$ in 2018 went resume AB was found to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:42.845 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.187$ improve progression free survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:45.187 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.247$ and overall survival in endometrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:48.247 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.347$ carcinoma and that discovery was

 $00:15:51.347 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.727$ quickly followed by endorsement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:15:53.730 --> 00:15:55.858 From the NCCN guidelines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:55.858 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.050$ and also from the Society of

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:15:59.149 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.709$ Gynecological Oncologists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:16:01.710 --> 00:16:02.988 So what what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:16:02.988 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.290$ Why did it take so long to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}16{:}06.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}09.580$ these targeted the rapies to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:16:09.580 --> 00:16:11.852 recognized for endometrial cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

00:16:11.852 --> 00:16:14.590 Well, the interest is not new.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00{:}16{:}14.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}17.152$ I took this statistics from PUB

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:16:17.152 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.764$ Med so if you do a search for

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:16:20.764 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.568$ her to an endometrial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87041821

 $00:16:22.570 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.938$ there is this interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:26.420 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.338$ Double wave and you can see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:28.338 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.709$ we are in the second second wave

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:30.709 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.559$ of the her two publications,

 $00:16:32.560 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.485$ so there was there was a lot of interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00{:}16{:}35.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}38.120$ and then after the first trial publication

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:38.120 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.745$ the interest went down a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

00:16:40.745 --> 00:16:43.298 and now we're in this growing phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

00:16:43.300 --> 00:16:45.710 We're not even done with 2021 yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:45.710 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.055$ and there's there's a lot of papers

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:48.055 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.409$ that not all of them are from you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00{:}16{:}50.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}54.358$ So this is a review I wrote in 2012 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:54.358 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.750$ it's not for you to read in detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:16:57.750 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.910$ just to show that there were a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

00:16:59.910 --> 00:17:02.098 studies already published before 2012,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:02.098 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.062$ and the rate of her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00{:}17{:}05.062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}07.847$ over expression was all over the place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:07.850 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.338$ Different criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

00:17:09.338 --> 00:17:11.570 different scoring methods,

 $00:17:11.570 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.996$ different antibodies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00{:}17{:}12.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}15.848$ different case inclusion criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:15.850 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.671$ So the the rate of her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:18.671 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.560$ overexpression was reported between.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:20.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.864$ 14 and 80% and register same is

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:23.864 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.330$ true for her two amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904934210526

 $00:17:27.330 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.170$ The rates varied from 15 to 47%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:34.220 \longrightarrow 00:17:37.972$ There were also a few case reports that

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:37.972 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.618$ were encouraging showing response in

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:40.618 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.858$ patients with her two positive tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:43.860 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.740$ And then the GOG study that I mentioned.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.060$ So just also for context they kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:51.060 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.059$ collaged conchology group is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.900$ the major gynecological oncology

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:17:55.900 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.250$ clinical organization that runs large

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00{:}17{:}59.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}02.310$ number of clinical trials with with

 $00:18:02.310 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.840$ several participating institutions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844367594210526

 $00:18:03.840 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.510$ It's really the way that most.

NOTE Confidence: 0.556626906666667

 $00:18:09.540 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.859$ Oncology trials RR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:14.970 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.050$ Uhm conducted and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:17.050 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.130$ gynecological oncology so really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:19.130 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.482$ If if anyone could could

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:21.482 \longrightarrow 00:18:23.750$ do and produce these numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:23.750 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.006$ that would be the jioji group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

00:18:26.010 --> 00:18:29.088 And despite of that they actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00{:}18{:}29.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}31.418$ really had a hard time recruiting

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:31.418 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.970$ patients for this trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:32.970 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.050$ It took them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.210$ It was running for seven years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:36.210 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.266$ took them seven years to recruit 33 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:39.270 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.873$ There was also a period of time

00:18:40.873 --> 00:18:42.362 when the study was shut down

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:42.362 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.607$ because of they called it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:43.610 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.898$ Investigator fatigue and any.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:45.898 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.758$ Anyhow they the bottom line

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:48.758 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.148$ is that it showed no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

00:18:51.150 --> 00:18:53.124 Benefit from using Tris is a map,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.455$ although it was also criticised

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00:18:56.455 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.265$ for only using single agent resume

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00{:}18{:}59.265 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}01.410$ app and including other tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.70541961

 $00{:}19{:}01.487 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}03.599$ other than serious carcinomas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:05.730 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.166$ So so that seemed to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:08.170 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.950$ the that seemed to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:09.950 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.478$ You know, that basically it's it's been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:13.480 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.904$ People have given up on on

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:19:15.904 --> 00:19:18.270 this on this potential targeted

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:18.270 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.770$ therapy for this tumor type.

 $00:19:19.770 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.874$ After this, except Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:19:22.874 --> 00:19:25.630 Centene persisted and I think you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:25.630 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.754$ I really have to give him a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:19:27.754 --> 00:19:29.607 credit for pursuing this and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:29.607 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.499$ he really believed that that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:31.499 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.431$ could be a better way of designing

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:33.431 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.900$ a study and showing that this this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:35.900 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.665$ Treatment can be really efficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:38.665 \longrightarrow 00:19:41.095$ and so dumb. Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:19:41.095 --> 00:19:43.390 His persistently persistence

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:43.390 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.232$ led to publication of two major

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:47.232 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.122$ papers in 2018 and 2020,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}19{:}50.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53.530$ showing that trust is a map in combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:53.530 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.774$ with the traditional chemotherapy is

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:19:56.774 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.260$ actually improving progression free,

 $00:19:59.260 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.110$ and overall survival in these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}20{:}02.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}05.598$ So here is the diagram of this trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:05.600 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.720$ There were a total of 61 patients enrolled

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:08.720 \longrightarrow 00:20:12.536$ in the treatment arm and in the control arm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:12.540 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.115$ And there was improvement of progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:17.115 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.510$ free survival with the best response

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:20.510 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.538$ in the advanced Stage Disease Group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:20:23.538 --> 00:20:25.414 Little less in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:25.414 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.290$ who had recurrent disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:20:27.290 --> 00:20:29.210 But still there was an improvement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:29.210 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.026$ and the same is true for overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.964$ The patients who had advanced stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:34.964 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.160$ disease responded the best for treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:39.160 \longrightarrow 00:20:42.232$ So then there was a lot of publicity

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:42.232 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.135$ and Yale publications and also the

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}20{:}45.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}48.585$ ASKO named Justice and Map as one

 $00:20:48.585 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.740$ of the advances of the year in 2019.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:20:52.740 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.939$ So that was that was a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:20:55.939 --> 00:20:58.030 breakthrough for these really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:20:58.030 --> 00:21:00.210 Aggressive tumors with high mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:00.210 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.394$ that really gave gave a lot of hope

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:03.394 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.550$ with a lot of hope for patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:05.550 \longrightarrow 00:21:09.856$ and so to recognize that in 2019,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}21{:}09.856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13.640$ the NCCN guidelines included.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}21{:}13.640 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}21{:}14.945$ Carboplatin, paclitaxel cluster

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:14.945 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.120$ Susan map for these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:17.120 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.586$ and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:17.586 \longrightarrow 00:21:18.984$ as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}21{:}18.984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}20.848$ the Society of Gynecological

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:20.848 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.478$ Oncologists also recommends testing her.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}21{:}23.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}25.825$ Two testing of serous carcinomas

00:21:25.825 --> 00:21:28.738 and adding just zoom out and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:21:28.738 --> 00:21:30.650 in the treatment regimen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.492$ So the question for us now in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:33.492 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.328$ pathology is how to evaluate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:36.328 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.868$ hurdle status in these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:38.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.870$ Come to answer that question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:40.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:43.030$ let's look at other tumor types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333 00:21:43.030 --> 00:21:44.570 Again, NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:44.570 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.718$ here is the long evolution of

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:46.718 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.150$ the her two guidelines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:48.150 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.105$ and other tumor types and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:51.105 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.878$ breast cancer starting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:21:52.880 --> 00:21:57.255 In 1998, with the FDA package insert,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:21:57.260 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.340$ the first ASCO CAP guidelines came out in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:00.340 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.420$ 2007 and then another two set of guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:04.420 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.568$ Finally, currently,

00:22:05.568 --> 00:22:09.638 we use the 2018 ASCO CAP guidelines

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:09.638 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.399$ in gastric cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:11.400 \longrightarrow 00:22:15.012$ The tumor characteristics of her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:15.012 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.420$ expression and amplification were

