WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "00:47:51.8080000"

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:02.506$ Today too, are y'all catch Santa grand

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

00:00:02.510 --> 00:00:05.690 rounds? Today is a special day. It's one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:05.690 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.785$ our endowed lectureships.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:06.785 \longrightarrow 00:00:09.340$ This is the blanched Omen lecture series

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:09.404 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.686$ was established in 2012 by Marvin Sears,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

00:00:11.686 --> 00:00:14.509 who many of you might remember was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00{:}00{:}14.509 \to 00{:}00{:}16.274$ long time chairman of our Department

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

00:00:16.274 --> 00:00:18.135 of Optomology and Visual Sciences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00{:}00{:}18.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.805$ He established his series in honor

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

00:00:20.805 --> 00:00:22.757 of his mother Blanched Holman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00{:}00{:}22.757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}24.265$ who eventually succumbed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

00:00:24.265 --> 00:00:25.396 acute myelogenous leukemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:25.400 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.656$ and this is the first and

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:27.656 \longrightarrow 00:00:29.536$ I'll lecture series at Yale.

00:00:29.540 --> 00:00:31.202 Devoted to hematology, malignancy's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795572

 $00:00:31.202 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.330$ It's intended to bring

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:00:33.330 \longrightarrow 00:00:34.389$ into Yale pioneers

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:00:34.390 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.110$ that have made major contributions

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:00:36.110 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.280$ to our understanding of the current

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:00:38.280 --> 00:00:39.700 trends in hematologic oncology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:00:39.700 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.176$ to a very exciting today to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}00{:}42.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}43.946$ Marcel Vandenbrink as our speaker

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:00:43.946 \longrightarrow 00:00:45.714$ and to introduce myself today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:00:45.714 --> 00:00:47.840 I'm going to turn the podium

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:00:47.840 --> 00:00:49.260 over to Stephanie Helene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}00{:}49.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}51.378$ the director of our Division of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}00{:}51.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}53.150$ Hematology. So Stephanie, the floor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}00{:}53.150 --> 00{:}00{:}54.920$ is yours. Thank you, Dan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:00:54.920 --> 00:00:56.690 So it's my absolute pleasure

00:00:56.690 --> 00:00:58.106 to introduce Doctor myself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}00{:}58.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}00.371$ wondering who is the head of division

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:00.371 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.816$ of hematologic malignancy Malignancy's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:01.816 --> 00:01:03.500 at Memorial Sloan Kettering.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:03.500 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.474$ Cancer Center so Doctor Funding Bank

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:05.474 --> 00:01:08.107 is an expert in hematopoietic stem cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}08.107 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}10.609$ transplantation and he obtained his MD

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:10.609 --> 00:01:13.245 and PhD from the University of Leiden,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:13.250 --> 00:01:15.165 completed a postdoctoral fellowship at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:15.165 --> 00:01:17.495 the Pittsburgh Cancer Institute and his

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:17.495 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.625$ residency at Duke University Medical Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:19.630 \longrightarrow 00:01:22.182$ He has been the head of the Division

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:22.182 --> 00:01:24.022 of Hematology Malignancies since 2008

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}24.022 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}26.661$ is also a professor of medicine and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:26.727 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.822$ immunology at Weill Cornell Medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:28.822 --> 00:01:30.906 College as a physician, scientist,

00:01:30.906 --> 00:01:32.124 Doctor, Vandenbrink studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}32.124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}33.748$ allogeneic stem cell transplantation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:33.750 --> 00:01:36.130 Both in the clinic and the laboratory,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:36.130 --> 00:01:37.830 and his research is currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:37.830 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.190$ focused on two areas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:39.190 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.234$ One is to study the role that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:41.234 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.944$ microorganisms living in the testing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:42.944 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.889$ playing in patients undergoing stem

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}44.889 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}46.980$ cell transplantation and in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:46.980 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.276$ receiving cancer immunotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}48.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}49.810$ He's developing strategies to help

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}49.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51.799$ the body rebuild the immune system

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}01{:}51.799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}53.419$ after bone marrow transplantation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:01:53.420 --> 00:01:55.765 His research in both of these areas

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:55.765 \longrightarrow 00:01:57.643$ is being translated into clinical

00:01:57.643 --> 00:01:59.653 trials that are currently ongoing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:01:59.653 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.599$ at Sloan Kettering and beyond.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:02:01.600 --> 00:02:02.214 In 2010,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:02:02.214 --> 00:02:04.363 Doctor Finder bring started the Susan and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:02:04.363 --> 00:02:06.698 Peter Solomon Divisional Genomics program,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:06.700 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.740$ which focuses on targeted therapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:08.740 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.372$ therapy approaches for patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}02{:}10.372 \longrightarrow 00{:}02{:}12.720$ with less with blood cancers such as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:02:12.720 --> 00:02:14.751 leukemia and this program was actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:14.751 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.541$ instrumental in the development of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}02{:}16.541 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18.474$ the first genomic profiling test.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

00:02:18.474 --> 00:02:20.182 Pro Haematological malignancy is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}02{:}20.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}22.203$ called Foundation One Heme which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:22.203 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.438$ we are happy to use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:23.440 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.722$ so I'm turning over the podium to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}02{:}25.722 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}27.569$ Doctor Vandenbrink who will tell

 $00{:}02{:}27.569 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}29.579$ us incredibly exciting stories on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00{:}02{:}29.579 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}31.694$ the intestinal microbiome in stem

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:31.694 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.332$ cell transplantation. So welcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043628

