WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:57:19" NOTE recognizability:0.819

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:02.096 Today's grand round speaker

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:00:02.096 --> 00:00:05.860 is Mina Shu or very own Mina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:05.860 \longrightarrow 00:00:08.500$  She needs no introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:00:08.500 --> 00:00:11.960 Actually, Mina has been here longer than I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:00:11.960 --> 00:00:15.212 but I'll introduce Mina for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:15.212 \dashrightarrow 00:00:19.684$  benefit of the new folks Mina grew up

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:19.684 \longrightarrow 00:00:22.972$  in California and came to northeast

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00{:}00{:}22.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.798$  for college at Harvard University,

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:26.800 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.304$  and then she went back for MD at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00{:}00{:}30.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}33.580$  UCSF and she must have missed

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:33.580 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.430$  the seasons and the snow,

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:36.430 \longrightarrow 00:00:39.106$  so she came back to Yale

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:39.106 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.890$  to train in pathology.

00:00:40.890 --> 00:00:42.450 During her training,

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00{:}00{:}42.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.740$  Mina rose to become chief resident and Mina

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:46.740 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.064$  showed an early interest in hematology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.474$  She spent a year doing research

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:00:54.474 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.780$  at Brigham and Women's Hospital.

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:00:58.780 --> 00:01:03.400 During her medical school and then after

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:03.400 --> 00:01:07.348 finishing her pathology residency at Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:07.350 --> 00:01:10.784 she went back to Brigham and Women's

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:10.784 --> 00:01:13.688 Hospital to do a clinical fellowship.

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:13.690 --> 00:01:16.270 And as minard's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:16.270 --> 00:01:19.498 if you logged in earlier you

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

 $00:01:19.498 \longrightarrow 00:01:22.267$  heard me say there was no room

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:22.267 --> 00:01:24.817 to do anything else but clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.694471460454545

00:01:24.817 --> 00:01:27.460 work with voice extremely heavy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:01:29.990 --> 00:01:32.955 Fortuitously, you know was recruited

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:01:32.955 --> 00:01:36.190 right back at faculty position at

00:01:36.190 --> 00:01:39.304 Yale pathology, and we are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:01:39.304 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.809$  lucky to have Meena here with us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:01:42.810 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.625$  Mina has established a track record of

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:01:46.625 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.767$  pursuit of curiosity and excellence in

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:01:49.767 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.221$  all her endeavors and I would say all her

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:01:54.221 --> 00:01:57.407 endeavors because she won many grants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:01:57.410 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.195$  awards and scholarships.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:01:59.195 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.860$  From early age, in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:02:01.860 --> 00:02:04.872 several in high school making it

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00{:}02{:}04.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}08.630$  to Harvard University Dean's list.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:02:08.630 --> 00:02:11.510 At Yale, an outstanding achievement

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:11.510 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.420$  in autopsy or world during residency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00{:}02{:}15.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18.104$  Several Chairmans challenge grant

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:18.104 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.459$  awards and a Gilleard foundation

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:21.459 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.737$  grant that is just to name a few.

00:02:24.740 --> 00:02:28.280 Mina is a consummate clinician and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00{:}02{:}28.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}30.640$  an excellent research collaborator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:30.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.976$  She has close to add publications

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:33.976 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.624$  to her credit. In addition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:02:36.624 --> 00:02:40.033 Mina is an outstanding teacher and mentor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:40.040 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.868$  and that's demonstrated by her various

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:02:43.868 --> 00:02:46.800 speaking engagements all over US,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

00:02:46.800 --> 00:02:48.944 Canada, and also China.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:48.944 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.624$  She has given short courses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:51.630 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.702$  interactive microscopy sessions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00{:}02{:}54.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}58.542$  participated in workshops and symposia

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:02:58.542 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.593$  at annual meetings of the US and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:02.593 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.710$  Canadian Academy of the Theology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:05.710 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.290$  And at other professional organizations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:09.290 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.970$  And her mentees,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00{:}03{:}10.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}13.210$  mostly residents and fellows,

 $00:03:13.210 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.818$  they have successfully presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00{:}03{:}15.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}19.078$  abstracts at national and international

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:19.078 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.211$  meetings and published the manuscripts

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:22.211 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.005$  in impactful journals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:24.010 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.050$  So with no further ado,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636

 $00:03:27.050 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.054$  let me now present her work today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857018006363636 00:03:31.060 --> 00:03:31.560 You know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}03{:}35.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39.488$  Thank you so much mand jou for

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:03:39.488 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.840$  that really amazing introduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:03:41.942 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.787$  that I probably don't deserve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}03{:}44.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}47.318$  but I just wanted to say, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}03{:}47.318 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}49.670$  thank you also for asking me to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}03{:}49.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}52.006$  this talk when you first asked me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:03:52.010 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.649$  I wasn't sure which of the many

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:03:54.649 --> 00:03:56.670 cool stories that were involved

00:03:56.670 --> 00:03:59.484 in in heme path I should present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}03{:}59.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}02.346$  but I quickly decided to do this one

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:02.346 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.480$  because I think you would agree with me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:05.480 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.865$  And and probably malani as

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:07.865 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.773$  the current IHC director.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:09.780 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.628$  That now is a good time to tell

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}04{:}12.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.495$  our trainees and students about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:04:15.495 --> 00:04:18.085 importance of discovering new markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:18.085 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.376$  and that we are not at the end of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:04:21.376 --> 00:04:24.774 IHC era but at the beginning and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:04:24.774 --> 00:04:28.930 will get even better during the next ten,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.780$  20-30 years at investigating protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}04{:}31.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}34.060$  expression in human tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}04{:}34.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}37.350$  And then cancer in particular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:37.350 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.026$  So these are my COI disclosures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:04:40.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.151$  I don't think that any of this

00:04:42.151 --> 00:04:43.860 will impact our talk today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:04:43.860 --> 00:04:45.140 And this is my outline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}04{:}45.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}49.860$  so I wanted to do a case presentation of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:04:49.978 --> 00:04:53.480 patient recently seen this phantom menace,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}04{:}53.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}56.140$  which is our counting of blast and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}04{:}56.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}58.360$  blast equivalents on heme path.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:04:58.360 --> 00:05:01.078 A New Hope or marker for AMOL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}01.078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}03.706$  and then a few other projects

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:03.706 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.740$  I spun off the original one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:06.740 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.120$  And by the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:05:08.120 --> 00:05:11.139 I am not actually a Star Wars geek.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.535$  Some of my friends are and they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}14.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}17.120$  I have thought in their childhood

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:17.120 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.352$  that becoming a Jedi is a legitimate

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:20.352 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.306$  career choice,

 $00:05:21.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.759$  which I think is kind of funny

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:05:22.759 --> 00:05:24.010 because as a pathologist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:24.010 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.028$  sometimes I think we are living

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:05:27.028 --> 00:05:29.570 that dream because we're actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:29.570 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.186$  able to on a daily basis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:32.190 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.675$  force miniscule pieces of tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:05:34.675 --> 00:05:38.505 to tell us their truth and that to

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:38.505 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.417$  me is amazing and quite Jedi like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}41.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}45.038$  So here's my books case presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:05:45.040 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.176$  This is a 58 year old woman with

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}47.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}50.159$ a 2 year history of chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}50.159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}51.345$ myelomonocytic leukemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}51.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54.549$  and I actually saw that initial CML

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}05{:}54.549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}57.104$  diagnosis now with progressive cytopenias

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:05:57.104 --> 00:06:00.404 bone pain and circulating glass and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:00.404 \dashrightarrow 00:06:03.790$  she is admitted for the symptoms.

 $00:06:03.790 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.198$  So her peripheral blood showed 8% blasts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}06{:}07.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}11.988$  These are mono blastic cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:11.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.850$  She also had degranulate poesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:06:14.850 --> 00:06:16.995 So dysplasia of the granulocyte

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:16.995 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.711$  lineage with abnormal folding

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:18.711 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.433$  of the granulocytes and in other

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:21.433 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.765$  areas hypo granularity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}06{:}22.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}25.360$  She also had a monocytosis as is

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}06{:}25.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}27.728$  normally seen for her blood smear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}06{:}27.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}29.998$  These delicately folding cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:29.998 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.266$  with Gray blue cytoplasm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:32.270 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.890$  These are mature monos.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:06:33.890 --> 00:06:35.915 They proceeded to do a

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:35.915 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.840$  bone marrow aspiration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:37.840 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.460$  but it was a dry tap,

 $00:06:39.460 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.208$  most likely because of the fibrosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:42.208 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.040$  in the core biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:44.040 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.496$  This was the core biopsy in which you

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:06:46.496 --> 00:06:49.444 see it is hypercellular for her age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:49.444 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.349$  there is dysplasia in the megakaryocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:06:52.350 --> 00:06:55.381 You can also see a myeloid predominance

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:55.381 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.578$  with hardly any erythroid islands here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:06:58.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.500$  But at least there is maturation in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}07{:}01.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}03.873$  form of metamyelocytes granulocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:07:03.873 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.711$  So actually if you compare to

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:07:06.711 --> 00:07:09.319 her initial bone marrow biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00{:}07{:}09.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}11.185$  this area looks very similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:07:11.185 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.677$  to the initial one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

 $00:07:12.680 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.360$  but a little more hypercellular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:07:15.360 --> 00:07:15.841 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857488426

00:07:15.841 --> 00:07:18.727 about 30% of the bone marrow

 $00:07:18.727 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.170$  actually showed these

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:20.251 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.799$  foci of immaturity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:21.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.481$  So here I say immaturity because the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

00:07:24.481 --> 00:07:27.180 cells have more dispersed chromatin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:27.180 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.632$  some distinct nucleoli.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

00:07:28.632 --> 00:07:31.052 And you're having a lack

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:31.052 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.869$  of the mature granulocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:33.870 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.370$  so this is very worrisome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:35.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.890$  especially in this clinical context

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00{:}07{:}38.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}41.706$  of transformation into AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

00:07:41.710 --> 00:07:45.066 So can we treat this patient as AML now?