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:17.513 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.435$ first described in the toga trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:20.440 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.650$ Trastuzumab for gastric cancer trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:23.650 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.674$ And based upon that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}22{:}25.674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}27.698$ based upon the observations

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:27.698 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.030$ from that trial in 2016,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:30.030 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.364$ they ask Cool CAP published the

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:32.364 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.612$ first official set of guidelines

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

00:22:34.612 --> 00:22:37.076 specific for gastric carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}22{:}37.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39.212$ and most recently a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:39.212 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.877$ Clinical trial on colorectal cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:41.877 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.654$ is using yet another set of criteria

 $00:22:45.654 \longrightarrow 00:22:48.930$ different from the other two tumor types,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:48.930 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.360$ so it is recognized in other

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.780$ tumor types that there is there

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:53.780 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.072$ are differences in how the her

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:22:56.155 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.679$ two expression and amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00{:}22{:}58.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}02.854$ Occurs and and how the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:23:02.854 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.998$ response is associated with these features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914897948333333

 $00:23:06.000 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.950$ so that led to these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00:23:07.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.398$ development of different guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

00:23:11.400 --> 00:23:13.770 And before I even go further,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00{:}23{:}13.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.885$ I want also wanted to emphasize that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00:23:16.885 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.702$ the clinical trial that I presented to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00:23:20.702 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.880$ you earlier started in 2011, when the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00{:}23{:}25.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}28.965$ Guidelines the only guidelines existing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00:23:28.965 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.959$ for any hurt evaluation over the ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8994679425

 $00:23:32.960 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.756$ Published by the ASCO CAP in 2007 that

 $00:23:35.756 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.390$ I'll come back to that in a little bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:40.820 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.386$ So let's look at the features

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:42.386 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.329$ of her two and breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:44.330 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.730$ Approximately 15 to 25% of the tumors are

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:47.730 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.638$ her two positive heterogeneity of her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:51.638 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.473$ expression and amplification is uncommon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:54.480 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.819$ although there is a little bit more

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:23:57.819 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.980$ variety and the reported rates and her

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00{:}24{:}01.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}05.280$ two heterogeneity or gene amplification,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00{:}24{:}05.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}07.513$ and for those cases it's been reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:07.513 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.768$ that they can be either a cluster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.610$ Heterogeneity or mosaic pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

00:24:12.610 --> 00:24:14.030 of heterogeneity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:14.030 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.540$ The basal basal lateral staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:16.540 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.188$ pattern is quite rare, mostly seen in

00:24:20.188 --> 00:24:21.826 invasive micropapillary carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00{:}24{:}21.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}24.932$ and in those cases that's considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:24.932 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.000$ a two plus score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:27.000 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.856$ And fish and I see are equally

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:29.856 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.840$ predictive of treatment response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:31.840 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.724$ So for that reason,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

 $00:24:33.724 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.550$ the herd to testing algorithm could

NOTE Confidence: 0.841705185

00:24:36.642 --> 00:24:39.408 start either with IC or a fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

00:24:43.580 --> 00:24:47.297 In gastric cancer, as I mentioned the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

00:24:47.300 --> 00:24:48.923 Guidelines were developed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00{:}24{:}48.923 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}51.487$ developed based on the information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

00:24:51.487 --> 00:24:54.663 The data from the toga trial and there

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:24:54.663 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.156$ were several nice papers are written

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

00:24:57.156 --> 00:25:00.364 on on that in correlation with the OR

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:25:00.364 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.584$ in conjunction with the toga trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:25:02.590 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.047$ And based on that we learned that

00:25:05.050 --> 00:25:07.666 22% of gastric or GE junction

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:25:07.666 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.320$ tumors are her two positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:25:10.320 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.865$ Although there is some variability

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

00:25:12.865 --> 00:25:15.410 depending on the histologic subtype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

00:25:15.410 --> 00:25:17.270 intestinal type tumors are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:25:17.270 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.028$ likely to be her two positive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00:25:20.028 \longrightarrow 00:25:22.494$ also based on the tumor location.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00{:}25{:}22.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}24.665$ So GE Junction tumors are

NOTE Confidence: 0.853787571428571

 $00{:}25{:}24.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}26.520$ more often her two positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}25{:}29.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}32.450$ Heterogeneity, unlike in breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

00:25:32.450 --> 00:25:34.304 is very common and it's present

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:25:34.304 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.670$ in up to 50% of tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}25{:}37.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}39.945$ The concordance between ISC and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:25:39.945 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.849$ fresh has been reported to be high

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:25:42.850 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.250$ and another important difference

00:25:45.250 --> 00:25:48.756 from breast cancer is that protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}25{:}48.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}50.780$ expression shows the highest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}25{:}50.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}52.352$ The strongest association

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:25:52.352 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.448$ with the therapeutic response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:25:54.450 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.344$ So the testing algorithm has to

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:25:58.344 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.291$ start with immunohistochemistry

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

00:26:00.291 --> 00:26:04.067 and only tumors with a two plus

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}26{:}04.067 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06.822$ immunostain will be reflex with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}26{:}06.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}09.894$ Her two fish, although there's some

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:26:09.894 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.180$ data and one of the trials that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}26{:}14.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17.450$ IC negative and fish positive tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:26:17.450 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.670$ may also benefit from treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:26:20.670 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.183$ Come just to illustrate or what I

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}26{:}23.183 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}25.349$ mentioned about the gastric tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00{:}26{:}25.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}28.982$ There is the characteristic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

00:26:28.982 --> 00:26:31.642 basolateral staining pattern,

00:26:31.642 --> 00:26:35.146 lack of epical staining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79890442

 $00:26:35.150 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.790$ And so. NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:26:37.990 \longrightarrow 00:26:40.558$ And so at the beginning of the clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

00:26:40.558 --> 00:26:42.710 trial for endometrial carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:26:42.710 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.077$ we decided to look at the characteristics

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:26:46.077 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.787$ of serious carcinomas to see if

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

00:26:48.787 --> 00:26:51.169 they also have unique features that

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

00:26:51.169 --> 00:26:53.778 should be taken into consideration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:26:53.780 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.548$ So we looked at 108 cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:26:57.550 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.504$ most of which were pure serious carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:27:00.510 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.128$ Some of them are mixed tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:27:04.130 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.220$ And we performed a immunohistochemistry and

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00{:}27{:}07.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.638$ her two fish on all of the two plus cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

00:27:11.640 --> 00:27:14.360 And compared the scoring systems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765255031666667

 $00:27:14.360 \longrightarrow 00:27:17.720$ the original FDA package insert score

00:27:17.720 --> 00:27:20.668 plus the 2007 ASCO CAP criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:23.580 \longrightarrow 00:27:27.094$ I'm using the two different scoring criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:27.100 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.030$ We found that there was of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:30.030 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.855$ some differences in the her

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

00:27:31.855 --> 00:27:34.540 two positive positive ITI rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:34.540 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.157$ about 30% of the tumors were her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

00:27:38.157 --> 00:27:43.098 using the ASCO CAP 2007 criteria and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:43.100 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.860$ More importantly, in terms of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:45.860 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.254$ icy fish concordance to 2007,

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714

 $00:27:48.254 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.578$ breast criteria gave a higher concordance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796174474285714 00:27:51.580 --> 00:27:53.059 It was 86%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00{:}27{:}55.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}58.242$ Another very important finding from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:27:58.242 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.160$ study was recognition of heterogeneity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:01.160 \longrightarrow 00:28:04.639$ It is very common in these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:04.640 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.048$ More than 50% of the her two positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

00:28:08.048 --> 00:28:10.718 cases and you can see some examples

 $00:28:10.718 \longrightarrow 00:28:13.135$ here where there are several neoplastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00{:}28{:}13.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}16.110$ glands on the right hand side and

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:16.110 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.328$ only a few of them are positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:18.328 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.912$ for her two on the left hand side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:21.920 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.492$ Same thing you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:23.492 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.296$ You have several neoplastic areas

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:26.296 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.968$ that are her two positive in with an

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:29.968 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.598$ intense training and then in the upper

NOTE Confidence: 0.851113857272727

 $00:28:32.598 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.735$ right corner of the slide there is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85111385727272700:28:34.735 --> 00:28:35.530 There is no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}28{:}37.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}40.030$ Expression even within the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

00:28:40.030 --> 00:28:42.440 gland you can find different

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}28{:}42.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}45.758$ protein expression levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