 $00:02:33.332 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.104$ And we look forward to your presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:37.240 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.500$ Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:38.500 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.336$ Thank you so much for these kind kind words.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:41.336 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.354$ Of course this is again going to be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:02:44.354 --> 00:02:47.587 lecture by zoom and we were just saying how?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:47.590 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.578$ Slowly but steadily we're getting a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}02{:}49.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}52.194$ bit tired of that and would like to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:02:52.194 --> 00:02:54.260 some real physical lectures again and see

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:54.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.290$ your audience and work with your audience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:56.290 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.918$ But no matter what, it is a fantastic honor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:02:58.918 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.506$ to be your guest and to speak for you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:01.510 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.832$ So the first thing that I have to tell

 $00:03:03.832 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.560$ you honestly is that I do have a conflict

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}03{:}06.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08.759$ of interest because some of the data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}03{:}08.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}10.566$ some of the studies that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:10.566 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.285$ will be showing were actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:12.285 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.525$ sponsored by the company serious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:14.530 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.190$ I'm not sure if I still need

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:17.190 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.778$ to show these kind of slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:19.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.065$ I think that most of us will have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}03{:}23.065 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}25.795$ a concept now that the microbiome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:25.795 \longrightarrow 00:03:29.389$ that lives inside of us and on us is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}03{:}29.389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}32.053$ definitely relevant for a lot of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}03{:}32.053 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34.345$ Physiology and one way of looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:34.345 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.148$ at that is what is summarized here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:03:37.150 --> 00:03:39.424 That one should start thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:39.424 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.441$ a human multi species symbiotic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:41.441 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.616$ supra Organism with a constant

00:03:43.620 --> 00:03:44.940 interaction between microbes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.648$ And human human cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:48.650 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.037$ So we've been doing that basically since

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:51.037 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.441$ 2009 and our focus was very much when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:03:54.441 --> 00:03:56.630 started on allogeneic transplant patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:56.630 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.910$ but since then we have broadened

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:03:58.910 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.050$ our whole scope.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:00.050 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.360$ These are the current leaders of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.610$ group and the original gangster,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:04.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.302$ Eric Pamer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:05.302 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.070$ As since then left us and has bolted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:04:08.145 --> 00:04:10.310 for the University of Chicago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}04{:}10.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}12.816$ so these are the folks within my

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:12.816 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.250$ lap that are working on this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:15.250 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.354$ and I will mention some of their names.

 $00:04:18.360 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.948$ When we get to their studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}04{:}21.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}24.654$ So an easy way to summarize about 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:24.654 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.870$ years of work by our group and by others

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:27.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.240$ within the context of allogeneic bone

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:30.240 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.976$ marrow transplantation and trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:31.976 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.260$ see if there's a clinical relevance to it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}04{:}34.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35.844$ Changes within the gut flora is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:35.844 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.971$ to take as a starting point the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:37.971 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.987$ causes of death within the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:39.987 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.128$ year after allogeneic transplants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:42.130 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.840$ And if you do that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:43.840 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.094$ then you can paint a cladogram an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:46.094 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.548$ indicate with a blue color text said

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}04{:}48.548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.678$ that are linked to good outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}04{:}50.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}52.804$ and with red color text editor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:52.804 \longrightarrow 00:04:54.220$ linked with bad outcomes.

 $00:04:54.220 \longrightarrow 00:04:56.285$ And you can differentiate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:56.285 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.937$ various clinically relevant outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:57.937 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.359$ 1st and most of all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:04:59.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.092$ of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:00.092 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.288$ the overall the overall survival rate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:02.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.226$ where you can see that certain texts are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:05.226 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.169$ linked in a positive or a negative way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:05:08.170 --> 00:05:11.146 Then of course the second one that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:05:11.146 --> 00:05:14.031 have focused on very much is if certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:14.031 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.970$ texts are linked to a graft versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}05{:}16.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}19.690$ and I'm giving you one study here from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:19.690 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.324$ 2015 where we demonstrated in a patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:22.324 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.109$ that during the time the time period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}05{:}25.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}26.950$ Of neutrophil engraftment which is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:26.950 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.323$ about 14 days out from allogeneic

 $00:05:29.323 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.618$ transplant that the abundance of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}05{:}31.618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}33.978$ a commensal enercell called sub

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00{:}05{:}33.978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}35.790$ laudia was clinically relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:35.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.316$ It seemed because patients who at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

00:05:38.316 --> 00:05:41.835 that point had low levels of that of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8666846

 $00:05:41.835 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.457$ that texture had a greater incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:05:44.546 --> 00:05:47.381 of little a graph versus host which

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:05:47.381 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.995$ is marked here with these red bars and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:05:50.995 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.330$ that leads to overall worse outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:05:54.330 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.810$ Many other clinically relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}05{:}55.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}58.472$ outcomes can also be linked to changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}05{:}58.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}00.738$ within the flora, such as infections,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:00.738 \longrightarrow 00:06:02.561$ organ toxicity, and even relapse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:02.561 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.536$ So now you can start to paint a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:05.536 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.906$ picture really of what the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:07.906 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.158$ taxa could be linked to an.