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:45.070 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.500$  Well, the definition of AML is

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00{:}07{:}47.500 --> 00{:}07{:}49.908$  20% loss in blood or bone marrow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:49.910 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.800$  So how can we reach that with

NOTE Confidence: 0.880798311538462

 $00:07:51.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.370$  our without our gold standard

 $00:07:53.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.770$  of the aspirin count?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00{:}07{:}56.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}59.460$  If the AML expressed our most

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

00:07:59.460 --> 00:08:01.750 utilized immunostain which is CD 34,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:01.750 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.550$  we could demonstrate that on core biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:04.550 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.070$  but without that marker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

00:08:06.070 --> 00:08:08.894 It would be very difficult to substantiate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:08.894 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.726$  the cytologic blast count on core,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.620$  and this was actually negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:13.620 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.990$  as we knew from before.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.640$  So just taking a step back and L is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00{:}08{:}19.716 \to 00{:}08{:}22.800$  genetically heterogeneous myeloid neoplasm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:22.800 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.452$  and while the FAAB classification is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:25.452 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.879$  not employed in clinical use now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:27.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.974$  it is still the most adherent to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:30.974 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.300$  myeloid differentiation status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:32.300 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.452$  so you'll see that it still comes into

 $00{:}08{:}34.452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}36.519$  play in current research studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00{:}08{:}36.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}38.823$  The overall poor 5 year old survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

 $00:08:38.823 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.173$  for AML as well as the relapse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8497792575

00:08:41.173 --> 00:08:43.740 rate continue to be a huge problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:08:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.868$  You can see that some improvements

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:08:47.868 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.302$  have been made in the last couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:08:50.302 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.830$  of decades as seen here in Black is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:08:53.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.260$  2000 to 2006 and yellow is until

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:08:57.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.396$  2011 and blue is the most current.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:09:00.400 \dashrightarrow 00:09:02.352$  This is from a Danish study that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

00:09:02.352 --> 00:09:04.260 using because it's one of the most recent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:09:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.300$  but those published from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:09:06.300 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.932$  US show similar statistics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:09:07.940 \dashrightarrow 00:09:10.109$  You can see that there is still a long

NOTE Confidence: 0.9457947

 $00:09:10.109 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.592$  way to go for patients over the age of 60.

 $00:09:15.510 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.634$  In broad strokes, some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

 $00{:}09{:}17.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}19.742$  major AML subtypes are classified

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

00:09:19.742 --> 00:09:22.222 according to cytogenetic findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

 $00:09:22.222 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.702$  that include balanced translocations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

 $00:09:24.710 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.612$  Molecular findings also

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

 $00:09:26.612 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.148$  help in risk stratification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

 $00:09:29.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.173$  Older age remains one of the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.870314763684211

00:09:31.173 --> 00:09:33.048 major risk factors for poor outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:36.100 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.305$  The foundation of treatment for

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:09:38.305 --> 00:09:40.510 new AML is induction chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}09{:}40.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}42.820$  followed by either consolidation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:42.820 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.200$  chemo or consideration toward

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}09{:}45.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}47.580$  allogeneic stem cell transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.704$  Newer therapeutic options include

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:49.704 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.620$  small molecule inhibitors, and in 2018,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:52.620 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.820$  BCL 2 inhibitor venetoclax was

 $00:09:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.058$  approved as a combo regimen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:57.060 \longrightarrow 00:09:58.816$  typically with hypomethylating agents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:09:58.816 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.450$  such as a deciding that does

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:10:01.523 --> 00:10:04.079 show great effect in older AML

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:04.079 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.783$  patients though durable remission.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:05.790 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.250$  Is still difficult to obtain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:09.250 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.200$  So going back to our case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:11.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.120$  the problem is whether we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}10{:}13.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}14.855$  diagnose AML in this particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}10{:}14.855 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}17.195$  biopsy where you have some areas

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:10:17.195 --> 00:10:19.010 of maturation and some not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:19.010 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.694$  and a absent aspirate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}10{:}21.694 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}10{:}25.830$  not just bad as pirate and just to show you

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:25.830 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.947$  in cases where you do get a good asper smear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:28.950 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.110$  This is the gold standard.

 $00{:}10{:}30.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}32.378$  The gold standard is counting of 500

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}10{:}32.378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}34.780$  cells in each patient to enumerate

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:10:34.780 --> 00:10:37.050 not just myeloblasts and monoblast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:37.050 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.409$  but in the case of monocytic leukemias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:10:39.410 --> 00:10:40.312 Pro monocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:40.312 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.567$  which are considered blast equivalents

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:42.567 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.760$  but not to include mature monocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:45.760 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.621$  So in this study in which they had 14

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:10:49.621 --> 00:10:51.320 hematopathologist do consensus counting

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:51.320 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.200$  of a number of cases on blood and aspirate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:55.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.416$  These two are mono blasts so clearly blasts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:10:59.420 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.616$  This one is the pro monocyte.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:11:01.620 --> 00:11:04.536 So just a step towards maturation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:11:04.540 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.820$  but still a blast equivalent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:11:06.820 --> 00:11:09.688 And here is a mature monocyte.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:11:09.690 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.712$  And of course they use the

 $00:11:11.712 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.723$  best picture presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00{:}11{:}12.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}15.110$  This is in a peripheral blood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:11:15.110 --> 00:11:17.688 just to make the situation worse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:11:17.690 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.850$  CML is further stratified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

 $00:11:19.850 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.709$  So this is the chronic counterpart to AML

NOTE Confidence: 0.862296337142857

00:11:23.710 --> 00:11:26.209 is stratified further by this last county.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:28.770 \longrightarrow 00:11:31.392$  And concordance can be very difficult

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}11{:}31.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}34.288$  to achieve even among these expert

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:11:34.288 --> 00:11:36.436 hematopathologist only getting 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:36.436 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.006$  consensus at 74% which just to be clear,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:11:40.010 --> 00:11:42.560 I don't think is good concordance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:11:42.560 --> 00:11:45.194 When you're trying to get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}11{:}45.194 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47.390$  patient into chemo for AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:47.390 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.016$  So the challenge is that even

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:49.016 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.650$  in the best possible scenario,

 $00:11:50.650 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.234$  like an excellent aspirant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:11:52.234 --> 00:11:55.215 the counting of Mono City lost equivalents

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:55.215 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.890$  is riddled with reliability issues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:57.890 \longrightarrow 00:11:59.260$  good as spirits are harder

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:11:59.260 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.630$  and harder to come by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.336$  This is something that when I

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:03.336 --> 00:12:05.655 talk to senior hematologist they

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:05.655 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.585$  really feel in their bones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:07.585 --> 00:12:09.749 it has become like a lost art,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:09.750 --> 00:12:11.598 very difficult to get good aspirates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}12{:}11.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}14.507$  I'm on service this week and Cohen and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:14.507 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.487$  were guessing that about three of our 20.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:17.490 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.110$  Last day or so we're good aspirates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:22.110 \longrightarrow 00:12:23.825$  Some of it is due to treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:23.830 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.490$  The newer treatments can lead to fibrosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:26.490 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.906$  There are procedural issues.

00:12:28.906 --> 00:12:32.030 There's going towards IR which may not be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556 $00:12:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.824$  You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.863308785555556

 $00:12:32.824 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.603$  as invested in looking at the aspirates

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:35.603 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.284$  later and there is no reliable

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:38.284 --> 00:12:40.489 monoblast marker on biopsy material.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:40.490 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.162$  So just to keep in mind that aspirate

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:43.162 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.298$  where that material comes from is

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:45.298 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.740$  the same tube that the flow and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:47.740 --> 00:12:49.168 Heterogenetic S are deriving

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}12{:}49.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}51.685$  their specimen from so it kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:51.685 --> 00:12:53.245 hurts us on multiple levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:12:53.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.038$  but the core biopsy remains good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}12{:}55.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}56.979$  The core biopsy is still coming from

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:56.979 --> 00:12:59.204 that same jump shooting needle and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:12:59.204 --> 00:13:01.774 it can add additional information

 $00:13:01.774 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.262$  beyond the aspirate in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}13{:}05.262 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}07.269$  architecture and localization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:07.270 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.677$  This is what I like to call

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:08.677 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.010$  the tree of myeloid life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:10.010 \longrightarrow 00:13:12.584$  So we start here with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:13:12.584 --> 00:13:14.883 hematopoietic stem cell going towards

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:14.883 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.373$  myeloid progenitors that then go

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:17.373 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.050$  toward GMP becoming granulocytes

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:20.050 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.250$  or monos and dendritic cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:13:24.250 --> 00:13:26.470 So just in case you're wondering

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}13{:}26.470 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}13{:}28.570$  about mono markers in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:28.570 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.405$  we do have a lot of sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00{:}13{:}31.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}34.152$  A lot of immunostains and flow

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:34.152 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.920$  markers like these that will mark.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:36.920 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.636$  All of these mono lineage cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.650$  but they do not differentiate

00:13:44.650 --> 00:13:47.058 between blast versus mature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:47.060 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.276$  On the other hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

00:13:48.276 --> 00:13:50.904 CD 34 is a great marker for glass

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:50.904 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.714$  that are positive for it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:52.720 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.499$  so the granular acidic glass are positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:55.499 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.558$  for CD34 whereas the granulocytes are not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86330878555556

 $00:13:58.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.248$  So what we're looking for is something here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9566488

 $00:14:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:14:08.398$  OK. Is there something with the sound

NOTE Confidence: 0.78706251

 $00:14:08.920 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.468$  ohh you're good now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:10.640 --> 00:14:15.288 OK? So we went on the hunt for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:15.290 --> 00:14:18.315 A phenotype. That is strongly

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:18.315 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.340$  strongly expressed by mono precursors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00{:}14{:}21.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}24.118$  but not expressed in later stages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00{:}14{:}24.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}26.878$  and in this older study using human

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:26.878 --> 00:14:29.258 umbilical cord blood and bone marrow,

 $00:14:29.260 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.390$  they were able to fractionate

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.894$  GMP into four subpopulations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:34.900 --> 00:14:37.984 Human common monocyte progenitors are one

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:37.984 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.546$  of the subpopulations here that do not

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:41.546 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.926$  show any potential for differentiating

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:43.926 --> 00:14:46.318 into myeloid or lymphoid cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:46.320 \longrightarrow 00:14:47.562$  and according to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:47.562 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.046$  Gene expression profiling I of eight

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:50.046 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.725$  here seems to show the features that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:52.725 --> 00:14:55.599 we're looking for in terms of being

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:14:55.599 --> 00:14:57.834 expressed in early mono progenitors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:14:57.840 \longrightarrow 00:15:00.558$  but not in their later stages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:00.560 \longrightarrow 00:15:03.720$  We also considered an R481,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00{:}15{:}03.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06.594$  but didn't have as much supporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:06.594 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.510$  data in the literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:15:08.510 --> 00:15:10.496 Fire Eight was also a great

 $00:15:10.496 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.770$  candidate for us because there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:12.770 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.530$  a commercially available antibody

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:14.530 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.290$  for purchase and testing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:15:16.290 --> 00:15:18.355 Some of you might say to yourself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:18.360 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.896$  wait, I just heard about IRV for some

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:15:21.896 --> 00:15:24.782 reason and you did last week when

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:15:24.782 --> 00:15:26.842 we had Lee Grimes from Cincinnati.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

00:15:26.842 --> 00:15:29.693 Come and talk to us about his work

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00{:}15{:}29.693 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}31.397$  in severe congenital neutropenia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00{:}15{:}31.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}34.600$  He actually used IRF 8 in his recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:34.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.652$  studies as a negative control in

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:37.652 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.140$  the balance between granulocyte

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:40.140 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.006$  and monocyte differentiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:42.010 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.202$  If I that paper actually came out later

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:44.202 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.547$  than when we proceeded down this pathway.