00:28:45.760 --> 00:28:47.740 And in addition to that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:28:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.520$ similar to gastric cancer,

 $00:28:49.520 \longrightarrow 00:28:52.190$ these tumors also frequently lack the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}28{:}52.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}55.714$ ethical staining resulting in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:28:55.714 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.826$ lateral basolateral staining pattern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:28:58.830 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.245$ We also looked at a smaller number

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:01.245 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.352$ of cases by fish to see if the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

00:29:04.352 --> 00:29:06.342 heterogeneity can also be observed

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:06.419 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.276$ at the gene amplification level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:09.276 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.890$ and we found two patterns of amplification

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}29{:}14.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}17.858$ and named them similar to what the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:17.858 \longrightarrow 00:29:19.570$ breast cancer literature used.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

00:29:19.570 --> 00:29:20.468 Cluster amplification,

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}29{:}20.468 \to 00{:}29{:}24.060$ which is where you have a large cluster

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:24.136 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.271$ of tumor cells showing amplification

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:26.271 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.920$ and in next to another class.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.406$ Clustered at that has no amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:32.410 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.398$ And another case where we found

 $00:29:35.398 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.434$ a strong correlation between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}29{:}38.434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}40.204$ immunohistochemical expression of

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:40.204 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.646$ the protein and the gene application.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:42.650 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.788$ You can see that the the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}29{:}45.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}48.455$ Her two positive areas corresponded

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:48.455 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.587$ to the amplified area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:29:50.590 \longrightarrow 00:29:53.752$ Her two week expression corresponded to

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00{:}29{:}53.752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}58.160$ the her two non amplified area on fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

00:29:58.160 --> 00:30:00.888 And then we also saw some cases with

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:30:00.888 \dashrightarrow 00:30:03.424$ a mosaic amplification pattern where

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:30:03.424 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.964$ there were individual tumor cells showing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:30:06.970 \dashrightarrow 00:30:08.944$ Her two gene amplification in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.907750445

 $00:30:08.944 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.640$ background of non amplified cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:13.770 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.731$ So based on our. Observations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:16.731 \longrightarrow 00:30:19.617$ at the beginning of the trial,

 $00:30:19.620 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.475$ we decided to use the existing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

00:30:23.475 --> 00:30:28.080 2007 ASCO CAP scoring system at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:28.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.000$ time with specific modifications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

00:30:30.000 --> 00:30:33.759 namely that CIRCUMFERENTIALLY.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:33.760 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.508$ Staining was not required.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:35.508 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.130$ U shaped or based on lateral.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00{:}30{:}38.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}40.490$ Lateral pattern was also accepted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:40.490 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.302$ for the her 2/3 plus score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:43.302 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.230$ In addition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:44.230 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.206$ due to the heterogeneity we decided

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00{:}30{:}48.206 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{-}}} 00{:}30{:}51.554$ to do the immunohistochemistry on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:51.554 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.350$ hysterectomy specimen to identify a large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:54.350 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.742$ larger amount of tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:56.742 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.839$ Uhm, for testing and also to do the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:30:59.839 \longrightarrow 00:31:02.805$ fish on two plus cases in correlation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:02.805 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.965$ with the IC stain slides so that

 $00:31:05.965 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.527$ we look at the area with most

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:08.527 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.946$ with the most protein expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:10.946 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.318$ Also, we typically selected a large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:14.320 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.492$ larger area for fish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

00:31:16.492 --> 00:31:19.750 unlike in breast cancer and her

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:19.862 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.802$ to 17 ratio of two or greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:22.802 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.017$ was used as a cutoff for fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

00:31:26.020 --> 00:31:29.852 So I would stop here for just a minute

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00:31:29.852 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.599$ to say that. Well, it would seem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

00:31:34.600 --> 00:31:36.470 Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

00:31:36.470 --> 00:31:40.134 It would seem logical to at this point

NOTE Confidence: 0.8458429075

 $00{:}31{:}40.134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}43.819$ use these clinical trial criteria too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}31{:}45.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}49.458$ 2. Idento to come.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:31:49.458 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.790$ Evaluate or two staining moving on in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:31:52.884 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.027$ these tumor types at the same time.

 $00:31:56.030 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.664$ Since then, two different sets of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}31{:}58.664 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}01.073$ criteria have been proposed for or

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:01.073 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.646$ have been published for breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:03.646 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.263$ and there are some authors who would

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:07.263 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.966$ advocate for using the 2018 breast criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:10.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.610$ saying that, well, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

00:32:12.610 --> 00:32:14.250 just for simplicity sake,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:14.250 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.705$ why don't we use the criteria that everybody

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}32{:}17.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}20.447$ is already familiar with and this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:20.450 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.160$ This is my my cartoon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}32{:}22.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}24.848$ Just to show that I think one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:24.848 \longrightarrow 00:32:26.609$ the arguments in addition just

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:26.609 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.635$ to to the fact that, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:28.635 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.315$ this is the the criteria I just mentioned

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:31.315 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.896$ are the ones that were shown to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:33.896 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.530$ correlate with response and the covert trial.

 $00:32:36.530 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.250$ In addition to that, if we use the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:39.250 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.279$ criteria from another tour type,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:41.280 \longrightarrow 00:32:44.017$ then we'll have a moving finish line.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

00:32:44.020 --> 00:32:46.180 You know it's not over and breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:46.180 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.890$ I'm sure that or I'm I'm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:49.890 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.682$ I, I suspect that there will be no

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:51.682 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.403$ as data accumulate and new studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:53.403 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.918$ come out and pressed it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}32{:}54.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}58.148$ It's entirely possible that they will

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

00:32:58.150 --> 00:32:59.238 adjust the guidelines accordingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:32:59.238 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.191$ and there will be a new set

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:01.191 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.279$ of guidelines for breast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}33{:}02.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}05.220$ So are we going to change our

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:05.220 \longrightarrow 00:33:06.897$ interpretation criteria every time

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:06.897 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.291$ based on another tumor type on breast

 $00:33:09.291 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.966$ or or on gastric for that matter?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

00:33:11.970 --> 00:33:14.952 So I really think that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:14.952 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.940$ important to establish endometrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:17.030 \longrightarrow 00:33:19.678$ carcinoma specific guidelines on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

00:33:19.680 --> 00:33:23.694 At this point and for that reason,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

00:33:23.694 --> 00:33:25.018 based on our experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}33{:}25.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}28.870$ I proposed her testing algorithm

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:28.870 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.648$ and and scoring criteria for

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:32.648 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.656$ an Demetria serious carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:35.660 \longrightarrow 00:33:38.556$ and this is of course just the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00{:}33{:}38.556 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41.452$ step and there will be many more

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:41.452 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.030$ steps to really identify the best.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.315$ Testing algorithm and and there

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:46.315 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.159$ is already currently a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90248156

 $00:33:49.159 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.578$ groups interested in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00{:}33{:}53.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}57.074$ In studying these tumors and and uh.

 $00:33:57.080 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.912$ There is many more publications that

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00:33:59.912 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.499$ I expect to come out on this topic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00:34:03.500 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.116$ We also performed an interobserver study

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00:34:06.116 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.514$ to look at the reproducibility of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00:34:09.514 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.188$ scoring system and found that it had a good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00{:}34{:}15.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}18.608$ Interobserver uh agreement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

00:34:18.608 --> 00:34:22.661 Kappa, which is comparable to what's being

NOTE Confidence: 0.725949411428572

 $00{:}34{:}22.661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}25.878$ published in breast and gastric tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00{:}34{:}28.620 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}34{:}32.346$ There are several remaining practical issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87643389333333

 $00:34:32.350 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.949$ On this topic, we still have to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:34:36.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.799$ Do more investigations to find out what

NOTE Confidence: 0.87643389333333

 $00:34:39.799 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.579$ correlates best with the clinical response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00{:}34{:}42.580 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}34{:}43.876$ immunohistochemistry or fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:34:43.876 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.830$ We have not done fish on all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87643389333333

 $00:34:47.830 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.955$ tumors and potentially there could

 $00:34:49.955 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.745$ be icy negative fish positive tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:34:52.745 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.625$ that may also benefit from treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

00:34:55.630 --> 00:34:58.402 We don't know the full clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:34:58.402 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.250$ impact of intratumoral heterogeneity

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:00.327 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.619$ in this tumor type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:01.620 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.248$ Also another question is sample selection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:04.250 \longrightarrow 00:35:07.015$ Should we do testing on the biopsy

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:07.015 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.570$ or grading versus the hysterectomy?