 $00:06:10.160 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.176$ In some cases we have some mechanism also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:13.180 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.580$ and I will show you some of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:06:17.580 --> 00:06:19.482 Now, many of these studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:19.482 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.930$ we did and that others who did

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:21.930 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.138$ were limited by small group sizes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:24.140 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.728$ For instance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:24.728 \longrightarrow 00:06:27.080$ here I am showing a study early on

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:06:27.141 --> 00:06:29.013 where we demonstrated that if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:06:29.013 --> 00:06:31.574 look again at the time of neutrophil

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}06{:}31.574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}33.238$ engraftment after an allogeneic

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:33.238 \longrightarrow 00:06:35.144$ transplant at the diversity within

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:35.144 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.106$ the gut flora that patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:37.106 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.250$ had that point had higher diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}06{:}39.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}41.035$ had a better overall outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.990$ and that seemed to be linked

 $00:06:42.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.840$ to the incidence of lethal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:44.840 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.220$ A graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:06:46.220 --> 00:06:46.910 But again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:46.910 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.598$ this was a single center small study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:49.600 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.664$ So we felt very fortunate when

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:06:51.664 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.987$ some of our dear friends and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}06{:}53.987 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}56.579$ colleagues from all over the world

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:06:56.579 --> 00:06:58.698 were willing to work with us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}06{:}58.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}01.670$ so that now we could do a much larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:07:01.670 --> 00:07:04.377 study looking at 1300 plus patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}07{:}04.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.765$ These patients were getting allogeneic

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:06.765 \dashrightarrow 00:07:09.520$ transplants for AML and DS NHL.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:09.520 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.782$ And the first thing that really

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:11.782 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.462$ struck us that if we looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:14.462 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.996$ the at the baseline sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:17.000 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.034$ so the samples when patients come

 $00:07:19.034 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.110$ in for their allogeneic transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}07{:}21.110 \longrightarrow 00{:}07{:}23.525$ that the composition of the flora was

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:23.525 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.980$ not that different between those centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:25.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.218$ And I'll give you some reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:28.218 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.337$ for that later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:29.340 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.080$ an SEC that in all four in all four centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:33.080 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.656$ What we notice is that the moment that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}07{:}35.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}38.320$ they come in for allogeneic transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:38.320 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.904$ there is a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:39.904 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.544$ A dramatic drop within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}07{:}42.544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.158$ diversity of the gut flora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:45.160 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.708$ And thus that matter a clinically yes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}07{:}47.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}50.260$ it does, as I'm showing here again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:50.260 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.438$ taking as a time point around

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:07:52.438 --> 00:07:53.164 neutrophil engraftment,

 $00:07:53.170 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.534$ which,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:07:53.534 --> 00:07:54.990 as I said already,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:07:54.990 --> 00:07:57.566 is about 14 days out from allergen

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:07:57.566 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.438$ echo transplant patients who at

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:07:59.438 --> 00:08:01.178 that point had higher diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:01.180 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.660$ that better overall outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:02.660 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.880$ And this was holding up for

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:08:04.950 --> 00:08:06.640 the New York and patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:06.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.502$ but also for the combined cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:09.502 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.260$ of the other three centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:12.260 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.408$ When we took a deeper dive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:14.410 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.564$ So what makes or what leads

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:16.564 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.000$ to that a difference?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:18.000 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.310$ Then it seemed to be mostly linked

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:08:20.310 --> 00:08:21.950 to transplant related mortality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}08{:}21.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}24.560$ not so much relapse and within

 $00:08:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.805$ that category it actually seems

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:26.805 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.325$ to be mostly a difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:29.325 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.520$ lethal graft versus host again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:08:31.520 --> 00:08:33.494 You can go one step further and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}08{:}33.494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}35.409$ you can start to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:35.409 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.074$ certain attacks are that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:37.074 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.283$ linked to more favorable or worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}08{:}39.283 \to 00{:}08{:}41.503$ outcomes and that you can validate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:41.510 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.603$ Then again by taking all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:08:43.603 --> 00:08:45.838 patients of the other three cohorts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.796$ and indeed see that certain a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00{:}08{:}47.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}49.499$ consortia would be linked to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:49.499 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.827$ better or worse outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

 $00:08:50.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.951$ As you can tell we're not so

NOTE Confidence: 0.7821491

00:08:52.951 --> 00:08:54.663 focused on really zooming in

00:08:54.663 --> 00:08:56.498 too much on certain attacks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:08:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.990$ a except for one and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:08:58.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.739$ get back to that one later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:01.740 --> 00:09:04.204 I told you already that these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:04.204 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.721$ came in with fairly similar diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:06.721 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.487$ and the composition of their flora,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:09.490 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.938$ and when we analyze that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:11.938 --> 00:09:13.570 against normal healthy folks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:13.570 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.261$ what we saw is that all at all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:16.261 --> 00:09:18.719 these centers patients come into

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00{:}09{:}18.719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}21.319$ a transplant with lower diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:21.320 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.696$ and we speculate that that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:23.696 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.596$ because most of them will have gone

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00{:}09{:}26.596 \to 00{:}09{:}29.480$ through a year or so of chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:29.480 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.734$ Neutropenic fevers treated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:30.734 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.824$ with all kinds of antibiotics.