00:15:46.550 --> 00:15:48.512 But if we had seen it at that time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00{:}15{:}48.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}50.736$  I think it would have given us further

NOTE Confidence: 0.93971398375

 $00:15:50.736 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.420$  support to pursue this marker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}15{:}54.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}57.646$  So RV is a master transcriptional

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:15:57.646 --> 00:15:59.430 regulator of monocyte development,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:15:59.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.395$  and it regulates monocyte differentiation

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:01.395 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.107$  genes that we know about is strongly

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:16:04.107 --> 00:16:05.807 induced by interferon gamma in

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}16{:}05.807 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}16{:}08.073$  the setting of infection and its

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:08.073 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.048$  first expressed after that comment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}16{:}10.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}12.118$  Granulocyte monocyte progenitor stage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:12.118 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.691$  Its expression is maintained at much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:16:15.691 --> 00:16:18.463 levels in monos Max and dendritic cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:18.470 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.434$  but not in neutrophils.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:16:20.434 --> 00:16:22.889 It promotes apoptosis via activation

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:22.889 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.338$  of facts and repression of.

 $00:16:25.340 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.550$  CL2 and ECL Excel and loss of IRA in mice

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}16{:}28.637 {\: -->\:} 00{:}16{:}31.619$  leads to an expansion of granulocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:31.620 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.760$  decreased monos,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:32.760 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.545$  decreased's and a CML like picture and

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:36.545 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.100$  in fact overexpression of IR of eight

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:16:39.100 --> 00:16:41.859 inhibits BCR 8 ball driven leukemogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:16:41.860 --> 00:16:44.165 It's transcripts are greatly reduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:44.165 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.532$  and CML patients and it's so far acts

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}16{:}47.532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}50.200$  as a tumor suppressor in mouse a PML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:50.200 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.671$  So you might wonder what prompted me

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:52.671 \longrightarrow 00:16:55.618$  to look at this marker in an acute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:16:55.620 \dashrightarrow 00:16:59.679$  Leukemia and I have to say at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}16{:}59.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}01.376$  I just really want to test it out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:01.380 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.136$  Given the earlier gene expression data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:05.140 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.164$  even though there was not much known

00:17:08.164 --> 00:17:11.380 about it acting as an oncogene in AML,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:11.380 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.200$  and in fact it was the reverse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.438$  but later studies did show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:15.438 \longrightarrow 00:17:17.520$  it was a good hunch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.913$  So we started doing this validation

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:20.913 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.078$  on a cornucopia of tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.450$  This is susmit adapala who actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.436$  had done Hurricane Path Fellowship

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:28.436 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.124$  before she came to Yale to be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:31.124 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.237$  research fellow with us for a year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:17:33.240 --> 00:17:36.360 and she is now a hematopathologist at LJ,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:36.360 \longrightarrow 00:17:37.503$  so she did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:37.503 \longrightarrow 00:17:39.789$  The scouring of literature for this

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}17{:}39.789 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}42.123$  gene expression profile and helped

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:42.123 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.937$  me get started on this validation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.460$  You can see that our of eight.

 $00:17:47.460 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.693$  Does in fact stain B cells in

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:49.693 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.457$  follicles in their mantle zone

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}17{:}51.457 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}53.307$  and in the germinal center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:53.310 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.478$  This is myeloid sarcoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:55.478 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.885$  In soft tissue it stains the tumor cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:17:59.885 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.840$  and it is negative in this carcinoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:18:03.840 --> 00:18:06.143 but you can see in the background

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}06.143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}08.389$  stroma here that there are granular

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}08.389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}10.759$  sites and there are histiocytes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}10.759 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}13.135$  those did not stand for our marker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:18:13.140 --> 00:18:16.173 So then I went ahead and pulled some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}16.173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}18.778$  our decalcified core bone marrow because

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}18.778 \longrightarrow 00{:}18{:}22.778$  we want to use this on decal cified tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:22.780 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.999$  This is what we get most often

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:24.999 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.703$  and here the blast counting is by

 $00:18:27.703 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.793$  the aspirate or gold standard.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}29.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}32.236$  So here is an initial diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:18:32.240 --> 00:18:34.440 Am OL monocytic leukemia at

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:34.440 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.103$  more than 90% blast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:18:36.103 --> 00:18:38.161 Here is a normal staging bone

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:18:38.161 --> 00:18:39.966 marrow for Hodgkin lymphoma that

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}39.966 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.480$  was not involved and a residual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}43.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}46.567$  Disease or residual for AML at 10%

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}18{:}46.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}48.936$  loss in the aspirate and here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:18:48.936 --> 00:18:50.788 1 at morphologic remission defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:50.788 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.950$  by less than 5% less.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:53.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.530$  So then we pulled our whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:56.530 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.650$  cohort of 90 am OL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:18:58.650 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.350$  That included remission residual somewhere

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:01.350 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.552$  in between and also a smaller cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:05.552 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.368$  of chronic myelomonocytic leukemia.

 $00:19:08.370 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.714$  Other AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00{:}19{:}09.714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}14.782$  So ammo's not monocytic and normal for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:14.782 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.706$  normal control bone marrows we enriched.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:17.706 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.702$  For the ones that had monocytosis in

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:20.702 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.806$  the peripheral blood from 10 to 30%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:23.810 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.620$  And you can see that. This.

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

 $00:19:29.620 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.168$  The different diagnosis they

NOTE Confidence: 0.739135859

00:19:31.168 --> 00:19:32.716 actually had the CBC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698511955

00:19:32.720 --> 00:19:34.552 a presentation, treatment protocols

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698511955

 $00{:}19{:}34.552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}36.842$  and outcomes that were compatible

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698511955

 $00:19:36.842 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.093$  with what you would expect to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698511955

 $00:19:39.093 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.823$  find for each disease category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

 $00{:}19{:}43.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}47.114$  The NGS showed that the tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

00:19:47.114 --> 00:19:49.490 had typical molecular features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

 $00:19:49.490 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.090$  about half the leukemias had NPM 1 mutations

 $00:19:53.090 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.236$  and close to a third had FLIT 3 ITD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

 $00:19:56.240 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.658$  You can also see that for

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

00:19:58.658 --> 00:19:59.867 the monocytic leukemias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

 $00:19:59.870 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.600$  whether they're chronic or acute,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

00:20:02.600 --> 00:20:04.826 that they were enriched for SRSF,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

 $00:20:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:20:06.330$  2 pathogenic variants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.840351166

 $00:20:06.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.400$  and of course, tattoo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:11.140 --> 00:20:12.898 Two practicing hematopathologist counted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00{:}20{:}12.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}16.300$  the stain on core biopsies and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:16.367 --> 00:20:19.069 are plotted here for each biopsy with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:19.069 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.759$  correlation to their aspirate blast counts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:21.760 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.287$  Sam Katz really gets all the credit

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:24.287 --> 00:20:26.566 here for prompting me to do this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:26.566 --> 00:20:28.308 project in the 1st place because

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:28.308 --> 00:20:30.932 if you don't know him well by now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:30.940 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.898$  he is a very eloquent complainer.

00:20:33.900 --> 00:20:36.780 And so while some people might just say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:36.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.996$  oh, I don't like to count 500 cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:38.996 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.040$  or this aspirin is really bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.176$  He really hones down on the problem here

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:45.176 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.956$  and compelled me to go upon this search.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:49.960 --> 00:20:53.101 So as you might know about what they say

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:20:53.101 --> 00:20:55.960 about good deeds not going unpunished,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:55.960 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.976$  he had to be roped into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:57.976 \longrightarrow 00:20:58.840$  validation as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:20:58.840 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.300$  So this was done independently

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:21:01.300 --> 00:21:03.760 with disregard for their diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:03.760 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.149$  and we achieved a pretty good correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00{:}21{:}08.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11.230$  This was the diagnostic test

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:11.230 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.116$  characteristics using a spera count

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:21:13.116 --> 00:21:15.648 as the surrogate for disease status,

 $00{:}21{:}15.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}18.772$  so AML being 20% plus or higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00{:}21{:}18.772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}21.540$ residual disease being 5% plus or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:21.540 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.080$  higher and negative or residual being

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00{:}21{:}25.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29.710$  less than 5% as compared to IR 8 IHC

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:29.710 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.910$  result due to a reviewer question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:32.910 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.143$  We actually went back and did the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:21:35.143 --> 00:21:37.733 same with CD 34 because we actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

00:21:37.733 --> 00:21:40.067 didn't know how well we're doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:40.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.396$  CD34,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:40.396 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.352$  as opposed to our aspirate blast

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00{:}21{:}42.352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}44.118$  count in the granulocytic leukemia

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:44.118 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.624$  and we did not actually get to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:46.624 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.910$  the same good correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:47.910 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.110$  It was still good,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.082$  but it was not quite at .8

NOTE Confidence: 0.8664532

 $00:21:51.082 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.194$  which we had for IR 8.

00:21:55.750 --> 00:21:59.026 And this is the correlation for CML,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:21:59.030 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.480$  which is not as strong.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:00.480 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.190$  But we also had a smaller cohort for CML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.710$  One of the reasons that CML cases might

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

00:22:07.802 --> 00:22:10.806 be especially difficult I believe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:10.806 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.150$  is that occasionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:12.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:15.474$  as with our first case that I showed there

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00{:}22{:}15.474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.022$  is focal elevation of glass which may

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

00:22:18.022 --> 00:22:21.310 not be well represented on aspirin smear,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:21.310 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.590$  because, as you might know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

00:22:23.590 --> 00:22:25.846 for aspirus you're really kind of sucking it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:25.850 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.080$  Thought from one specific point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00{:}22{:}28.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}30.078$  So here is an interesting biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00{:}22{:}30.080 \to 00{:}22{:}32.420$  We had a few years ago where you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:32.420 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.244$  see even on low power that this corner

 $00:22:35.244 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.360$  here looks different from this part.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00{:}22{:}37.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39.817$  So most of the bone marrow showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.316$  as in the upper part maturing

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:42.316 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.980$  trilineage amount of polices.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:43.980 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.900$  Some increase in boss because

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.820$  this person also had CML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:47.820 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.830$  That was a little bit elevated

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

00:22:49.830 --> 00:22:51.679 like CML one or CM L2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:51.680 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.242$  but then the lower right hand corner

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:54.242 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.490$  actually had a sheet of glass.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00{:}22{:}56.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}58.590$  As represented in E here and when

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00:22:58.590 \longrightarrow 00:23:01.377$  we did our of eight you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

 $00{:}23{:}01.377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}03.187$  how dramatic this transition is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734265515714286

00:23:03.190 --> 00:23:05.866 Almost like a solid tumor malignancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:08.960 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.756$  I also get asked whether the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:11.756 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.154$  macrophages are positive,

 $00:23:13.160 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.788$  and I think not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:14.788 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.970$  This is a AML that is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:17.970 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.095$  monocytic with a federal flage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:23:21.100 --> 00:23:23.206 Here this is a monocytic leukemia

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:23.206 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.343$  at initial diagnosis and this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:25.343 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.341$  one of our staging bone marrow