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:09.570 \longrightarrow 00:35:12.888$ Should we test primary versus metastasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:12.890 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.982$ and finally specimen handling and fixation

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00{:}35{:}16.982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}21.540$ time and and the issue of control?

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:21.540 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.732$ Slides on the on the topic of

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:24.732 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.710$ heterogeneity data from breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:26.710 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.854$ and gastric cancer have shown that

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:29.854 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.810$ homogeneous her two overexpression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:32.810 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.128$ Has more benefit from targeted therapy

 $00:35:36.128 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.649$ compared to heterogeneous her two expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:39.650 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.496$ On the topic of sample selection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:43.500 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.848$ there are several considerations

NOTE Confidence: 0.876433893333333

 $00:35:44.848 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.533$ and this is an interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00{:}35{:}48.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}52.676$ Topic for that reason because first of all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00{:}35{:}52.676 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}35{:}54.924$ Comparing biopsies versus hysterectomy

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:35:54.924 \longrightarrow 00:35:58.090$ of course fixation is probably better

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00{:}35{:}58.090 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}36{:}01.359$ and and a better controlled and biopsies

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:01.439 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.127$ gradings compared to hysterectomy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:04.130 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.965$ especially if they're not open right away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:06.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.910$ Also we have to take the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:09.910 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.380$ heterogeneity into consideration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:11.380 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.780$ What will give us a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:13.780 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.380$ sampling of the tumor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:15.380 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.088$ Is it if we select one block from the

 $00:36:19.088 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.075$ hysterectomy or is it potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:21.075 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.774$ a more spatially?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:22.774 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.590$ Heterogeneous sampling, and inoculating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:26.590 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.490$ Also, the timing of the sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:30.490 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.646$ In breast cancer? UM, it's a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:33.650 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.202$ It's a very important to have the her

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:36:37.202 --> 00:36:42.250 two status information before the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:36:42.250 --> 00:36:43.519 Definitive surgery because

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:36:43.519 --> 00:36:45.634 oftentimes based on that result,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:45.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.165$ the patient will be offered

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:36:48.165 --> 00:36:49.175 neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:49.180 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.287$ So that's why I think it's a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:51.290 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.342$ It's a straightforward to do the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:53.342 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.530$ started testing on the core biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:36:55.530 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.918$ There is no such consideration or

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00{:}36{:}57.918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}00.729$ it's much less common in dimitriou

00:37:00.729 --> 00:37:03.013 cancer patients don't typically

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:37:03.013 --> 00:37:04.726 get neoadjuvant treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:04.730 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.430$ so for that reason,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:06.430 \longrightarrow 00:37:09.506$ the the testing could wait until the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00{:}37{:}09.506 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}12.164$ hysterectomy in most of the cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:12.170 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.529$ The question also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:37:13.529 --> 00:37:15.794 should we test multiple blocks?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:15.800 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.979$ Should we test the metastasis if the?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:37:19.980 --> 00:37:21.345 Primary was negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:21.345 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.075$ so so to answer these questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:24.080 \dashrightarrow 00:37:28.049$ we can again take a look at the gastric

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:28.049 \dashrightarrow 00:37:30.697$ literature and and learn from what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00{:}37{:}30.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}34.263$ They found in gastric carcinomas a

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:34.263 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.881$ nice study from University of Rochester

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:37.881 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.400$ showed that the more specimens you test,

 $00:37:41.400 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.295$ the higher the likelihood that

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:43.295 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.720$ you'll get her two positive result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:37:45.720 --> 00:37:49.650 So comparing patients with only one

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

00:37:49.650 --> 00:37:53.180 specimen from 12% positive ITI rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:53.180 \longrightarrow 00:37:56.640$ you go up to 24% of positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:56.640 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.940$ ITI rate if patients have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92376738

 $00:37:58.940 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.229$ More than more than one specimen so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:03.360 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.104$ Based on that, we designed a study

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

00:38:06.104 --> 00:38:08.987 that Douglas was working on and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

00:38:08.987 --> 00:38:11.429 published last year to compare the

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00{:}38{:}11.512 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}14.844$ her two status in paired biopsy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00{:}38{:}14.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}17.356$ hysterectomy specimens and showed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:17.356 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.255$ the concordance was a lower than what

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:21.255 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.245$ was reported in breast tumor literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:25.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.982$ so only 84% concordance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:26.982 \longrightarrow 00:38:30.608$ and so if we only tested the endometrial

 $00:38:30.608 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.717$ passes or grading the we would have a 15%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:34.717 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.788$ False negative rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:35.788 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.930$ and if we only tested the

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:38.006 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.006$ hysterectomy you would have almost

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

00:38:40.006 --> 00:38:43.362 a 30% of false negative rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:43.362 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.136$ So it really is true also for

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:46.136 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.376$ endometrial cancer that if we test

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00{:}38{:}48.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}50.226$ multiple specimens then we increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00{:}38{:}50.226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}52.818$ the rate of her two positive ITI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00{:}38{:}52.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}55.389$ Here are the six cases from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:55.389 \longrightarrow 00:38:58.071$ study that had a discrepant result

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:38:58.071 \longrightarrow 00:39:00.571$ between the biopsy and hysterectomy

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00{:}39{:}00.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}03.382$ and most of the cases the change

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

00:39:03.382 --> 00:39:06.274 went from positive in the biopsy

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:39:06.274 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.300$ to negative and the hysterectomy.

 $00:39:09.300 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.164$ Here is one of the examples where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:39{:}12.164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}14.692$ biopsy was strongly positive or three

NOTE Confidence: 0.813491637333333

 $00:39:14.692 \longrightarrow 00:39:17.740$ plus and hysterectomy was a one plus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00:39:20.500 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.710$ Nice study from the Netherlands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00:39:22.710 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.258$ Looked at paired primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00:39:25.258 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.169$ and metastatic tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

00:39:27.170 --> 00:39:29.750 metastatic and amitiel or carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

00:39:29.750 --> 00:39:31.490 including serious carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

00:39:31.490 --> 00:39:34.390 and they found that overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00:39:34.390 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.356$ there is a 23% discordance rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00{:}39{:}37.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}40.066$ between these tumors and again

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00{:}39{:}40.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}42.910$ the change could go both ways.

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00:39:42.910 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.572$ It could go from a positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00{:}39{:}44.572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}46.601$ to negative or from a her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.769834814

 $00:39:46.601 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.036$ negative to her two positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:39:50.300 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.898$ For specimen handling.

 $00:39:52.900 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.942$ The current recommendations for best breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:39:55.942 \dashrightarrow 00:39:59.220$ and gastric cancer is cold is chaemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:39:59.220 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.444$ Time of 1 hour or less and at

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:40:02.444 --> 00:40:07.190 least six hours of fixation. Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:07.190 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.022$ So in terms of future on directions. Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:40:11.022 --> 00:40:16.800 We still need to work on identifying the

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:16.800 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.700$ the correlation between clinical response

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

00:40:20.700 --> 00:40:24.396 and her two IC and fish characteristics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:24.400 \longrightarrow 00:40:25.960$ and in addition to that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:25.960 \longrightarrow 00:40:27.927$ there are new her two testing methods,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

00:40:27.930 --> 00:40:32.424 namely sequencing, that may also be

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:32.424 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.490$ used for evaluation of her two status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:40:37.490 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.577$ In addition, there is a question about

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:40.577 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.484$ should we test the for the extracellular or

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:40:44.484 --> 00:40:47.820 the intracellular domain of the receptor?

 $00:40:47.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.824$ And also, what about her too

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:49.824 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.160$ and other gynecological tumors?

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:40:51.160 --> 00:40:54.120 High grade endometrial carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:40:54.120 \longrightarrow 00:40:55.600$ or carcinosarcoma?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:40:55.600 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.666$ There is also a lot of history

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:40:58.666 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.526$ type agnostic clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:00.526 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.126$ What should we use for those trials?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

00:41:04.126 --> 00:41:05.458 Scoring criteria?

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:41:05.458 --> 00:41:08.007 And then finally what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:08.007 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.742$ Is there any correlation between

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00{:}41{:}10.742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.370$ the her two status and prognosis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

00:41:14.370 --> 00:41:17.226 In terms of the next generation sequencing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00{:}41{:}17.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}21.236$ there is a study from a MSK a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:41:21.236 --> 00:41:24.330 years ago showing very nice very high

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:24.426 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.382$ concordance between the her two IC and

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00{:}41{:}28.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}33.608$ fish and the MSK impact sequencing platform.