 $00:09:32.830 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.015$ And so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:34.015 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.385$ But what was interesting is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:36.385 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.074$ coming in with an even lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:39.074 --> 00:09:41.284 diversity coming into a transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:41.372 \dashrightarrow 00:09:44.138$ was again linked to worse outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:44.140 --> 00:09:46.654 Similar findings we have now also

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:46.654 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.157$ for Ottawa transplant where we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:49.157 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.425$ a similar drop within the diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:51.425 --> 00:09:53.865 which starts at the moment that these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:53.865 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.843$ patients come in for a transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:09:55.843 \longrightarrow 00:09:58.021$ And again if we take asmark

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:09:58.021 --> 00:10:00.119 the time point of neutrophil.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00{:}10{:}00.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}00.854$ So engraftment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:10:00.854 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.790$ which is about 9 days out from Ottawa

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

 $00:10:03.864 \longrightarrow 00:10:06.150$ transplants we see again that having

 $00:10:06.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.682$ at that time point higher diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554378

00:10:08.682 --> 00:10:11.490 is linked to better overall outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:10:13.630 --> 00:10:16.228 Now, Meanwhile, a number of studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:16.230 \longrightarrow 00:10:18.605$ specifically within checkpoints and blockades

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:18.605 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.980$ have also demonstrated that diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:21.041 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.159$ seems to matter for certain outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:23.160 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.304$ In this case, responses to checkpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00{:}10{:}26.304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}29.883$ blockade and we have some early data

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:29.883 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.649$ also that this might matter for

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:32.649 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.826$ the efficacy of car cell therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00{:}10{:}35.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}37.846$ Some studies that were still finishing

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:10:37.846 --> 00:10:40.301 at the moment seem to indicate also

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:40.301 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.389$ that changes within the gut flora

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:10:42.389 --> 00:10:44.188 specific texture could be linked with

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:44.188 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.555$ the pace of the CD four and regeneration

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:46.555 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.855$ after an allogeneic transplants.

 $00:10:47.860 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.272$ I don't want to make too much of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:50.272 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.513$ deal here of these various attacks

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:10:52.513 --> 00:10:55.098 are because we still want to take

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:55.098 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.958$ that into a germ free mouse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:10:56.960 --> 00:10:58.580 Models and study data further,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:10:58.580 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.205$ but this gives us hints of which

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:01.205 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.516$ assault apps might be or which

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:03.516 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.356$ text that might be relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:05.360 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.900$ Another critical feature is

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:06.900 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.210$ that with the loss of diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:09.210 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.429$ what happens also is that in some

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:11.429 --> 00:11:12.933 of these patients specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:12.933 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.368$ within the post transplant period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:15.370 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.274$ there is a moment that their whole flora

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:18.274 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.150$ is being dominated by a single taxer.

 $00:11:21.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.142$ If you use as a definition that domination

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:24.142 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.995$ is when more than 1/3 of your flora

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:26.995 --> 00:11:29.619 is dominated by a certain attacks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:29.620 --> 00:11:32.644 and then we actually notice that in all

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:32.644 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.477$ patients at all centres they will have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:35.480 --> 00:11:37.880 At a certain at time points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:37.880 --> 00:11:39.880 a dominance or almost all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:39.880 --> 00:11:42.784 and what was very striking is that all

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:42.784 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.292$ four centers had all former centers

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:45.292 --> 00:11:47.854 that the most prominent bacteria that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00{:}11{:}47.929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}50.275$ would do that is Enterococcus an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.650$ We knew already from studies at

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:11:52.650 --> 00:11:55.729 our center that having a state of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:55.729 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.629$ dominance with Enterococcus within

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:11:57.629 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.076$ the post transplant period was linked

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:12:00.076 --> 00:12:02.938 to a 9 faults of risk for bacteremia,

 $00:12:02.938 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.570$ with VRE for instance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:12:05.570 \longrightarrow 00:12:06.886$ Bob was very striking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:12:06.886 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.860$ Is that at all four centers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:12:08.860 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.738$ It was one specific species that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00{:}12{:}10.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}12.614$ would do that that would lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:12:12.614 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.553$ to a state of a dominance and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

 $00:12:14.553 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.430$ that was Enterococcus aficion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86777544

00:12:16.430 --> 00:12:18.070 As I'm showing you here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:12:20.100 --> 00:12:22.236 And that seemed to matter clinically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:12:22.240 --> 00:12:24.166 Also because what we know Tist

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:12:24.166 --> 00:12:26.158 is having during the period or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:26.158 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.084$ the post transplant period at one

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:12:28.084 --> 00:12:30.452 point a state of dominance with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:30.452 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.527$ Enterococcus aficion was linked to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:12:32.527 --> 00:12:34.740 greater risk of graft versus host,

 $00:12:34.740 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.159$ worse overall outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}12{:}36.159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}38.051$ and specifically an increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:38.051 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.398$ incidence of lethal a graft versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:40.398 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.762$ host that was true for all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:12:42.762 --> 00:12:44.848 New York of patients and also held

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:44.848 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.090$ up when we took the three cohorts

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:48.090 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.730$ from the other centers together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:50.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.949$ So we took that into mouse models

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}12{:}52.949 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}55.246$ and what I'm showing you here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:12:55.246 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.930$ every box is 1 mouse where we did

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}12{:}57.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}00.042$ sequential a sequencing an in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:00.042 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.710$ case here if we add some of T cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:02.710 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.782$ to the allograft with which these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:13:04.782 --> 00:13:07.104 mice were being a transplanted which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:07.104 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.426$ will lead to a graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:09.430 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.100$ As you can see here,

00:13:11.100 --> 00:13:12.770 lethal a graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}13{:}12.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}15.450$ Then you must notice that there are these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:15.450 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.120$ These these red diamonds here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:13:17.120 --> 00:13:19.292 which means that there's a blooming

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:19.292 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.097$ of Enterococcus happening during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:21.097 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.879$ development of a graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:22.880 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.840$ In these mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}13{:}23.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}26.080$ these mice are not getting any type

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:26.145 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.130$ of antibiotic or anything else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:28.130 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.150$ We thought first.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:13:29.150 --> 00:13:29.490 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:29.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.961$ maybe that is just for one strain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:31.961 \longrightarrow 00:13:33.377$ or for one setting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:33.380 \longrightarrow 00:13:35.130$ so we did different strains

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:35.130 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.530$ in three different settings.