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:23:27.341 --> 00:23:29.183 biopsies showing a Cidra page here

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}23{:}29.183 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}33.260$  and they were negative for a marker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:33.260 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.440$  There were discrepancies in

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:23:35.440 --> 00:23:37.075 assessing residual disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:23:37.080 --> 00:23:40.804 so 10 cases showed a discrepancy defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}23{:}40.804 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}44.360$  at where a spirate had less than 5% loss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}23{:}44.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}46.360$  But IRA expression was

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:46.360 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.860$  just a little above 5%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:48.860 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.434$  so three of these actually had

 $00:23:51.434 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.752$  definitive evidence of disease by

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}23{:}53.752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}55.852$  cytogenetics as unbalanced translocations

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:23:55.852 --> 00:23:59.520 flit 3 ITD or MPM 1 mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:23:59.520 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.385$  and three have clinical relapse

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:01.385 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.790$  within two months of the biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}24{:}03.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}05.566$  So I just want to point out here

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:05.566 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.995$  that our whole correlation our

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:06.995 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.849$  ground truth in this study has

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}24{:}08.849 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}10.570$  been the aspirate blast count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:10.570 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.530$  But that as we know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}24{:}12.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}14.786$  as pathologist is just another sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.390$  It's a different sample from the core biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:17.390 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.826$  So what is really the truth?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}24{:}19.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.906$  Maybe it is the clinical behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:24:21.910 --> 00:24:24.164 Maybe it is genetics or molecular and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:24.164 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.755$  and I think that that correlation comes

 $00:24:26.755 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.009$  into play when we're looking at a new marker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:24:30.010 --> 00:24:31.880 One had flow elevation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:31.880 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.376$  human tacones above 10%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:33.380 \longrightarrow 00:24:35.440$  Which pumped in me to go on a search for

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:35.497 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.814$  all the biopsies that had increased humidity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:24:37.820 --> 00:24:39.548 Phones, hard to find,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:39.548 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.276$  but they're they are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:24:41.280 --> 00:24:42.465 IRA dusting hematogenous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:42.465 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.835$  so that could be a pitfall.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:44.840 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.934$  In the rare case where you had

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:47.934 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.598$  really significant elevation by

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:49.598 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.272$  flow and then we had two remaining

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}24{:}52.272 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54.160$  discrepancies of overcount by IR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}24{:}54.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}56.440$  RF eight as compared to a spirate

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:24:56.440 \longrightarrow 00:24:58.780$  at a low percentage blast,

 $00:24:58.780 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.132$  one did show RA expression that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}25{:}01.132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}03.490$  lower than the aspire blast count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:03.490 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.041$  But upon evaluation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:05.041 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.109$  the core biopsy showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:07.109 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.660$  substantial aspiration artifact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:08.660 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.610$  so perhaps it should have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:10.610 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.350$  excluded in the first place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:12.350 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.810$  So, excluding the above cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:13.810 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.420$  where disease was still present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:25:15.420 --> 00:25:18.698 the overall discrepancy was 3% with

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:18.698 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.938$  regard to residual disease assessment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:21.940 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.044$  So in conclusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:23.044 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.090$  in Almal there is high correlation of IRV

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:26.090 \longrightarrow 00:25:28.496$  positive cells to aspirate last count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:25:28.500 --> 00:25:31.507 The comparison of IRV staining to

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:31.507 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.109$  blast count and see mammal also

00:25:33.109 --> 00:25:34.880 showed a pretty good correlation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}25{:}34.880 \to 00{:}25{:}37.958$  though that requires more study and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}25{:}37.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}40.606$  in contrast reactive monocytosis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:40.606 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.658$  AML without monocytic differentiation

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:42.658 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.550$  did not show IRA elevation when it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.455$  used to categorize cases as acute leukemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:49.460 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.890$  positive or residual leukemia or negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:25:51.890 --> 00:25:53.186 Sensitivity and specificity

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:53.186 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.210$  was high and this marker can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}25{:}56.284 \to 00{:}25{:}59.092$  clinically useful as IHC to possibly

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:25:59.092 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.964$  diagnose and track disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:00.970 \longrightarrow 00:26:03.785$  Particularly in cases of poor

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}26{:}03.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06.600$  as piration or focal blast increase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:06.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.050$  So shortly after this manuscript

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:26:09.050 --> 00:26:11.010 was accepted for publication,

00:26:11.010 --> 00:26:12.888 actually a great study came out

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:12.888 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.570$  in molecular cell that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:14.570 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.054$  really helped me understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:16.054 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.909$  what we were seeing better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:17.910 \longrightarrow 00:26:19.878$  This is a summary of transcription

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:26:19.878 --> 00:26:20.862 factor domain focus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}26{:}20.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}23.545$  CRISPER screens genes were ranked

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}26{:}23.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26{:}220$  by AML biased essentiality scores

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00{:}26{:}26.301 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}28.576$  defined by the difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:26:28.576 --> 00:26:30.851 a particular domain score in

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:30.934 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.328$  AML versus non AML cell lines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

00:26:33.330 --> 00:26:34.842 And I should point out that

NOTE Confidence: 0.912389138888889

 $00:26:34.842 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.850$  in the cell lines

NOTE Confidence: 0.8651197875

 $00:26:35.908 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.812$  that showed. Particularly high IRF

NOTE Confidence: 0.8651197875

00:26:38.812 --> 00:26:41.725 8 dependency, those were monocytic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8651197875

 $00{:}26{:}41.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44.575$  leukemias, and the others are not.

 $00:26:47.630 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.155$  Umm? Competition based proliferation

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:26:51.155 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.180$  assays performed in Castine positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:26:54.180 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.027$  cell lines show that AML cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

00:26:57.027 --> 00:26:59.367 that were transduced with IRF 8

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:26:59.449 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.014$  guided RNA were rapidly depleted

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:27:02.014 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.579$  and outcompeted by parental cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

00:27:04.580 --> 00:27:08.820 In separate studies showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:27:08.820 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.316$  173 AML patient samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:27:10.316 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.664$  High R of eight expression was seen in

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00:27:13.664 \longrightarrow 00:27:15.732$  association with diverse cytogenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

00:27:15.732 --> 00:27:17.800 and molecular driver mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00{:}27{:}17.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}20.452$  so there's genetic and molecular features

NOTE Confidence: 0.05407837

 $00{:}27{:}20.452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23.250$  actually did not define this behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:27.520 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.410$  They also found that RFA is

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:29.410 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.339$  enriched at the MEF 2D locus.

 $00:27:31.340 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.550$  That is another transcription factor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00{:}27{:}33.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38.118$  and it is known to be important in

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

00:27:38.118 --> 00:27:40.648 some Bal in several cell lines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:40.648 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.036$  such as month 13,

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.798$  which is a monocytic cell line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:43.800 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.380$  RNA seek of gene expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:45.380 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.076$  Changes indicate that cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

 $00:27:47.076 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.772$  lines transduced with guided

NOTE Confidence: 0.7621785233333333

00:27:48.772 --> 00:27:52.145 RNA to IF8 revealed MEF 2D to

NOTE Confidence: 0.762178523333333

00:27:52.145 --> 00:27:53.660 be significantly downregulated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:27:56.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.610$  So transcription factors are

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:27:58.610 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.870$  difficult to the apeutically target,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00{:}28{:}00.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}03.210$  so they looked for a chromatin

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00{:}28{:}03.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}05.212$  regulator upstream that would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:05.212 \longrightarrow 00:28:07.062$  more druggable in a separate crisper

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

00:28:07.062 --> 00:28:08.452 dropout screen that was focused

 $00:28:08.452 \longrightarrow 00:28:10.230$  on chromatin regulatory domains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

00:28:10.230 --> 00:28:13.966 They uncover CMU and eight as AML specific,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00{:}28{:}13.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}16.834$  and here you can see that in certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:16.834 \longrightarrow 00:28:19.618$  cell lines they are hypersensitive to

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

00:28:19.618 --> 00:28:22.203 depletion of this chromatin reader,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:22.210 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.020$  and others are less so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.358$  The ones that are non AML are

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:27.358 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.497$  insensitive to it and by the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00{:}28{:}29.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}31.220$  cmda is ubiquitously expressed

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:31.220 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.940$  in all cell lines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:32.940 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.662$  so it was not because of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.85399628875

 $00:28:34.662 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.328$  much the YD ate there was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

 $00{:}28{:}39.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41.015$  They further found that all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

00:28:41.015 --> 00:28:43.806 AML cell lines are IR 8 high are

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

 $00:28:43.806 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.982$  hypersensitive to depletion of CMY D8

 $00:28:46.982 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.510$  and loss of CMD 8 resulted in decrease

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

 $00{:}28{:}49.586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}51.890$  in ire of eight as well as Mick

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

00:28:51.890 --> 00:28:55.130 over time and an increase in Miller

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

 $00:28:55.130 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.684$  differentiation associated genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

 $00:28:56.690 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.795$  Genetic depletion CMND in normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

00:28:58.795 -> 00:29:00.479 hematopoietic stem cells did

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

 $00:29:00.479 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.389$  not impact cells in vitro.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49053782

00:29:02.390 --> 00:29:05.180 So just what you want for a druggable target.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}09.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}11.418$  Altogether and with other data that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

00:29:11.418 --> 00:29:13.030 not presenting in the interest of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}13.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}15.970$  they show that IR 8 helps form

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:15.970 \longrightarrow 00:29:17.848$  a transcriptional circuit to

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

00:29:17.848 --> 00:29:19.477 support AML proliferation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:19.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.735$  They also showed that a targetable chromatin

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:22.735 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.069$  reader CMI and eight regulates IRF 8

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:26.069 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.859$  by lineage specific enhancers in AML.