00:41:33.610 --> 00:41:34.370 And similarly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00{:}41{:}34.370 --> 00{:}41{:}35.510$ just this year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:41:35.510 --> 00:41:38.882 published from Brigham UM,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:38.882 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.654$ they identified 100% concordance

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:41.654 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.822$ between next generation sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:41:43.822 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.990$ results and the combined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.355$ I see fish interpretation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:41:48.355 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.247$ under meteor serious carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:50.250 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.080$ So this this almost sounds

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:52.080 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.910$ too good to be true,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.934$ and I think one of the issues with

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:41:56.934 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.226$ this study was that almost very

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:41:59.226 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.132$ high percent of the cases 75% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00{:}42{:}02.132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}05.018$ the tumors were her two negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:42:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.075$ So it's it's easier

 $00:42:08.075 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.908$ to achieve concordant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:42:09.910 --> 00:42:10.404 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:10.404 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.368$ result when when the tumors her

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:13.368 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.981$ two negative only 20% were two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:42:15.981 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.107$ plus and only 4% were three plus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

00:42:19.107 --> 00:42:22.341 And also fish was only performed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:42:22.341 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.789$ on a smaller number of tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667 00:42:25.790 --> 00:42:26.226 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00{:}42{:}26.226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}29.278$ a couple of years ago we also

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:29.278 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.817$ presented our data on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00{:}42{:}31.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}35.310$ correlation between icy fish and next

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:35.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.686$ generation sequencing or sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

00:42:37.690 --> 00:42:42.240 Results were from mostly just.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:42:42.240 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.665$ Retrieved from the foundation medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:44.665 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.542$ or the tumor profiling lab results

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:47.542 \longrightarrow 00:42:50.526$ and we found that indeed we have 100%

 $00:42:50.530 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.380$ concordance among the negative cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:53.380 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.075$ but the concordance is much lower when

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:42:56.075 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.960$ we look at the positive cases only 43%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:43:00.960 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.732$ Concordance rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.924577766666667

 $00:43:01.732 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.048$ but that still gives an overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.9245777666666667

 $00:43:04.050 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.980$ 87% concordance for these tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:43:14.119$ An enemy to our cancer is also

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}43{:}14.119 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.320$ different from other tumor types

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:16.320 \longrightarrow 00:43:19.770$ and with with regards to the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}43{:}19.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}21.854$ So cellular and extracellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:21.854 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.938$ domain of the receptor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:23.940 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.640$ Several studies have shown,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}43{:}25.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}27.340$ including David Dream slap,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:27.340 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.360$ that on these tumors often

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:43:29.360 --> 00:43:30.976 shut the extracellular domain,

 $00:43:30.980 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.722$ which is the drug binding domain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:34.722 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.782$ to Susan Medwed binds to

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:36.782 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.018$ the extracellular domain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.180$ So once you lose that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:39.180 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.040$ you lose the therapeutic target.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}43{:}41.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}43.074$ Yet most of the antibodies were

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:43.074 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.399$ used in technical lab to detect her.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:43:45.400 --> 00:43:47.232 Two expression is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}43{:}47.232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}49.064$ against the intracellular domain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:49.070 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.834$ So are her two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:49.834 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.407$ Let me know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:43:50.410 --> 00:43:52.290 Staying may still be positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:52.290 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.991$ and yet the tumor may not responded

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:55.991 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.046$ to treatment for that reason,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:43:58.050 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.790$ so that's another important consideration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:44:00.790 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.638$ and here are some nice images from doctors,

 $00:44:05.640 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.948$ rim rim slab showing the differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}44{:}09.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}12.130$ I intracellular domain was

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:44:12.130 --> 00:44:14.670 labeled with the CB11 antibody,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:44:14.670 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.830$ which we use for awhile now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:44:16.830 --> 00:44:18.480 We we use EP3 currently which

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:44:18.480 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.200$ is also against the interests.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:44:20.200 --> 00:44:23.552 The domain and the only antibody

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:44:23.552 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.662$ clone that targets the extracellular

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:44:25.662 --> 00:44:27.909 domain that at least I'm aware

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:44:27.909 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.308$ of is the SP3 antibody and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00:44:32.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.285$ 88% of the tumors with a high

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

00:44:35.285 --> 00:44:37.286 intracellular domain had low

NOTE Confidence: 0.782352527692308

 $00{:}44{:}37.286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}39.866$ extracellular domain labeling levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:44:42.950 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.102$ Her two testing could also be expanded to

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:44:46.102 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.400$ other high grade under material carcinomas.

00:44:49.400 --> 00:44:51.512 There are several studies that just

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:44:51.512 --> 00:44:54.143 came out this year showing that her

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:44:54.143 --> 00:44:56.381 two positive ITI is highly associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:44:56.381 --> 00:44:59.662 with a P53 apparent Geno type,

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:44:59.662 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.194$ regardless of histologic classification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:45:02.200 --> 00:45:06.399 As many of you know, there is some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:06.400 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.176$ Uhm, interobserver variability and

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00{:}45{:}10.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14.896$ how these tumors are classified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:45:14.900 --> 00:45:17.766 So basically you could have a P53 aberrant

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:17.766 \longrightarrow 00:45:19.794$ tumor that based on other features

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00{:}45{:}19.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}22.222$ may be called a clear cell carcinoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:22.222 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.600$ or a grade 3 endometrial carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:24.600 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.513$ and that would potentially make the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:28.513 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.709$ ineligible for uneligible for the treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:31.710 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.475$ So there is there is a potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:34.475 \longrightarrow 00:45:37.230$ to expand the treatment for to

 $00:45:37.230 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.700$ include these tumors as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:39.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.204$ And one of the studies showed that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:42.204 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.820$ correlation was even stronger between

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:43.820 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.666$ the her two status and the P53 mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:46.666 \longrightarrow 00:45:50.610$ Then her two status and serious sister type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:50.610 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.570$ And this was a one of our studies in

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00:45:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.194$ collaboration with the University

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:45:56.194 --> 00:45:56.962 of Wisconsin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

00:45:56.962 --> 00:45:59.266 showing her two positive ITI in

NOTE Confidence: 0.686973425714286

 $00{:}45{:}59.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}01.039$ a clear soccer Sonoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.878378875

 $00{:}46{:}03.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}06.481$ Similarly, in Carcinosarcoma's there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.878378875

 $00:46:06.481 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.420$ in vitro and in vivo studies showing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:11.020 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.458$ UMD at the targeted treatment may work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:15.460 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.460$ And in our study, we found that 12%

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:19.460 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.952$ of course in sarcomas are positive

00:46:22.952 --> 00:46:26.344 if you use the 2007 criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:26.344 \longrightarrow 00:46:29.610$ most of them are uterine her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

00:46:29.610 --> 00:46:31.710 positive ITI is much less common and

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

00:46:31.710 --> 00:46:34.037 high grade ovarian serous carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:34.040 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.688$ so 14% versus 7%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:35.688 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.668$ And most of the tumors that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:38.668 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.140$ hurt a positive had a serious

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:41.140 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.440$ or a mixed epithelial component.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00{:}46{:}45.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}48.560$ Heterogeneity similar to an immediate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00{:}46{:}48.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}50.260$ serious carcinomas was also

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:50.260 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.385$ commonly seen in these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:52.390 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.322$ and most of them had a positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00{:}46{:}54.322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56.539$ ITI in the carcinoma component.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:46:56.540 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.591$ Only one case had a two plus

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

00:46:58.591 --> 00:47:00.810 staining in the circular component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668924677142857

 $00:47:00.810 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.666$ which is shown here on the upper right.

 $00:47:05.970 \longrightarrow 00:47:08.760$ So there is currently a clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

00:47:08.760 --> 00:47:11.894 trial in Japan and the Japanese

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00:47:11.894 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.829$ group already published data on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

00:47:14.830 --> 00:47:17.567 Compared to status and they found they

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00:47:17.567 \longrightarrow 00:47:19.646$ actually compared the gastric criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00:47:19.646 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.148$ with the current breast criteria and

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00:47:22.148 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.574$ they found 70% concordance between

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00:47:24.574 \longrightarrow 00:47:27.214$ the two different scoring criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00:47:27.220 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.888$ mostly due to the differences in lateral

NOTE Confidence: 0.744379424705882

 $00{:}47{:}31.888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}34.120$ based, lateral membranous pattern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:37.350 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.029$ There are many.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:40.030 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.898$ Tissue agnostic or tumor type agnostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:42.898 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.810$ clinical trials are available.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:44.810 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.701$ Basket trials that may include all solid

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:47.701 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.768$ tumors with her two positive positive status.