 $00:13:36.530 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.696$ For for monitoring a graft versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:13:38.696 --> 00:13:40.531 host causing a graft versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:40.531 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.475$ host in all of these cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:42.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.032$ we kept on finding about seven days out

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:45.032 \longrightarrow 00:13:46.861$ from Allergan Aker transplant during

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:46.861 \longrightarrow 00:13:49.479$ the development of a graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}13{:}49.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}52.910$ There's a blooming of Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:52.910 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.570$ Those that matter in these mouse models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:13:55.570 --> 00:13:55.937 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:13:55.937 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.750$ we test the debt by taking a germ free mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}13{:}59.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}01.650$ giving them a minimal flora

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:01.650 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.170$ plus or minus Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:03.170 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.490$ In these mouse models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:04.490 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.398$ By the way we saw blooming with different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:07.398 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.387$ with a different species was not physiome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:10.390 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.910$ but Enterococcus faecalis an.

 $00:14:11.910 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.430$ If we did that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.950$ If these mice had

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:14:14.950 --> 00:14:16.470 Enterococcus in their flora,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:16.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:18.370$ then indeed they had worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:18.370 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.890$ a graft versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}14{:}19.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}23.698$ and again had a blooming of Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:23.700 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.926$ So we took that further into these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:14:25.926 --> 00:14:28.189 mouse models and analyzed mechanisms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:28.190 \longrightarrow 00:14:30.060$ and since this is published,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:30.060 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.930$ I'm only going to summarize

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:31.930 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.800$ it here with Soma schematics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:33.800 \longrightarrow 00:14:36.236$ So what we think is happening and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:36.236 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.068$ what kind of data we have so far

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:14:39.068 --> 00:14:41.684 is that the damage caused by chemo

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:14:41.684 --> 00:14:43.769 and by the conditioning regiments

00:14:43.769 --> 00:14:46.355 plus the Elo activated T cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}14{:}46.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}48.135$ which specifically targets the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:48.135 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.612$ crypt stem cells and causing a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}14{:}50.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}52.754$ graft versus host within the gut.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:52.760 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.568$ That will lead to enterocyte damage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:55.570 \longrightarrow 00:14:57.630$ The enter sites therefore start

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:14:57.630 \longrightarrow 00:15:00.717$ to make less of an anti microbial

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:15:00.717 --> 00:15:03.067 approaching called REC 3 which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:03.067 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.242$ is known as we and others have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:06.242 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.762$ actually demonstrated to be a an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00{:}15{:}08.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10.970$ anti and anti microbial approaching

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:10.970 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.730$ that can contain Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:12.730 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.580$ Another thing that also happens is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:15:15.580 --> 00:15:17.480 that he enterocytes specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:17.556 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.326$ within the ilium or less,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.355$ are capable of making electees

 $00:15:21.355 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.962$ that will lead them to increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:23.962 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.978$ levels within the lumen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:15:25.980 --> 00:15:30.378 Of lactose and that plus the fact that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

 $00:15:30.378 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.825$ there's less of rec rec three will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8248834

00:15:32.825 --> 00:15:35.033 then lead to an Enterococcus blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:15:35.040 --> 00:15:36.078 The Enterococcus Bloom

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:36.078 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.154$ pushes away some of the year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:38.160 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.228$ Commensal flora well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:15:39.228 --> 00:15:41.720 One of the beneficial things that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:41.789 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.389$ commensal flora does is we and others have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:15:44.390 --> 00:15:46.644 A demonstrated is that it makes a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:46.644 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.774$ butyrate and butyrate is an intraluminal

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:48.774 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.604$ nutrient for these intro sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}15{:}50.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}52.602$ So if there's less a buty rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:52.602 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.062$ then that will lead to even more

00:15:55.062 --> 00:15:56.822 damage to the enterocytes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:15:56.822 --> 00:15:58.998 now you're in a downward spiral.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:15:59.000 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.826$ And things get worse and worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:01.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.168$ So we're trying to figure out are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:04.168 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.717$ there ways that we can maybe blocked

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:16:06.717 --> 00:16:08.925 AT and we thought initially about

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:09.003 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.528$ some bacteriophages and other things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:11.530 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.917$ But then the post Doc who was

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}16{:}13.917 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}16{:}15.885$ working on this Christof Stein

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:15.885 \longrightarrow 00:16:18.895$ touring are did a very simple thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}16{:}18.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}21.228$ He analyzed simply what are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:16:21.228 --> 00:16:22.780 pathways with already nutrients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:16:22.780 --> 00:16:24.332 As I mentioned already,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:24.332 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.884$ that Enterococcus favors well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:16:25.890 --> 00:16:28.599 As I said already, it likes Electo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:28.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.218$ so in his culture system for intro

 $00:16:31.218 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.729$ Enterococcus he simply poured some lactaid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:33.730 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.650$ From the local pharmacy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:35.650 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.186$ demonstrated that with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:37.190 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.890$ Of course he could block the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:39.890 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.690$ growth of these bacteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:41.690 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.133$ He then went back to these mouse