 $00:29:28.860 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.764$  So at this point we were quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}30.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}32.759$  convinced that I of eight might

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:32.759 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.614$  serve as a transcriptional addiction

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

00:29:34.614 --> 00:29:36.000 in monocytic leukemias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}36.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}38.817$  and we were curious as to how else we

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:38.817 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.969$  can use this in daily clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:41.970 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.214$  What I'm presenting here is work

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

00:29:44.214 --> 00:29:45.710 done by Dan Mcquade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:45.710 \longrightarrow 00:29:48.069$  who is the 2nd year Yale MD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}48.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}50.690$  PhD candidate who really learned

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:50.690 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.786$  all of heme path.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:29:52.790 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.798$  It seems within a year and this was

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}56.798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}59.908$  just published a couple months ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}29{:}59.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}02.922$  We showed that RF-8 specifically stains

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:02.922 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.470$  moneyglass and these extramedullary tumors,

 $00:30:05.470 \longrightarrow 00:30:08.190$  so this is a myeloid sarcoma in a lymph node.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}30{:}08.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}09.406$  Follicles are still intact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:09.406 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.640$  but you just can see the blast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:11.640 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.080$  In the uh, Paracortical area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:14.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.192$  some of the blocks are more towards medullary

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

00:30:17.192 --> 00:30:20.349 area and they were actually MPO positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714 00:30:20.350 --> 00:30:21.173 Seen here, NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:21.173 \dashrightarrow 00:30:24.717$  but the areas of the boss without MPO

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}30{:}24.717 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}27.059$  positivity were expressing IRF 8,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:27.060 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.550$  so this is in tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}30{:}28.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}31.490$  This is a little dimmer in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:31.490 \longrightarrow 00:30:34.660$  mantle zone and when we plotted the

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00{:}30{:}34.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}37.396$  relative expression of CD 34 MPO

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:37.396 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.918$  and RF-8 for all of these cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862529079285714

 $00:30:39.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.440$  you see an almost inverse relationship.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:30:44.880 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.152$  Another recent I think that we did was

00:30:50.152 --> 00:30:53.926 looking at BPDCN, so BPDCN is another

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:30:53.926 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.128$  extramedullary hematopoietic tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:30:56.130 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.415$  It's often difficult to diagnose

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:30:58.415 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.202$  as it presents first in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

00:31:01.202 --> 00:31:04.114 skin or soft tissue and the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

00:31:04.114 --> 00:31:06.680 helpful marker to date is CD 123,

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:31:06.680 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.170$  which is also a druggable target.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:31:09.170 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.880$  This can be very dimly staining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:31:10.880 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.385$  This is not just in our lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:31:12.390 \dashrightarrow 00:31:15.758$  it's universally known that city 123

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:31:15.758 \longrightarrow 00:31:18.194$  can be somewhat dim in this tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

00:31:18.200 --> 00:31:20.818 That really, really relies on the marker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00{:}31{:}20.820 --> 00{:}31{:}22.930$  so we look to see if IRF 8 can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00{:}31{:}23.002 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}25.438$  helpful in these instances and it was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38732213

 $00:31:25.440 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.750$  This was done in collaboration with Doctor

 $00:31:27.750 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.990$  Gallery Pansy from Dermatopathology here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

00:31:33.640 --> 00:31:35.176 Doctor Jacqueline Pinkus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:35.176 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.004$  who was the health director at

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:38.004 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.259$  Brigham when I was training.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:40.260 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.089$  She is just a guru in immunohistochemistry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:44.090 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.475$  I think she actually discovered

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:45.475 \longrightarrow 00:31:46.583$  how disdain for Kappa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:46.590 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.558$  Lambda and tissue back in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00{:}31{:}48.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}50.938$  day and when she saw our paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:50.940 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.775$  she immediately started doing some

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:52.775 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.590$  double stains and this is leukemia cutis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:55.590 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.500$  Double stain with RV in

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:57.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.410$  brown and lysozyme in red.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:31:59.410 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.410$  So as you might remember,

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:00.410 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.638$  lysozyme stains all of the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:03.638 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.580$  maturation stages of monos and histocytes.

 $00:32:06.580 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.950$  And you can see it staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:08.950 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.379$  the history of site.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:10.380 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.082$  Like Sweets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:11.082 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.539$  but there are eight is not staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:13.539 \dashrightarrow 00:32:15.648$  because there are no glass in here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:15.650 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.142$  Other potentially helpful double

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:18.142 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.710$  stains are CD34 with RF-8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:20.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.411$  I think in terms of what if we

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:24.411 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.483$  have a Milo monocytic leukemia and

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00{:}32{:}27.483 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}29.854$  I think Doctor Pinkus is already

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:29.854 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.870$  doing the double stain with City

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

 $00:32:31.870 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.187$  123 to kind of take out the

NOTE Confidence: 0.702619746

00:32:34.187 --> 00:32:36.260 dendritic cells in a bone marrow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:32:38.290 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.006$  We also looked at the TCG,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

00:32:40.010 --> 00:32:42.964 a pattern of expression for IRF 8.

 $00:32:42.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.190$  The red block boxes are tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:32:45.190 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.726$  The Gray is normal, and you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

00:32:47.726 --> 00:32:51.218 for AML and DLBCL you have this very

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

00:32:51.218 --> 00:32:53.074 dramatic difference in expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:32:53.080 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.850$  whereas in the other cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:32:54.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.638$  not as much in the ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:32:56.638 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.554$  here like this is, I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:32:58.554 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.726$  stomach and testicular germ cell tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00{:}33{:}00.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}02.571$  We're kind of curious as to whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:02.571 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.548$  it really did show that difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:04.550 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.567$  We had a tissue microarray composed of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:07.570 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.736$  All these different types of carcinomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:09.736 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.795$  and it really did not stain for any of

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:12.795 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.298$  them except for one lymphoma that snuck in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

00:33:15.300 --> 00:33:17.466 This was actually diagnosed by Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

00:33:17.466 --> 00:33:19.978 Jose Costa really back in the day

 $00:33:19.978 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.982$  where it was called malignant lymphoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00{:}33{:}21.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}24.620$  So of course that prompted me to do a CD

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:24.686 \longrightarrow 00:33:27.580$  20 just to make sure it was in fact a DLBCL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:27.580 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.218$  So for the rest of the tumors you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

00:33:29.218 --> 00:33:30.920 see here that there is some staining,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:30.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.558$  but that is not in tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876580608333333

 $00:33:32.560 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.010$  so that may explain the TCGA data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:33:37.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:39.622$  We also looked at the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:33:39.622 --> 00:33:41.410 differential diagnosis in soft tissue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:33:41.410 \longrightarrow 00:33:43.685$  which is actual sarcomas as

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:33:43.685 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.505$  opposed to myeloid sarcomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:33:45.510 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.598$  so this is done in collaboration

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:33:47.598 --> 00:33:48.990 with Doctor William Wong,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00{:}33{:}48.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}51.678$  who had been a mentor of Doctor Gary

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:33:51.678 --> 00:33:53.787 Pansies when she was in training,

 $00:33:53.790 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.150$  and you can see that for the sarcomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:33:56.150 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.480$  including the ones that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:33:57.480 \longrightarrow 00:33:58.810$  small round blue cell tumors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:33:58.810 --> 00:34:01.696 They're negative for higher of eight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:01.700 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.372$  So so far we've been talking about all

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:04.372 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.978$  the myeloid and monocytic differentials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:06.980 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.440$  What about the lymphoid?

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:08.440 \longrightarrow 00:34:11.500$  Because we know it also stains for B cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:11.500 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.675$  Well, here is another common

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:13.675 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.415$  problem in hematopathology classic

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:15.415 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.261$  country and lymphoma versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:34:17.261 --> 00:34:19.049 anaplastic large cell lymphoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:19.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.442$  and these have overlapping

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:21.442 \longrightarrow 00:34:22.638$  morphologic features.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:22.640 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.052$  They also have overlapping

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:25.052 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.258$  immunophenotypic features,

 $00:34:26.260 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.260$  and we sometimes have to rely only on PAX 5,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:30.260 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.812$  which is not always.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:31.812 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.752$  Positive and classic caution lymphomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:33.752 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.289$  and can also be amplified in some alcl's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:36.289 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.367$  So we took 74 cases of Hodgkin and 15 cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:39.367 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.450$  of ALK negative LCL to see how they would do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:42.450 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.345$  Obviously all positive ACL we

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00{:}34{:}44.345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}46.670$  would not have a problem with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00{:}34{:}46.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}48.605$  And you can see here that even in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00{:}34{:}48.605 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.548$  PAX five negative Hodgkin lymphomas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.930$  you can have dim staining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182 00:34:51.930 --> 00:34:52.980 For IRF 8,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00{:}34{:}52.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55.430$  we shouldn't be using this in isolation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182 00:34:55.430 --> 00:34:56.078 of course, NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:34:56.078 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.022$  but in the context of the

 $00:34:58.022 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.629$  morphology and other markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:34:59.630 --> 00:35:02.360 I think it can be helpful since

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.490$  it is dead negative in all ACL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:35:07.656$  And this is the kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:35:07.656 --> 00:35:09.890 composite of cases are pacified,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:35:09.890 --> 00:35:12.130 negative I of eight positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:35:12.130 --> 00:35:14.050 some of course are double negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:14.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.073$  and here we really have to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:35:16.073 --> 00:35:18.279 at all the different stains and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:18.279 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.389$  other features that we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00{:}35{:}20.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22.588$  This was also a first author paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:35:22.588 --> 00:35:25.307 for Dan who just got this accepted

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:25.307 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.432$  for publication couple weeks ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:27.440 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.604$  So in conclusion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:28.604 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.320$  IFA can be used to detect extramedullary

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

00:35:31.396 --> 00:35:33.340 hematopoietic tumors as well.

 $00:35:33.340 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.028$  That can be a diagnostic challenge

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:36.028 \dashrightarrow 00:35:39.062$  such as leukemia cutis myeloid sarcomas

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:39.062 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.004$  BPDCN its expression is essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:41.004 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.050$  absent in all other solid tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:43.107 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.321$  malignancies that can present as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:45.321 \longrightarrow 00:35:47.171$  differential diagnosis here and as

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:47.171 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.761$  a transcription factor that's also

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:48.761 \dashrightarrow 00:35:50.818$  important in B cell lineage commitment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:50.818 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.541$  It can show some promise in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:53.541 \longrightarrow 00:35:55.789$  detection between Hodgkin versus ALCL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870332921818182

 $00:35:55.790 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.968$  which is a real clinical dilemma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858756120714286

 $00:36:00.560 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.755$  Our findings were just recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.858756120714286

 $00{:}36{:}02.755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05.493$  replicated by a couple labs in

NOTE Confidence: 0.858756120714286

00:36:05.493 --> 00:36:07.916 Switzerland and Italy, showing that yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858756120714286

00:36:07.916 --> 00:36:09.968 it is a reliable monoblast marker,

 $00:36:09.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.946$  but they also show it staining BPDCN well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.662321272

00:36:15.920 --> 00:36:19.317 And thanks to Anoj Verma, our resident here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.662321272

 $00{:}36{:}19.317 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22.250$  this has been reviewed in the context

NOTE Confidence: 0.662321272

 $00:36:22.331 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.987$  of other emerging immunohistochemical

NOTE Confidence: 0.662321272

 $00:36:24.987 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.643$  biomarkers for myeloid neoplasms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:29.770 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.270$  So what about our case?

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:31.270 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.810$  Or a patient with CML?

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

00:36:32.810 --> 00:36:34.868 How do I diagnose this as our

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00{:}36{:}34.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}36.511$  final diagnosis after showing this

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:36.511 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.593$  case around to multiple other heme

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

00:36:38.593 --> 00:36:40.574 path faculty members was myeloid

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00{:}36{:}40.574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}42.624$  neoplasm with increased blasts most

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:42.624 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.773$  compatible with progression to AML?