 $00:47:50.768 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.372$ So what scoring criteria should we

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:53.372 \longrightarrow 00:47:56.159$ use for for these trials or what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:47:56.160 --> 00:47:58.872 What are those trials using one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:47:58.872 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.070$ them was recently published, so I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.639$ Went into the details and into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:48:04.639 --> 00:48:06.769 supplementary material to find out how

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:06.769 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.689$ was the her two status determined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:48:08.690 --> 00:48:11.198 This particular trial included

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:11.198 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.079$ two endometrial cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:13.080 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.746$ Is one of them was not tested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:14.750 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.918$ the other one was her 2/3 plus positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:17.920 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.960$ and the only comment they made on how

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00{:}48{:}21.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}24.880$ the status was determined was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:24.880 \longrightarrow 00:48:27.491$ the heritage status was defined on

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:27.491 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.200$ the basis of local lab testing data

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00{:}48{:}30.284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}32.918$ and no further detail is provided.

 $00:48:32.920 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.975$ These are the currently ongoing

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00{:}48{:}35.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38.419$ trials for endometrial serous

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00{:}48{:}38.419 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}41.158$ carcinomas and coarseness sarcomas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:48:41.160 --> 00:48:44.104 And I expect there will be many more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:48:44.110 --> 00:48:47.060 There are many more in the works and

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00{:}48{:}47.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}49.700$ I think lastly, on the prognostic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:48:49.700 --> 00:48:50.820 prognostic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:50.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.820$ and predictive significance of her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:48:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:58.060$ status in breast cancer and gastric cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:48:58.060 --> 00:49:01.600 It's a known negative prognostic marker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:01.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.792$ and in breast cancer also her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:04.792 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.994$ positive ITI predicts a good response

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00{:}49{:}07.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}10.318$ to other chemotherapeutic agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:49:10.320 --> 00:49:13.850 Soum a large, collaborative study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:13.850 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.875$ also looked at the correlation

00:49:16.875 --> 00:49:19.485 between prognosis and her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

00:49:19.485 --> 00:49:21.345 status in endometrial cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:21.350 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.910$ and found that that is also true and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:23.910 \longrightarrow 00:49:25.935$ and the meteor serous carcinomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:25.935 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.521$ her two positive tumors have worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.94928628

 $00:49:28.521 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.956$ progression free and overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:49:32.970 \longrightarrow 00:49:36.936$ So in summary, about 25 to 30% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00{:}49{:}36.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}39.732$ endometrial serous carcinomas are her two

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00{:}49{:}39.732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}42.896$ positive to Tsumeb improves progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:49:42.896 \longrightarrow 00:49:46.940$ free and overall survival if added

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:49:47.050 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.890$ to the standard chemotherapy regimen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:49:50.890 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.554$ There are unique features of Hurtigruten

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:49:53.554 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.330$ expression and gene amplification,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:49:55.330 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.560$ and the because of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

00:49:59.560 --> 00:50:02.440 Speaker two testing and scoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:50:02.440 \longrightarrow 00:50:05.506$ algorithm was proposed based on the

 $00:50:05.510 \longrightarrow 00:50:09.080$ 2018 clinical trial enrollment data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:50:09.080 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.880$ There's also prognostic significance of

NOTE Confidence: 0.931616652857143

 $00:50:11.880 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.459$ her two status and potentially weakening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:17.540 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.810$ We can expand this a targeted therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:20.810 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.578$ to other tumor types and also to early

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00{:}50{:}24.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}27.350$ stage and a meteor service carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:27.350 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.222$ And I would like to acknowledge my colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:31.222 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.848$ and many of them helping me in pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00{:}50{:}34.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}37.935$ especially pay hue and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:37.935 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.153$ in gynecological oncology, Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

00:50:40.153 --> 00:50:43.057 Santina and his lab and all the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:43.057 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.676$ wonderful gynecological oncologist

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00{:}50{:}44.676 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}50{:}47.626$ gynecologist center in our group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:47.630 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.350$ So thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78061792

 $00:50:49.350 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.160$ Period attention.

 $00:50:54.450 \longrightarrow 00:50:58.012$ That was wonderful and I don't see

NOTE Confidence: 0.68609166

 $00{:}50{:}58.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}01.059$ any questions in the chat yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00:51:01.060 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.724$ But I do have a couple of companies

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

00:51:04.724 --> 00:51:10.012 since her Tonio has is now embracing

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00:51:10.012 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.826$ adenocarcinomas in multiple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

00:51:12.830 --> 00:51:17.846 Organ systems. Breast GY and ovary

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00:51:17.846 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.990$ and Dmitry AM gastric colorectal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00:51:22.990 \longrightarrow 00:51:27.412$ Uhm, why is it not used

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

00:51:27.412 --> 00:51:29.623 for lung adenocarcinomas?

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00:51:29.630 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.210$ That's question number one and

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00{:}51{:}32.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}35.486$ the question #2 is what about

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

00:51:35.486 --> 00:51:37.874 squamous cell carcinomas and

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

00:51:37.874 --> 00:51:40.742 number of those RP53 positive?

NOTE Confidence: 0.791896709090909

 $00:51:40.742 \longrightarrow 00:51:42.886$ The high grade ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.782180664

 $00:51:43.460 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.100$ you mean high grade serous

NOTE Confidence: 0.782180664

 $00{:}51{:}46.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}47.408$ carcinomas over the ovary.

 $00:51:48.120 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.585$ No, actually. My question is

NOTE Confidence: 0.80118766875

 $00:51:50.585 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.760$ outside of that. You yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:51:52.770 \longrightarrow 00:51:54.128$ No I said no I I got.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00{:}51{:}54.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}55.762$ I got lost because I at the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:51:55.762 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.530$ time I was reading David Ramsey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:51:57.530 --> 00:52:02.262 Comments here he yeah I think for

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:52:02.262 --> 00:52:04.354 long I mean what I could tell you

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:04.354 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.058$ is probably, you know there's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:06.058 \longrightarrow 00:52:08.556$ I'm sure there's so many large

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:52:08.556 --> 00:52:11.420 studies on the molecular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:52:11.420 --> 00:52:13.012 Characteristics of lung cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:13.012 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.002$ and it's probably that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00{:}52{:}15.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}16.640$ her two amplification is just

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:52:16.640 --> 00:52:18.640 not common among I don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00{:}52{:}18.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}21.152$ I mean I that would be my guess

 $00:52:21.152 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.874$ that similar to other high

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:22.874 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.920$ grade tumors in the GI tract,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:52:24.920 --> 00:52:26.078 I can speak for, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:26.080 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.010$ like a high grade serous

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:28.010 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.554$ carcinomas of the ovaries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:29.560 \longrightarrow 00:52:32.409$ As much as they are similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

00:52:32.409 --> 00:52:33.630 endometrial serous carcinomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:33.630 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.985$ the amplification hurt amplification and

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00{:}52{:}35.985 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}52{:}38.800$ over expression rate is much much lower,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00:52:38.800 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.676$ so it's really not a good good

NOTE Confidence: 0.812015182857143

 $00{:}52{:}40.676 \longrightarrow 00{:}52{:}42.190$ the rapeutic target for those tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

 $00:52:44.220 \longrightarrow 00:52:46.712$ I can comment on that in long.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

 $00:52:46.712 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.516$ There's hardly any amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

 $00:52:48.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.560$ There's some mutation for her too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

 $00:52:50.560 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.360$ but hardly any information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

 $00:52:52.360 \longrightarrow 00:52:53.680$ But in Italian that was

00:52:53.680 --> 00:52:54.700 just a terrific lecture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

00:52:54.700 --> 00:52:55.796 Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

00:52:55.796 --> 00:52:56.618 Thank you David,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960545

 $00:52:56.620 \longrightarrow 00:52:58.104$ but I do have a couple questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944742234

 $00.52.58.830 \longrightarrow 00.53.00.050$ The first one is about

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:00.530 \longrightarrow 00:53:02.602$ the more you look, the more you find

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:53:02.602 --> 00:53:05.166 that is that the more specimens that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}05.166 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}07.487$ looked at suggests that there are some

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}07.487 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}09.860$ input of heterogeneity that is and and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:09.860 \longrightarrow 00:53:11.120$ see there's some breast cancer as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:11.120 \longrightarrow 00:53:12.520$ That is that if you look at more,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:12.520 \longrightarrow 00:53:13.820$ there's some some breast cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}13.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}16.328$ Or some one had a genius heterogeneous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:16.330 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.180$ but the question is, does it affect outcome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:18.180 \longrightarrow 00:53:20.895$ That is, have you looked to see if

 $00:53:20.895 \longrightarrow 00:53:23.190$ when you find an increase in 10%

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}23.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}24.900$ because you look at more specimens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.940$ those patients actually respond

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:25.940 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.601$ to trust as a madman? Chemo?