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:44.133 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.199$ models and what he did there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:46.200 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.940$ he's bought Chow without electrons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.824$ which is actually difficult because lactose

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:49.824 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.099$ is everywhere in many different nutrients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:52.100 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.564$ But he was able to get that mate

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:54.564 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.416$ and when he put these mice in two

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}16{:}57.416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}59.390$ different models on the child,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:16:59.390 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.738$ it was lactose free.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:00.738 \longrightarrow 00:17:02.760$ Who could get somewhat less a

 $00:17:02.832 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.248$ graft versus host me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:17:04.250 --> 00:17:05.980 You're not curing a graft

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:05.980 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.364$ versus host with this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:07.370 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.575$ and he could block the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:17:09.575 --> 00:17:10.898 blooming of Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:10.900 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.103$ So then he took that finding back to humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:15.110 \longrightarrow 00:17:17.318$ And we looked in our patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:17:17.320 --> 00:17:18.058 A cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}17{:}18.058 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}17{:}19.903$ Are there maybe patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:19.903 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.010$ have lactose intolerance?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:21.010 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.600$ When we looked at that we hoped,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:23.600 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.310$ of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:24.310 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.795$ is that that would be linked to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}17{:}26.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}29.128$ increased levels of graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:29.130 \longrightarrow 00:17:32.442$ We didn't really find that there was a trend,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00:17:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.026$ but what we did notice is the

00:17:35.026 --> 00:17:36.933 moment that patients come off

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}17{:}36.933 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}39.453$ antibiotics and that is the 0 here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}17{:}39.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41.195$ Then those patients who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

00:17:41.195 --> 00:17:42.583 lactose intolerant will have

NOTE Confidence: 0.7907168

 $00{:}17{:}42.583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}44.260$ higher levels of Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:17:46.540 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.997$ So as I've been trying to show you here

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

00:17:48.997 --> 00:17:51.445 in this part so the Enterococcus can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

00:17:51.445 --> 00:17:54.090 dominate in the post transplant period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00{:}17{:}54.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}56.826$ it is linked to a graft versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:17:56.830 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.702$ and lactose is one of the basic nutrients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00{:}17{:}59.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}01.976$ for Enterococcus and using lactate or or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00{:}18{:}01.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}03.830$ Basically strategies like that could

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:03.830 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.051$ potentially block the bloom of Enterococcus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:06.051 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.832$ an in that way limit the graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:08.840 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.115$ This of course begs for a clinical

00:18:11.115 --> 00:18:13.289 study which we haven't done yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:13.290 \longrightarrow 00:18:16.930$ so I can't tell you anything about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:16.930 \longrightarrow 00:18:18.890$ Meanwhile, other centers have also

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:18.890 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.850$ demonstrated that the levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:20.914 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.784$ Enterococcus within the post transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

00:18:22.784 --> 00:18:25.788 periods are linked to a graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8346875

 $00:18:25.790 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.246$ I'm just showing you one out of several here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:18:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.930$ Another disease that we were interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}18{:}32.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}35.707$ in is the a complication of chronic graft

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:18:35.707 --> 00:18:37.762 versus host after allogeneic transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}18{:}37.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}40.686$ so we try to figure out if changes within

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:18:40.686 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.890$ the four I could be relevant for that also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:18:43.890 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.822$ Now, the onset of chronic graft

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:18:45.822 --> 00:18:47.970 versus host is of course much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:18:47.970 --> 00:18:50.350 much later is about 200 days out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:18:50.350 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.077$ and what we did in this case is we

00:18:53.077 --> 00:18:55.729 looked at the samples about 100 days out

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}18{:}55.729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}58.665$ and try to see if there were certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:18:58.665 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.292$ texts on maybe that could be linked.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:01.292 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.518$ In a favorable or an unfavorable

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:03.518 --> 00:19:06.291 way with the onset of chronic graft

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:06.291 --> 00:19:08.126 versus host much, much later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:08.126 --> 00:19:10.750 and indeed we have some hints now such

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:10.815 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.980$ as Streptococcus in Accra Mencia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:12.980 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.152$ That seems to favor the onset

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}19{:}15.152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}17.010$ of chronic graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:17.010 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.579$ So of course that this needs much

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:19.579 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.680$ much more work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:20.680 --> 00:19:23.014 Another feature in this article that

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:23.014 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.605$ I'm not summarizing is that there might

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:25.605 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.307$ be also a role for certain short chain

 $00:19:28.307 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.932$ fatty fatty acids that might limit the

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:30.932 \longrightarrow 00:19:34.590$ incidence of chronic graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}19{:}34.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}37.012$ Now I mentioned already a few times

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:37.012 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.670$ that this drop in the diversity within

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:39.670 --> 00:19:42.534 the gut flora is pretty dramatic in

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:42.534 --> 00:19:45.318 all patients who have an allogeneic

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}19{:}45.318 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}46.710$ bone marrow transplantation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:46.710 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.286$ So we went back and we try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}19{:}49.286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}51.470$ analyze what are possible factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:19:51.470 --> 00:19:54.386 that might cause that dramatic loss,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.808$ and the first one of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:19:56.810 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.536$ that we looked at was antibiotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:00.540 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.144$ And indeed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:01.144 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.258$ if you look at the use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:03.258 --> 00:20:05.110 broad spectrum antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:05.110 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.312$ so those type of antibiotics that