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:44.773 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.860$  And our patient was started on treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.928$  with PIXIUS which is a liposomal 7 + 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00{:}36{:}51.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}54.110$  It's Donna Robinson was cytarabine

 $00:36:54.110 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.854$  with a consideration toward

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:55.854 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.548$  associated Gene and venetoclax.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:36:57.550 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.756$  She would have gotten that instead if.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:37:00.760 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.284$  The age was older and she

NOTE Confidence: 0.893188766

 $00:37:02.284 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.300$  didn't have the symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

 $00:37:05.470 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.950$  So here is our case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

00:37:06.950 --> 00:37:09.630 When I went back to stain it with our eight,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

 $00:37:09.630 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.429$  you can see that in fact the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

 $00:37:11.429 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.044$  areas where we suspected increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

00:37:13.044 --> 00:37:15.411 loss there was increase in RF-8

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

 $00:37:15.411 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.817$  and in the areas of maturing

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

00:37:17.817 --> 00:37:19.650 Trilineage Marquis there was not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

 $00{:}37{:}19.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}21.939$  so this certainly made me feel better

NOTE Confidence: 0.91975849

 $00:37:21.939 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.180$  about calling her as evolution to AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:26.270 \longrightarrow 00:37:28.926$  Another recent study also showed I of a

 $00:37:28.926 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.107$  as an AML specific susceptibility gene.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:37:32.110 --> 00:37:34.860 So here using publicly available

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:34.860 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.919$  databases they show that these red dots

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:38.919 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.222$  representing genes that were essential

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:41.222 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.208$  to AML but not in non AML cell lines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:37:45.210 --> 00:37:47.821 And here what I really want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:47.821 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.569$  highlight is that IFA expression is

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:50.569 \longrightarrow 00:37:53.480$  also correlated with poor prognosis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:53.480 \longrightarrow 00:37:56.120$  I think for those of us who remember.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:56.120 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.170$  The FAB classification and little

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:37:58.170 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.220$  period of time after that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:38:00.220 --> 00:38:03.160 many times when we first diagnosed AML,

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:38:03.160 --> 00:38:04.816 clinicians will come down and say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:04.820 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.024$  but is it monocytic?

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:38:06.024 --> 00:38:07.830 Does it look monocytic to you?

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00{:}38{:}07.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}09.675$  Because then I will consider

 $00:38:09.675 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.520$  this as a worse prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:38:11.520 --> 00:38:13.732 And here we have if we consider

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:13.732 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.380$  RFA to be a marker of mono bus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:16.380 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.220$  some substantiation of that suspicion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:19.220 \dashrightarrow 00:38:20.954$  We're no longer asked that because

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:20.954 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.942$  there's more of a focus right

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:22.942 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.862$  now on exactly what mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:24.862 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.014$  and genetic translocations?

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857 00:38:26.020 --> 00:38:26.824 They have, NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00{:}38{:}26.824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}29.638$  but I think that that older clinician

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

00:38:29.638 --> 00:38:31.788 perspective of when we say monocytic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00:38:31.790 \longrightarrow 00:38:33.570$  it's usually worse for them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.692884770142857

 $00{:}38{:}33.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}35.430$  Still holds true in some way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00{:}38{:}37.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}40.652$  This also made me think of a prior

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:38:40.652 --> 00:38:42.699 observation made a couple years ago,

 $00:38:42.700 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.285$  which I think is experientially

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00{:}38{:}45.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}47.499$  many hematopathologist feel that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:38:47.499 --> 00:38:49.542 have seen certain very prominent

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:38:49.542 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.128$  instances of which is monoblast elk

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:38:52.128 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.500$  growth after venetoclax treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:38:54.500 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.223$  So in this study they also segregated

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:38:57.223 \longrightarrow 00:38:59.342$  their patients based on fab

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:38:59.342 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.994$  classification and found that only the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:01.994 \dashrightarrow 00:39:03.773$  monocytic classifier was predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:39:03.773 --> 00:39:06.233 of refractory response to Aza Ven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571 00:39:06.240 --> 00:39:07.170 So here. NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:07.170 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.960$  This is a non monocytic leukemia

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.218$  and this is a monocytic leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:39:13.220 --> 00:39:16.237 They talk primary human AML cells from

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:39:16.237 --> 00:39:19.135 both what they term primitive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:19.135 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.165$  AMOLED and in vitro demonstrated lower

00:39:22.165 --> 00:39:25.586 kill with both phonetic clocks and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:39:25.586 --> 00:39:29.330 combo phonetic clocks with acidity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00{:}39{:}29.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}31.843$  They also showed this in a violin

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

00:39:31.843 --> 00:39:34.016 plot how monocytic disease arising

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:34.016 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.571$  after treatment can be derived

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:36.571 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.104$  from preexisting subclones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915611486428571

 $00:39:38.110 \longrightarrow 00:39:40.210$  In this other patient at relapse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}39{:}42.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}45.235$  So our future directions include

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}39{:}45.235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}48.050$  something Poe hands working on with

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:39:48.050 \dashrightarrow 00:39:50.360$  flow cytometric detection of R8

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:39:50.360 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.650$  and refining that monoblast gate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:39:52.650 --> 00:39:55.728 Doing that in collaboration with OHSU,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}39{:}55.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}57.378$ a multi institutional validation

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:39:57.378 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.390$  using AI tools that suit your parent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:00.390 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.333$  Cherry is leading and I got a lot of

 $00:40:03.333 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.863$  helpful consultation from Doctor David Rim

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:05.863 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.107$  and this is being done in collaboration

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:40:09.107 --> 00:40:12.690 with MGH BWH Upenn, New Mexico.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:12.690 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.024$  OHSU Cornell and Stanford and there

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:40:15.024 --> 00:40:18.193 is a focus in this group on wanting

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:18.193 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.076$  to further look at CML and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:21.076 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.621$  whole subclassification of CML which

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:23.621 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.779$  is a bit controversial in The Who.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}40{:}26.779 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}28.644$  Whether this marker can help

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:28.644 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.180$  us hone it down a little more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}40{:}31.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}33.788$  And I do hope to identify IRF 8

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:33.788 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.564$  target genes in actual am OL samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:36.564 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.604$  and in primary human monoblast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:40:38.610 --> 00:40:40.780 And since I have a regulates BCL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:40.780 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.720$  two family members maybe 1 pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}40{:}43.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}47.690$  Of venetoclax resistance in AML.

00:40:47.690 --> 00:40:50.336 So thank you very much for

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:50.336 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.630$  your attention and your time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:40:52.630 --> 00:40:55.486 Thank you so much for the many people

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:40:55.486 --> 00:40:57.762 who contributed and really helped

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:40:57.762 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.630$  move this forward to our external

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:41:00.707 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.907$  collaborators for the project that

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:41:02.907 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.048$  our that is ongoing and to our

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}41{:}06.048 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}41{:}08.640$  colleagues in derm path soft tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:41:08.640 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.037$  path pathology tissue services this

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00{:}41{:}11.037 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.600$  could not have been done without Amos

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

00:41:14.690 --> 00:41:17.786 and Laurie and are flow hematology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:41:17.786 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.060$  And biostats colleagues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742571882857143

 $00:41:20.060 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.008$  Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945264442

 $00:41:30.230 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.485$  We are open for questions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.945264442

 $00:41:33.485 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.660$  was excellent by the way.

00:41:35.660 --> 00:41:38.900 From a non humanoid pathologist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945264442

 $00:41:38.900 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.510$  I thought the story is riveting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98421958

00:41:43.070 --> 00:41:43.680 Thank you. NOTE Confidence: 0.864354593333333 00:41:45.240 --> 00:41:45.618 May I ask NOTE Confidence: 0.766595401166667

 $00:41:45.630 \longrightarrow 00:41:47.400$  a question Mina that was fantastic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

00:41:47.670 --> 00:41:50.901 lot of work and you know you have carried

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

00:41:50.901 --> 00:41:53.080 through something that you found and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

00:41:53.080 --> 00:41:55.418 it is now evolving into something far

NOTE Confidence: 0.8378819861111111

00:41:55.418 --> 00:41:57.350 bigger than you may have imagined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:41:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.136$  Initially from the stain that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8378819861111111

 $00{:}42{:}01.136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}04.598$  showed you in the recent case of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:04.598 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.934$  case that you're diagnosed with acute

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:07.934 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.690$  or progression to acute leukemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8378819861111111

 $00:42:11.690 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.570$  It looks like the staining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:15.570 \longrightarrow 00:42:18.470$  Is was probably more than 20% and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:18.470 \longrightarrow 00:42:20.076$  there is a graduation of stating

 $00{:}42{:}20.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}22.074$  there are many nuclei which are

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00{:}42{:}22.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}26.890$  dimmer in their expression of if it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:26.890 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.054$  Do you think as the last mature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:30.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.190$  the expression level slowly decreases?

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

 $00:42:32.190 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.010$  Is not an all in non phenomena and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

00:42:35.010 --> 00:42:37.185 second question is this is a surface

NOTE Confidence: 0.837881986111111

00:42:37.185 --> 00:42:40.620 you know marker in some ways right so?

NOTE Confidence: 0.854028683333333

00:42:41.650 --> 00:42:43.168 It's a it's a nuclear marker

NOTE Confidence: 0.617058726

 $00:42:43.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.060$  nuclear marker, so is it? So can

NOTE Confidence: 0.858715913

 $00:42:46.070 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.275$  it be targeted for the rapies

NOTE Confidence: 0.858715913

00:42:47.275 --> 00:42:48.480 in some ways or no?

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00:42:50.920 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.560$  OK, so great questions Dan Pat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00{:}42{:}53.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}55.852$  I think for the first one

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00:42:55.852 \longrightarrow 00:42:58.099$  you know in terms of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00:42:58.100 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.680$  Some lighter or some darker that is

 $00:43:01.680 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.070$  very important and I think that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00:43:05.070 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.218$  In the validation, what was helpful

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00{:}43{:}07.218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}09.369$  was its correlation with last count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00{:}43{:}09.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}12.037$  So we were counting all the ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

00:43:12.037 --> 00:43:15.093 that had any staining and you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.72757639

 $00:43:15.093 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.379$  obviously this is going to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:43:19.810 --> 00:43:21.150 You know, if you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:21.150 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.160$  Had a stronger dilution you might

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:43:23.231 --> 00:43:25.007 be seeing more of the background

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:25.007 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.309$  if you had a lesser dilution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00{:}43{:}27.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}31.014$  So what we titrated to was that point

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:31.014 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.602$  at which we were seeing a percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:34.602 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.058$  blast that were reflective of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:43:38.058 --> 00:43:40.369 actual morphologic blast count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:40.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.388$  So it is interesting in that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:43:44.388 --> 00:43:45.740 lot of hematopathologist ask,

00:43:45.740 --> 00:43:47.966 well, does it stain Pro monocytes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:47.970 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.616$  and it's such a good question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00{:}43{:}50.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}52.964$  I don't know how to answer it because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:52.970 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.255$  Homicide is a cytologic definition

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:55.255 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.455$  when we see it in the aspirate

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:43:58.455 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.171$  and there is no great marker that

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:01.171 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.313$  just gets at the Pomona sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:44:03.320 --> 00:44:05.152 So I wish that I could just stay

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:44:05.152 --> 00:44:07.464 in and aspirate that had a ton of

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:07.464 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.900$  promyelocytes and see if it did pick them up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:09.900 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.852$  The only consoling part of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:12.852 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.559$  whole dimmer staining is that what

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00{:}44{:}15.559 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}44{:}18.293$  we got it to is in correlation

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:18.293 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.217$  with that gold standard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:20.220 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.100$  so we are counting them and I do think that.