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:27.601 \longrightarrow 00:53:29.767$ Yeah, that's that's one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}29.767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}31.419$ unanswered questions and and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:31.419 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.943$ don't have an answer to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:32.950 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.600$ I all I can say is that it's been looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}35.668 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}53{:}38.314$ at in gastric cancer and apparently not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:53:38.320 --> 00:53:39.130 Too surprisingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}39.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}41.155$ they don't respond that well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:53:41.160 --> 00:53:43.575 If every rate of her two positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:43.580 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.540$ you know if they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:44.540 \longrightarrow 00:53:45.980$ Percent of tumor cells that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:46.034 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.309$ her two positive is lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:47.310 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.062$ On the other hand.

00:53:49.062 --> 00:53:51.955 I'm, I know you're aware there is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}53{:}51.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}54.130$ antibody drug conjugates that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:53:54.130 \longrightarrow 00:53:56.480$ may help overcome this problem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:53:56.480 --> 00:53:58.699 because once you know if you have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:53:58.700 --> 00:54:00.975 let's say a her two positive tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:00.975 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.568$ cell cluster surrounded by all

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:02.568 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.248$ the her two negative tumor cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:04.250 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.452$ but you're able to deliver that

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:06.452 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.553$ chemotherapeutic drug within

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:07.553 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.359$ the within the neighborhood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:54:09.360 --> 00:54:11.584 you know and and just bind to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:11.584 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.784$ receptor on the positive cells and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}54{:}13.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}16.419$ release the drug in the in the vicinity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:54:19.150$ That would also have this by stander.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:54:19.150 --> 00:54:19.964 Chilling effect,

 $00:54:19.964 \longrightarrow 00:54:22.813$ so I think that that is potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:22.813 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.628$ one way to to overcome this problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:25.630 \longrightarrow 00:54:27.535$ For these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90055371466666700:54:27.535 --> 00:54:28.170 yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:28.170 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.778$ and just in follow up related to

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}54{:}29.778 \longrightarrow 00{:}54{:}31.779$ that I was going to ask you about

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:54:31.779 --> 00:54:33.753 in her two or trustees map drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}54{:}33.753 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}36.084$ taken and I I saw that there have

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}54{:}36.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}37.601$ been some beginning trials in

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:37.601 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.323$ and Dmitry AM in Destiny 3,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:39.330 \longrightarrow 00:54:41.229$ which is a breast cancer trial of that drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:41.230 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.790$ For the three plus breast cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:54:42.790 --> 00:54:44.330 just reported on as positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:44.330 \longrightarrow 00:54:47.050$ So some oncologists are saying that now we

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:54:47.050 --> 00:54:48.910 won't need fish anymore because anyone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667 00:54:48.910 --> 00:54:49.445 that's.

00:54:49.445 --> 00:54:51.340 Even plus one positive or

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}54{:}51.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}52.790$ higher will get transcribed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667 00:54:52.790 --> 00:54:53.956 Rusty can, NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:54:53.956 --> 00:54:56.742 and we probably will just test biopsy

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00.54.56.742 --> 00.54.59.234 or some similar tests to have because

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:54:59.234 \longrightarrow 00:55:01.880$ you only need a low level to benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.145$ Are you seeing the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:03.145 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.904$ thing and endometrium?

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:03.910 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.278$ That is where the low levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}55{:}05.278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}06.948$ benefit or did in the trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00.55.06.948 \longrightarrow 00.55.08.123$ have been done so far,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:55:08.130 --> 00:55:10.440 I've only high levels been looked at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667 00:55:10.440 --> 00:55:10.773 Uhm, NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:10.773 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.104$ the that the only trial that so

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:13.104 \longrightarrow 00:55:15.513$ far has been published is the one

00:55:15.513 --> 00:55:18.100 one I showed and I think there

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:18.100 \longrightarrow 00:55:20.608$ is others on ongoing trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:20.608 \longrightarrow 00:55:22.598$ will include and her two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:22.600 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.869$ but I'm not entirely sure what the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00{:}55{:}25.869 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}28.034$ criteria for enrollment will be

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:28.034 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.738$ for those so so there there are no

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:30.826 \longrightarrow 00:55:33.270$ more data on that yet other than

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

00:55:33.270 --> 00:55:35.895 maybe you know some of those basket

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:35.895 \longrightarrow 00:55:38.109$ trials may have included tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900553714666667

 $00:55:38.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:40.600$ That would fit into that category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.770553114444445

 $00:55:41.890 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.651$ So. So I have a question from Mary Robair UM.

NOTE Confidence: 0.770553114444445

 $00:55:47.651 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.656$ You attribute the difference between

NOTE Confidence: 0.770553114444445

 $00:55:50.656 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.264$ biopsy more like positive and resection

NOTE Confidence: 0.7705531144444445

 $00:55:54.264 \longrightarrow 00:55:57.594$ to fixation alone or other factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.770553114444445

00:55:57.594 --> 00:56:01.533 and question number two is does the

NOTE Confidence: 0.770553114444445

 $00:56:01.533 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.263$ internal versus external domain issue

 $00:56:04.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.818$ apply to gastric and breast as well?

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:56:11.909$ First question, yes, that one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:11.909 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.130$ possible explanations is fixation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:14.130 \longrightarrow 00:56:16.776$ as so there would be one argument

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:16.776 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.340$ to to do the testing on the biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:20.340 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.260$ And just like in breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:22.260 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.994$ basically we could start the and

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}56{:}23.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}26.009$ that that's what I started doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}56{:}26.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}28.810$ Starting the testing on the biopsy or

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}56{:}28.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}31.499$ creating and if it's negative then

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:31.499 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.319$ repeat the tests on the hysterectomy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:34.320 \longrightarrow 00:56:35.900$ The other potential explanation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}56{:}35.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}39.373$ in addition to fixation, could be a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}56{:}39.373 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}41.897$ More spatially heterogeneous sampling

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:41.897 \longrightarrow 00:56:44.748$ you know, like unlike breast cancer,

 $00:56:44.748 \longrightarrow 00:56:46.336$ where it's a directive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

00:56:46.340 --> 00:56:48.500 core biopsy or a gastric cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:48.500 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.258$ it's so directed. And the scopic biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

00:56:51.260 --> 00:56:53.696 This is completely like a blinded biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273 00:56:53.700 --> 00:56:54.346 right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:54.346 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.576$ The gynecologist collects tissue from

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:56:57.576 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.867$ all potentially all parts of the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:00.867 \longrightarrow 00:57:03.429$ especially if it's a great time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}57{:}03.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05.782$ It samples the very large areas

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:05.782 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.350$ of the endometrial lining,

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}57{:}07.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}10.430$ as opposed to if I select a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:10.430 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.404$ Block from this wreck to me that

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:12.404 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.411$ that is just that one spot in

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:14.411 \longrightarrow 00:57:17.338$ the on the heaters and exceller

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:17.338 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.080$ versus intracellular domain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

00:57:20.080 --> 00:57:23.834 From what I know, I think it's not that, uh?

 $00:57:23.834 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.578$ There is not such a large discrepancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00{:}57{:}27.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}29.968$ in breast and gastric cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:29.970 \longrightarrow 00:57:33.190$ I think that's a more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:33.190 \dashrightarrow 00:57:36.706$ Specific problem for for endometrial cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:36.710 \longrightarrow 00:57:38.865$ This extracellular domain shedding occurs

NOTE Confidence: 0.873291762727273

 $00:57:38.865 \longrightarrow 00:57:41.020$ more frequently in dimitriou cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64835981875

 $00:57:43.050 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.760$ And there is another question from Uma

NOTE Confidence: 0.64835981875

 $00{:}57{:}46.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}48.757$ Krishnamoorthy. In your experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64835981875

 $00{:}57{:}48.757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}51.202$ what is the approximate percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.64835981875

00:57:51.202 --> 00:57:54.120 of caser with with heterogeneity?