 $00:20:07.312 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.635$ we typically give when a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}20{:}09.635 --> 00{:}20{:}11.207$ has fever and neutropenia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:11.210 --> 00:20:13.454 and specifically will do damage to

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:13.454 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.400$ their commensal enter up flora,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}20{:}15.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.472$ then indeed the exposure to those

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:18.472 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.476$ types of antibiotics will lead to

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:21.476 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.080$ a greater drop in the diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}20{:}24.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}26.418$ We analyzed over a period about 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}20{:}26.418 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}\:} > 00{:}20{:}28.825$ years the use of antibiotics in

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:28.825 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.605$ our allogeneic transplants patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:30.605 --> 00:20:34.029 and try to see if certain types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:34.029 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.044$ antibiotics were linked to greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}20{:}36.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}37.988$ incidence of lethal graft versus host

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:37.988 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.747$ an we came up with two piperacillin

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:40.747 --> 00:20:42.619 tazobactam and imipenem also

00:20:42.619 --> 00:20:44.023 mirror mirror Panama's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:44.030 --> 00:20:45.542 We're using it now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:45.542 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.051$ but for this study we could only look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:49.051 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.266$ me Pennant and those are indeed two types

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:52.266 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.698$ of antibiotics that do more damage to the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:55.700 --> 00:20:56.780 Commensal anaerobic flora,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:20:56.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:58.580$ then many other types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:20:58.580 --> 00:21:00.020 broad spectrum antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:00.020 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.990$ such as it's ever been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:21:01.990 --> 00:21:05.527 As I'm showing you here that was LinkedIn D2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:05.530 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.274$ higher incidence of lethal graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:08.280 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.478$ We took that again into a mouse

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}21{:}10.478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13.295$ model and we could see indeed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:13.295 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.545$ these two broad spectrum antibiotics

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:21:15.545 --> 00:21:18.069 that damage the analog flora would

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}21{:}18.069 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}20.548$ lead to worse graft versus host.

00:21:20.548 --> 00:21:23.894 And to make a Long story short,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00{:}21{:}23.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}26.276$ because this is all published when

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:26.276 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.541$ we studied this further in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:28.541 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.662$ mouse model we saw a few things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:30.670 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.648$ First of all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:21:31.648 --> 00:21:34.392 we saw a change within the gut flora

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:34.392 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.424$ that there was a blooming of a bacteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:37.430 \longrightarrow 00:21:38.142$ Ecker, Ecker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:38.142 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.210$ Mencia and Accra.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:39.210 \longrightarrow 00:21:41.352$ Mencia lives very close to the mucus

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

00:21:41.352 --> 00:21:43.537 layer and has mucolytic enzymes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85659957

 $00:21:43.537 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.330$ therefore will lead to a greater breakdown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00{:}21{:}46.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}48.418$ We actually speculate of the mucus

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00{:}21{:}48.418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}50.725$ layer and we could to demonstrate

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:21:50.725 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.835$ that the gut barrier function.

 $00:21:52.840 \longrightarrow 00:21:55.521$ More impaired in these mice treated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

00:21:55.521 --> 00:21:58.008 this broad spectrum antibiotic than not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:21:58.010 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.565$ and that again, might set up a

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:00.565 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.189$ cascade of a number of things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:03.190 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.740$ more stimulation of potentially of certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

00:22:05.740 --> 00:22:08.759 dendritic cells that I won't get into now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00{:}22{:}08.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}11.262$ They will make higher levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:11.262 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.746$ aside account that we know is

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00{:}22{:}13.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16.315$ linked to gut a graft versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:16.320 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.546$ which is all 2020 three that

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00{:}22{:}18.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}20.547$ will lead to greater activation

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:20.547 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.145$ of Elo activated CD 4T cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:23.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.467$ In this model that we are using,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:25.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.780$ those are the driving donor T cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

00:22:27.780 --> 00:22:30.428 that will give you a graph versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80423427

 $00:22:30.430 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.747$ leading to worse overall graph versus host.

 $00:22:32.750 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.070$ Specifically within the column.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:36.340 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.189$ So a number of studies have looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00{:}22{:}39.189 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}42.150$ now over the last decades or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:42.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.286$ If the use of broad spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:44.286 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.303$ antibiotics has any impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

00:22:46.303 --> 00:22:48.379 outcomes after allogeneic transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:48.380 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.630$ and as we were chatting earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:50.630 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.130$ the the first studies looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:22:55.425$ at the use of antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:22:55.430 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.445$ broad spectrum antibiotics in humans

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

00:22:57.445 --> 00:23:00.371 in the 1970s and 80s actually seemed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:00.371 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.290$ to indicate that wiping out the whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.906$ flora would lead to better outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

00:23:05.910 --> 00:23:07.870 Specifically, less graft versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:07.870 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.084$ and there are some pediatric studies

 $00:23:10.084 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.570$ that still seem to indicate that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:12.570 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.928$ but the bulk of the stories,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:14.930 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.282$ the bulk of the studies over

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:17.282 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.850$ the last two years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:18.850 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.258$ do seem to indicate that the use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

00:23:21.258 --> 00:23:22.823 of broad spectrum antibiotics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:22.823 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.118$ is linked to worse outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:25.120 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.507$ specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00{:}23{:}25.507 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27.829$ increased levels of lethal graft versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8688149

 $00:23:27.829 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.208$ host or graft versus host overall.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:32.790 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.296$ So what can we do about that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:35.300 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.172$ Well, one of the things that we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:38.172 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.758$ been looking at is a beta lactamase