00:44:23.100 --> 00:44:26.406 At some point it is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:44:26.406 --> 00:44:28.610 see able by light microscopy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:44:28.610 --> 00:44:33.538 but is probably still baseline there by RNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364 00:44:33.540 --> 00:44:33.850 right? NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:33.850 \longrightarrow 00:44:36.020$  Like if you look at the really

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00{:}44{:}36.020 {\: --> \:} 00{:}44{:}37.900$  mature macrophage you can see in

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

 $00:44:37.900 \longrightarrow 00:44:39.395$  the gene expression profiles that

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:44:39.395 --> 00:44:41.110 they do have some expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851914538636364

00:44:41.110 --> 00:44:43.540 but we're not seeing it by by our IHC now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.669145725

00:44:45.090 --> 00:44:47.940 That particular case, if you use that state,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82695271

00:44:47.940 --> 00:44:49.977 your counts for the blast would have

NOTE Confidence: 0.82695271

 $00:44:49.977 \longrightarrow 00:44:51.590$  been much higher than 30%. Then

NOTE Confidence: 0.874354805

 $00:44:52.290 \longrightarrow 00:44:53.850$  is that right? Or I'm just?

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:44:54.020 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.934$  Yeah, I think what I showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:44:55.934 \longrightarrow 00:44:58.050$  you though was one foci right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:44:58.050 \longrightarrow 00:45:00.338$  One area where it seemed a little higher,

 $00:45:00.340 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.690$  but then just in practice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.377$  and I'm not sure this is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:04.377 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.998$  right thing to do in practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:06.000 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.562$  By consensus we we typically have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:08.562 \longrightarrow 00:45:11.350$  do it through the whole entire core.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:11.350 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.348$  Yeah, and in terms of whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

00:45:13.348 --> 00:45:14.347 it's therapeutically targetable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:14.350 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.440$  you know it may be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:15.440 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.302$  but it is a transcription factor and it is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

00:45:18.310 --> 00:45:20.065 you know, also important in

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00{:}45{:}20.065 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}21.469$ B cell lineage development,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:21.470 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.325$  so I think it would be hard

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

00:45:23.325 --> 00:45:25.750 to just try to focus on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

00:45:25.750 --> 00:45:28.599 You could end up causing a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.816597968333333

 $00:45:28.599 \longrightarrow 00:45:29.820$  of the problems.

00:45:29.820 --> 00:45:32.187 David, I think you were next with the hand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00{:}45{:}33.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}34.743$  Yeah, that my question is similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

00:45:34.743 --> 00:45:36.680 Dan Potts in a little bit in a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:36.680 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.163$  ways I see that you're progressing

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:38.163 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.793$  toward a multi institutional study

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:39.793 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.749$  which will be really interesting to

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:41.749 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.445$  see if this can be carried out by

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:44.445 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.305$  many pathologists at many places,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:46.310 \longrightarrow 00:45:48.431$  but it worries me that the intensity

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:48.431 \longrightarrow 00:45:50.495$  at which excel becomes a positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00{:}45{:}50.495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}52.310$  cell because someone were pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:52.310 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.792$  light and some of them are pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00{:}45{:}54.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}56.896$  dark and that probably represents a

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:45:56.896 \longrightarrow 00:45:58.926$  difference in RF-8 expression levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

00:45:58.930 --> 00:46:00.386 Do you have any way to standardize that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00:46:00.390 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.217$  Or how are you going to check that the

 $00:46:02.217 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.616$  results here at Yale are the same?

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

 $00{:}46{:}03.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}04.970$  As your other institutions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.784033972666667

00:46:04.970 --> 00:46:05.780 you're collaborating with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

00:46:06.560 --> 00:46:08.546 yeah, that's that's a great question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:08.550 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.708$  and we are. You know, as you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:12.708 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.270$  we're trying to do this with some

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:15.351 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.357$  quantitative imaging analysis to see out

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

00:46:18.357 --> 00:46:21.851 what cutoff point does it actually show.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:21.851 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.037$  Kind of a consensus with regard

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:25.037 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.260$  to not just the diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.186$  but a consensus across all 7 institutions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

00:46:33.186 --> 00:46:35.515 And you know, I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00{:}46{:}35.515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}37.635$  I think that this is I wish we

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:37.635 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.048$  had done this earlier with CD 34.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:40.050 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.838$  In fact, because all these labs.

00:46:41.840 --> 00:46:44.465 Doing CD 34 and using that day-to-day

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

00:46:44.465 --> 00:46:47.542 to tell you whether the AML still there

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:47.542 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.757$  but we don't know how compatible we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00{:}46{:}50.757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}53.416$  with each other and whether you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:46:53.416 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.510$  if we did some quantitative imaging

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00{:}46{:}55.577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}57.671$  whether it would actually bring us

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00{:}46{:}57.671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00.431$  to a better consensus and tell us the

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:47:00.431 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.793$  truth that we're not reporting right now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

00:47:02.793 --> 00:47:04.858 So I and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:47:04.860 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.296$  nobody really wants to do the bus

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00{:}47{:}07.296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}08.510$  quantification themselves by I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:47:08.510 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.830$  so I think it's it's really moving us

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:47:10.830 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.916$  forward to a point where we can be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82646443

 $00:47:12.920 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.860$  More standardized across the board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:14.970 \longrightarrow 00:47:16.330$  Yeah, I'm not worried about

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00{:}47{:}16.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}18.338$  standardized accounting as much as I am

00:47:18.338 --> 00:47:19.538 standardizing the biochemistry part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:19.540 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.745$  that is the tighter and the stain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

00:47:21.750 --> 00:47:22.860 That is, how do you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:22.860 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.688$  if it's if it's too light,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:24.688 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.476$  then whether you count it by

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:26.476 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.628$  eye or by an imaging system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:28.630 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.550$  it will just not be counted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:30.550 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.542$  and that's what I would guess that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:32.542 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.943$  will be some institutions that will be

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:34.943 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.788$  lighter than other institutions overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.358$  and then that could throw off the result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:40.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.620$  Absolutely yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

00:47:41.620 --> 00:47:42.302 Transit control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00{:}47{:}42.302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}44.007$  like you know with estrogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.806298309375

 $00:47:44.007 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.790$  receptor we have intrinsic the

 $00:47:45.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.545$  ducts inside the normal breast

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:47:48.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.720$  and we absolutely have

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:47:49.720 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.740$  those internal controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:47:50.740 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.560$  That's the good thing with him is

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

00:47:52.560 --> 00:47:54.018 we almost always have internal

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00{:}47{:}54.018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}55.578$  control because there's so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00{:}47{:}55.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}57.349$  other cells in the background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:47:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:48:00.260$  So we're using B cells as the

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:00.260 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.360$  control and also dendritic cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.448$  So I've actually seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00{:}48{:}05.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}07.278$  brighams immunostain for it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

00:48:07.278 --> 00:48:10.840 which you're using on the Ventana I believe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:10.840 \longrightarrow 00:48:15.780$  And also cornells and also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:15.780 \longrightarrow 00:48:20.060$  OHSU UM and then of course the

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

00:48:20.060 --> 00:48:22.987 two international groups so so far,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:22.990 \longrightarrow 00:48:26.002$  seven groups in the US large

00:48:26.002 --> 00:48:28.919 academic centers have brought it on

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

00:48:28.919 --> 00:48:31.361 board for optimization and I have

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:31.361 \longrightarrow 00:48:34.149$  not yet seen one that was very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

00:48:34.149 --> 00:48:35.785 you know, significantly different

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:35.785 \longrightarrow 00:48:38.360$  in terms of staining a tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:38.360 \longrightarrow 00:48:40.580$  They've also sent me their tissues

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:40.580 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.624$  to stain to compare side by

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:42.624 \longrightarrow 00:48:44.580$  side so that has been helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:44.580 \longrightarrow 00:48:47.004$  It takes a lot of work to see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:47.010 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.218$  Whether that question and

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:48.218 \longrightarrow 00:48:49.426$  that answer holds out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286

 $00:48:49.430 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.210$  though it's a great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768800545714286 00:48:52.210 --> 00:48:52.820 Amarie NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:48:54.080 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.992$  thank you, just a superb talk and

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:48:56.992 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.996$  such an elegant presentation of your

 $00:48:59.996 \longrightarrow 00:49:03.332$  thought process and the steps through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00{:}49{:}03.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}06.960$  And so I congratulate you as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:06.960 --> 00:49:08.600 busy surgical pathologist for

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:08.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.697$  thinking for the thought process

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:10.697 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.019$  and for getting this work done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:13.020 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.121$  So many congratulations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00{:}49{:}14.121 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}17.168$  I I'm I think a lot about inflammation

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00{:}49{:}17.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}19.947$  these days and I notice that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:19.947 --> 00:49:22.169 don't know anything about RF 8

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:22.169 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.600$  except I do notice that it is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:24.600 --> 00:49:26.200 Important in battling infection

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:26.200 --> 00:49:29.034 and that if you if you're deficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:29.034 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.058$  in IRF 8 you have a severe primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:32.134 --> 00:49:34.806 immunodeficiency and that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:34.806 --> 00:49:37.521 also now in GW studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:37.521 \longrightarrow 00:49:41.028$  they find variance of IRA or a

00:49:41.028 --> 00:49:44.280 significant risk for autoimmune diseases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:44.280 --> 00:49:46.086 and I just wondered if you had

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:46.086 --> 00:49:47.520 any any thoughts about that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:47.520 --> 00:49:49.956 Does that manifest at all in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

00:49:49.956 --> 00:49:51.860 world and pathology and and I'm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:51.860 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.738$  I'm wondering if we can use

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:53.738 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.990$  this antibody as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.193$  As we think about these autoimmune

NOTE Confidence: 0.868036462105263

 $00:49:58.193 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.159$  inflammatory conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:01.290 \longrightarrow 00:50:04.466$  Yeah, I that is such a fantastic question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

00:50:04.470 --> 00:50:07.830 I really don't know that much about its

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:07.830 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.554$  role in autoimmunity except to say that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00{:}50{:}11.554 \to 00{:}50{:}15.828$  know if you take out the monocytic lineage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:15.830 \longrightarrow 00:50:18.576$  there will be kind of hell to pay, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:18.576 \longrightarrow 00:50:21.200$  So I think that it it absolutely plays

 $00:50:21.278 \longrightarrow 00:50:23.948$  an important role when it's functional.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:23.950 \longrightarrow 00:50:26.603$  When it's doing its normal job in

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:26.603 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.168$  terms of infection and inflammation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:29.170 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.766$  So we cannot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

00:50:30.766 --> 00:50:33.958 Completely take it out of function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:33.960 \longrightarrow 00:50:39.198$  but only in when it is upregulated in tumor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:39.200 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.540$  And I think that's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:40.540 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.609$  Also is confusing to me and I think something

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00{:}50{:}43.609 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}46.543$  that I really want to work on is why in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:46.618 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.976$  its normal function it is proapoptotic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

00:50:48.976 --> 00:50:50.688 But then in tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00{:}50{:}50.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}52.795$  obviously they are continuing to

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:52.795 \longrightarrow 00:50:57.120$  proliferate and live on, so it must be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

00:50:57.120 --> 00:50:59.689 Maybe it's binding differently in some way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:50:59.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:01.910$  When it's tumor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:01.910 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.928$  you know there there have been

 $00{:}51{:}04.928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}07.398$  studies showing its deficiency and

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00{:}51{:}07.398 \to 00{:}51{:}09.107$  DLBCL that I have to read more about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:09.110 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.074$  but you know it has manifested

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

00:51:12.074 --> 00:51:14.050 different kinds of phenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00{:}51{:}14.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}16.100$  whether it's tumor versus normal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:16.100 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.494$  So I hope that others will be

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:18.494 \longrightarrow 00:51:20.562$  interested in working on this because

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:20.562 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.816$  I cannot do all of the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:22.889 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.569$  types of studies and IRA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:24.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:27.188$  I think it's just really cool and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:27.190 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.690$  Complicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81544541125

 $00:51:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.180$  Won't you?