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00:57:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.538$ So in this study that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00:57:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.775$ performed 30% overall.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00:57:59.775 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.610$ And among the positive cases more than 50%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00{:}58{:}05.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}08.210$ Had heterogeneity and since then

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00:58:08.210 \longrightarrow 00:58:11.246$ there there are other studies as

00:58:11.246 --> 00:58:13.686 well that confirmed a similarly

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00:58:13.686 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.698$ high rate of heterogeneity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

00:58:15.700 --> 00:58:18.479 So that's I think in that regard

NOTE Confidence: 0.882768423333333

 $00:58:18.479 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.270$ it's more similar to gastric cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877986928

 $00:58:22.780 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.290$ Then there is another question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.718220555

 $00.58:26.500 \longrightarrow 00.58:30.316$ MH446. It says what percentage of

NOTE Confidence: 0.718220555

 $00:58:30.316 \longrightarrow 00:58:32.860$ endometrial serous carcinomas are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.718220555

 $00.58:32.860 \longrightarrow 00.58:35.810$ I'd seen negative and fish

NOTE Confidence: 0.718220555

 $00:58:35.810 \longrightarrow 00:58:38.610$ positive and what is the mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:58:39.100 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.932$ so that would also be a good question

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:58:41.932 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.937$ and that's that's also one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:58:44.937 \longrightarrow 00:58:46.709$ unanswered questions because based

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:58:46.709 \longrightarrow 00:58:49.356$ on the current algorithm we only do

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00{:}58{:}49.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}52.604$ her two fish on the two plus is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:58:52.604 \longrightarrow 00:58:56.965$ We we don't do her two fish routinely on

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:58:56.965 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.420$ a 0 or one plus and and on A3 plus.

 $00:59:01.420 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.508$ There are a few cases that we we

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:04.510 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.484$ subjected to fish that were part

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:06.484 \longrightarrow 00:59:09.018$ of a study and and we looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

00:59:09.018 --> 00:59:11.570 those and and it it does occur I

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

00:59:11.570 --> 00:59:13.470 I can't remember a percentage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:13.470 \longrightarrow 00:59:15.675$ We didn't test a lot of cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:15.675 \longrightarrow 00:59:19.310$ but once nobody it happens and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:19.310 \longrightarrow 00:59:20.378$ I don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:20.378 \longrightarrow 00:59:22.870$ What the what the potential mechanism you

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:22.939 \longrightarrow 00:59:25.655$ know probably similar to to breast cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

00:59:25.660 --> 00:59:26.899 I mean, I think these are not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

00:59:26.900 --> 00:59:28.960 you know, tumor type specific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:28.960 \longrightarrow 00:59:31.742$ It may be that that they,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

00:59:31.742 --> 00:59:34.298 they they protein is not expressed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667 00:59:34.300 --> 00:59:34.872 you know. NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667 $00:59:34.872 \longrightarrow 00:59:36.588$ But but there is a there

NOTE Confidence: 0.832882843666667

 $00:59:36.588 \longrightarrow 00:59:38.570$ could be still amplification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $00:59:40.640 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.160$ OK, there is another one

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

00:59:43.160 --> 00:59:45.680 from Karen Finberg by fish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $00:59:45.680 \longrightarrow 00:59:49.562$ We assessed the her two gene nor

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $00:59:49.562 \longrightarrow 00:59:53.294$ other nearby gene on chromosome 17.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $00:59:53.300 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.820$ And that's the question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $00:59:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.960$ Is it known?

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

00:59:55.960 --> 01:00:00.314 How much of chromosome 17 maybe Co

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $01:00:00.314 \longrightarrow 01:00:04.340$ amplified with her to a mutual carcinomas?

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $01:00:04.340 \longrightarrow 01:00:07.340$ And could this contribute to

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $01\text{:}00\text{:}07.340 \dashrightarrow 01\text{:}00\text{:}09.622$ tumor aggressiveness and or

NOTE Confidence: 0.804575021

 $01:00:09.622 \longrightarrow 01:00:11.786$ response to targeted therapy?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

01:00:12.560 --> 01:00:14.864 Yeah, I think this has been raised

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:14.864 \longrightarrow 01:00:17.703$ also in breast cancer because there's a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:17.703 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.279$ of other important genes on chromosome 17.

 $01:00:20.280 \longrightarrow 01:00:25.296$ Top 2P53 those all have been implicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:25.296 \longrightarrow 01:00:30.870$ in and cases where there is a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

01:00:30.870 --> 01:00:33.430 Chromosome 17 polysomy or gain

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

01:00:33.430 --> 01:00:35.291 of chromosome 17. Actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

01:00:35.291 --> 01:00:37.859 I'm working on a paper right now on

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01{:}00{:}37.859 \longrightarrow 01{:}00{:}40.618$ her two fish and related to, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:40.618 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.012$ to look at the specific characteristics

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:43.012 \longrightarrow 01:00:45.309$ of her two fish and Co.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:45.310 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.550$ Amplification is not that common.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:47.550 \longrightarrow 01:00:50.440$ We had in our archives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:50.440 \longrightarrow 01:00:54.234$ We found about 15% rate of chromosome

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:00:54.234 \longrightarrow 01:00:57.638$ 17 or polysomy in these tumors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01{:}00{:}57.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}00.115$ or at least the chromosome

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:01:00.115 \longrightarrow 01:01:02.045$ 17 centromeric gain. Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:01:02.045 \longrightarrow 01:01:04.270$ But but clarification is actually

 $01:01:04.270 \longrightarrow 01:01:06.050$ not not that common.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:01:06.050 \longrightarrow 01:01:07.786$ I think we had one case in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88474754826087

 $01:01:07.786 \longrightarrow 01:01:09.309$ which that that was present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

01:01:11.090 --> 01:01:13.856 And then finally, I'll recap where

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:13.856 \longrightarrow 01:01:15.700$ Doctor Morrow's comments Natalia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:15.700 \longrightarrow 01:01:18.070$ Thanks for the terrific review.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:18.070 \longrightarrow 01:01:21.134$ As you know, Yale may have been the

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:21.134 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.214$ situation to have treated a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01{:}01{:}24.214 \longrightarrow 01{:}01{:}27.004$ with Herceptin for endometrial serous

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

01:01:27.004 --> 01:01:29.994 carcinoma Bay and Peter Schwartz.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:29.994 \longrightarrow 01:01:32.855$ Her two positive year 2002

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:32.855 \longrightarrow 01:01:35.030$ bad win never reported it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:35.030 \longrightarrow 01:01:36.542$ Really interesting to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.742643981

 $01:01:36.542 \longrightarrow 01:01:38.054$ how this has evolved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:38.920 \longrightarrow 01:01:43.039$ Yeah, I think. I remember you

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:43.039 \longrightarrow 01:01:44.904$ told me that story before.

01:01:44.910 --> 01:01:47.017 I think this this is one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:47.017 \longrightarrow 01:01:48.574$ the important lessons from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01{:}01{:}48.574 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}51.825$ from this work is that when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:51.825 \longrightarrow 01:01:53.640$ started I was still a resident.

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

01:01:53.640 --> 01:01:55.115 Actually when I started working

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:55.115 \longrightarrow 01:01:57.313$ on this and I just didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:57.313 \longrightarrow 01:01:59.299$ know which direction it will go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:01:59.300 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.908$ It took many many years for this to

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:02:02.908 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.614$ to come to fruition and and it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:02:06.614 \longrightarrow 01:02:09.043$ just really wonderful to see how this

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:02:09.043 \longrightarrow 01:02:11.499$ became a successful treatment option.

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:02:11.500 \longrightarrow 01:02:13.936$ Again, thanks to Doctor 17 and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.302451706666667

 $01:02:13.940 \longrightarrow 01:02:15.509$ They seem so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761569752

 $01:02:17.640 \longrightarrow 01:02:19.020$ OK, it's a long journey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820664886666667

 $01:02:19.640 \longrightarrow 01:02:23.348$ Yeah, excellent so.

 $01:02:23.350 \longrightarrow 01:02:25.090$ We can wrap it up now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820664886666667

01:02:25.090 --> 01:02:26.770 Thank you so much Natalia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820664886666667

01:02:26.770 --> 01:02:29.000 Thank you man by
e bye.