NOTE Confidence: 0.957642576666667

 $00:51:31.850 \longrightarrow 00:51:35.126$  I've got two questions. One is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.957642576666667

 $00:51:35.130 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.210$  do you think that bone marrow aspirates

NOTE Confidence: 0.957642576666667

 $00:51:38.210 \longrightarrow 00:51:41.140$  are going to fall out of favor?

 $00:51:45.330 \longrightarrow 00:51:48.210$  So, so I don't think so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00{:}51{:}48.210 \longrightarrow 00{:}51{:}50.676$  I you know it's hard for them to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:51:50.676 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.282$  a good aspirate, but a good aspirate

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:51:53.282 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.490$  is just worth its weight in gold.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:51:55.490 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.905$  It is so important to get that

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:51:57.905 \longrightarrow 00:52:00.650$  fluid sample that we can use for

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:00.650 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.690$  cytogenetics and molecular and flow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.322$  I don't think it would ever

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:04.322 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.830$  really fall out of favor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:05.830 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.954$  I do think that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:06.954 \dashrightarrow 00:52:09.342$  We need a better way to obtain it

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:09.342 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.283$  because it is not just like at Yale or

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:12.283 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.677$  you know this clinic or that clinic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:14.680 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.518$  When I've talked to other institutions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:21.426$  this is a major problem in the US and

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:21.426 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.856$  folks coming from outside of the US

 $00:52:24.856 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.076$  hematologist trained at other countries

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:27.076 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.575$  usually have been really trained at

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00{:}52{:}29.575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}32.013$  looking at their own aspirates and

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

00:52:32.013 --> 00:52:34.299 seeing whether they're good or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:34.300 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.828$  They're much better at

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

00:52:35.828 --> 00:52:37.356 getting an aspirate right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:37.360 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.848$  so I think it's partly that

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:38.848 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.050$  the training and the US.

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

00:52:40.050 --> 00:52:43.635 Focus more on treatment versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:43.635 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.786$  the diagnostic procedure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:45.790 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.876$  so there might be a swing in

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00:52:47.876 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.773$  the other direction as we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.886626861666667

 $00{:}52{:}49.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}51.328$  how important the aspirate is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

 $00{:}52{:}52.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}56.142$  The other question I have is

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

 $00:52:56.142 \longrightarrow 00:52:59.060$  this drug that works again.

 $00:52:59.060 \longrightarrow 00:53:00.581$  That targets BCL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

 $00{:}53{:}00.581 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}03.623$  Two BCL two is expressed on

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

 $00:53:03.623 \longrightarrow 00:53:06.230$  other lymphocytes as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

 $00:53:06.230 \longrightarrow 00:53:09.524$  So are there what happens to

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

00:53:09.524 --> 00:53:11.720 those lymphocytes in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.907322532727273

 $00:53:11.815 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.560$  that are receiving this drug?

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:53:15.760 --> 00:53:18.190 Yeah, you know no drug is

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:18.190 \longrightarrow 00:53:19.810$  without its side effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00{:}53{:}19.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}22.274$  but I I have to say that venetoclax

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:22.274 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.245$  has reportedly done pretty well in

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:25.245 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.454$  these patients because so much of

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:28.454 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.134$  their lymphocytes are actually really

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00{:}53{:}31.134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}33.774$ abnormal or myeloid cells are so

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:33.774 \longrightarrow 00:53:36.554$  abundant that they have a depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:53:36.554 --> 00:53:39.258 in normal lymphocytes already.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:39.260 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.644$  So venetoclax has been shown to

 $00:53:42.644 \longrightarrow 00:53:45.980$  really induce that initial remission.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00{:}53{:}45.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}48.676$  The duration of that remission is not long,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:48.680 \longrightarrow 00:53:50.000$  so that is a problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:50.000 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.915$  And these breakthroughs and relapses

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:53.915 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.690$  happen pretty quickly thereafter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:53:55.690 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.000$  So so that is a real issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:53:58.000 --> 00:54:02.480 But, you know, I think also we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:54:02.480 --> 00:54:05.296 we think of OK, this stain is high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:54:05.296 \longrightarrow 00:54:08.100$  and so this this drug must work, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:54:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.260$  Well in the one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:54:09.260 --> 00:54:09.974 Sustained highly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:54:09.974 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.150$  but it actually has not worked out that way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00{:}54{:}13.150 --> 00{:}54{:}17.632$  So in terms of CLL it's worked really well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00:54:17.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.606$  but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:54:18.606 --> 00:54:21.328 full of your lymphoma is BCL 2 positive

00:54:21.328 --> 00:54:23.796 and yet it's not as it's not doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

 $00{:}54{:}23.796 \longrightarrow 00{:}54{:}25.841$  as well in follicular so it's not

NOTE Confidence: 0.834722404

00:54:25.841 --> 00:54:27.850 like a one to one correlation either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759111265

00:54:31.460 --> 00:54:33.808 Thank you Mina. The venetoclax

NOTE Confidence: 0.759111265

 $00:54:33.808 \longrightarrow 00:54:35.356$  is very interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:54:35.360 --> 00:54:37.608 Manju, because this is a drug where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:54:37.608 --> 00:54:39.336 actually have to titrate up in CLL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:54:39.340 --> 00:54:41.764 you give it all at once and patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:54:41.764 --> 00:54:44.399 will get extreme tumor lysis syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00:54:44.400 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.108$  The problem with these drugs as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00:54:46.110 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.630$  based on their structure

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00:54:48.630 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.520$  is they're extravascular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:54:50.520 --> 00:54:51.816 Extrusion is very limited,

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00{:}54{:}51.816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}54.629$  so there are many tumors where within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:54:54.629 --> 00:54:56.659 circulating system it's very effective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00{:}54{:}56.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}59.428$  but on tissues it's just a drug property.

 $00:54:59.430 \longrightarrow 00:55:00.642$  That drug is very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00:55:00.642 \longrightarrow 00:55:02.157$  very tightly albumin bound and

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

 $00:55:02.157 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.895$  very poorly able to actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.724115359333334

00:55:03.895 --> 00:55:05.275 egress from the bloodstream.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91433855

 $00:55:07.000 \longrightarrow 00:55:08.290$  Thank you, thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.921617997142857

 $00:55:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:55:09.679$  you so much. That's a great point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:11.130 --> 00:55:15.026 Hi Mina, I have a question for you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:15.030 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.572$  So this is more of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:17.572 \longrightarrow 00:55:18.840$  immunohistochemistry question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:18.840 --> 00:55:21.588 Are you really looking into multiplexing?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:21.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:23.935$  And since this monoblast count

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:23.935 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.950$  is so critical in the 20% count,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:26.950 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.150$  so I was wondering,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:28.150 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.358$  are you relying only on IR F8 and would

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:32.358 --> 00:55:35.240 you also consider multiplexing with CD 34?

00:55:35.240 --> 00:55:38.240 But then we no CD 34 doesn't pick

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:38.240 --> 00:55:40.271 up all monoblast monocytic leukemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:40.271 --> 00:55:43.890 so is there any other marker for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:43.890 --> 00:55:46.658 which is cytoplasmic localization?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:46.658 --> 00:55:49.426 Like CD 117 would be more helpful

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:49.426 --> 00:55:51.939 for you versus CD 34, which also I

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:51.939 --> 00:55:53.743 believe goes to the nucleus, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:55:53.743 \longrightarrow 00:55:57.207$  So having a Multiplex stay in that is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:57.210 --> 00:55:57.778 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:57.778 --> 00:55:59.198 picks up two different localizations

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

00:55:59.198 --> 00:56:01.050 would be more helpful than having.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86452940125

 $00:56:01.050 \longrightarrow 00:56:02.380$  Absolutely yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:02.650 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.594$  I'm I'm so glad you brought it up

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00{:}56{:}04.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}07.062$  and I really hope to get your buy in

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:07.062 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.570$  and doing the multiplexing. In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:09.570 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.810$  I think CD34 with RA would be perfect.

00:56:12.810 --> 00:56:16.023 In fact, CD 34 is going to be membranous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00.56:16.030 \longrightarrow 00.56:17.166$  and this is nuclear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:17.166 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.612$  Then we would capture all of them, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

00:56:20.612 --> 00:56:26.104 And at MGB they're already doing 123 with RH,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:26.104 \longrightarrow 00:56:28.294$  just to show its double.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:28.300 \longrightarrow 00:56:32.330$  Expression in the dendritic cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:32.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.450$  so so that's another possibility.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

00:56:34.450 --> 00:56:37.393 But I I do think that in cases where

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:37.393 \longrightarrow 00:56:40.850$  we really are relying on this kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:40.850 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.289$  getting to 20% the the multiplexing

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00{:}56{:}43.289 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}45.970$  with 34 would be super super helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00:56:45.970 \longrightarrow 00:56:47.506$  So I'd be happy to work on it

NOTE Confidence: 0.839677546

 $00{:}56{:}47.506 \to 00{:}56{:}48.240$  with your staff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97088134

 $00:56:53.380 \longrightarrow 00:56:56.600$  Thank you so much for all of your time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97088134

 $00:56:56.600 \longrightarrow 00:56:58.616$  Please feel free to ask me any other

 $00{:}56{:}58.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}00.348$  questions as you might see me in

NOTE Confidence: 0.97088134

 $00{:}57{:}00.348 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}03.660$  the hallway. Thank you, thank you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90936305

 $00{:}57{:}03.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05.390$  thank you all for coming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90198743

 $00{:}57{:}06.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}07.560$  Great talk.