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:23:40.758 --> 00:23:43.315 that you would give orally so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:43.315 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.379$ within the lumen you can block

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:23:45.379 --> 00:23:47.506 any kind of effects of whatever

 $00:23:47.506 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.660$ type of antibiotic you are using.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:49.660 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.814$ So these are some early studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:51.814 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.250$ with such a compound,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:23:53.250 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.650$ so if we get gift that then indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:23:55.650 --> 00:23:58.377 we can block in a normal mouse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:23:58.377 --> 00:24:00.427 the change within the diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:24:00.430 --> 00:24:01.866 The blooming of Enterococcus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:01.866 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.841$ When you treat a mouse with both an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:04.841 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.109$ antibiotic and this beta lactamase,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:07.110 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.702$ and if you take it to a mouse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:24:09.702 --> 00:24:11.938 model for graft versus host,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:11.940 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.298$ similarly you can somewhat block the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}24{:}14.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}16.961$ worsening of graft versus host that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:16.961 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.355$ would get with the with the antibiotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:24:19.360 --> 00:24:21.825 Of course, we're looking forward

 $00:24:21.825 \longrightarrow 00:24:24.710$ to taking this into trials now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}24{:}24.710 --> 00{:}24{:}26.150$ A second major factor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:26.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.227$ we think that can impact on the dramatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:29.227 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.153$ loss of diversity are are the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:32.153 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.669$ types of a conditioning regiments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:34.670 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.099$ So we took a deep dive here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.557$ As all of the different types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:39.557 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.951$ air conditioning regiments that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}24{:}40.951 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}42.925$ we have been using at our center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:42.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.550$ and as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:44.550 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.456$ there are many.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:45.456 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.268$ You can put them into three

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:47.268 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.089$ categories based upon their strength.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:24:49.090 --> 00:24:52.842 Going from my lower blade of two reduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:24:52.842 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.397$ intensity tune on my lower blade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:24:55.400 --> 00:24:58.550 And if you do that as you would expect,

 $00:24:58.550 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.136$ the ones with lower strength indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:01.136 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.777$ curfew less of a drop in the diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.484$ And even if you were control

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:06.484 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.490$ for the use of antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:08.490 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.570$ you still keep on finding that same thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:25:12.570 --> 00:25:14.640 Another thing that was very interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:14.640 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.653$ when we looked at it in some more detail

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}25{:}17.653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}19.873$ is that certain regiments and we don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:25:19.873 --> 00:25:22.193 know why we need to study that further,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:22.200 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.126$ such as this one with fludarabine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}25{:}24.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}26.050$ cyclophosphamide and low dose at TV.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

00:25:26.050 --> 00:25:28.080 I seem to be linked to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}25{:}28.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.580$ blooming of certain bacteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00{:}25{:}29.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31.218$ and here I'm pointing out again

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515854

 $00:25:31.218 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.439$ the one that I mentioned earlier,

 $00:25:33.440 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.080$ Accra Mencia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:25:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:25:38.700$ Another factor that hasn't been

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:25:38.700 --> 00:25:40.930 studied with that much detail yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:25:40.930 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.562$ but we know is a major factor for

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:25:44.562 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.267$ changes within the flora is diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:25:47.270 --> 00:25:51.500 So to be able to get accurate dietze data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:25:51.500 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.790$ we hired a nutritionist who very carefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:25:54.790 --> 00:25:58.559 day by day and almost 100 patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}25{:}58.559 \to 00{:}26{:}01.961$ monitored exactly what these patients 8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:01.970 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.112$ The first thing that he notices

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:04.112 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.100$ if he looked at the onset when

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:07.100 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.570$ patients come into transplant that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:09.570 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.230$ calculating the Nutrition risk index.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:12.230 \longrightarrow 00:26:15.170$ Patients coming in with lower levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:15.170 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.906$ for that index have already a lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:18.906 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.154$ diversity within their flora.

00:26:21.160 --> 00:26:23.344 Another thing that he notices that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}26{:}23.344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}25.677$ the calorie intake the moment that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:26:25.677 --> 00:26:28.095 these patients are comin goes down

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:28.095 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.597$ dramatically and follow sort of the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:30.597 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.760$ pattern as that drop within diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:26:33.760 --> 00:26:36.274 And he first would have analyzed

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:36.274 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.871$ the usual aspects that people look

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}26{:}38.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}41.385$ at when they're studying a diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}26{:}41.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44.358$ So calories, protein, fats, fiber and swim.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}26{:}44.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}46.940$ And he found indeed that calorie

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:26:46.940 --> 00:26:48.660 intake was positively correlated

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:48.733 \longrightarrow 00:26:50.783$ with the diversity fiber also

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}26{:}50.783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52.833$ and also positively with blodia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:52.840 \longrightarrow 00:26:56.368$ And that is a true for both calories and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:26:56.368 \longrightarrow 00:26:59.837$ fiber and negatively for Enterococcus so.

 $00:26:59.840 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.064$ That was interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00{:}27{:}01.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}03.512$ but what I actually found even

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:27:03.512 --> 00:27:05.392 more interesting is a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:05.392 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.492$ way to look at a diet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:07.500 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.330$ and that is to look at it as a taxonomy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:11.330 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.610$ So now you look at all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:13.610 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.304$ fruits of products more than these

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:16.304 \longrightarrow 00:27:19.312$ categories like protein, fat and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:27:19.312 --> 00:27:22.440 And when we analyzed our data like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:22.440 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.135$ what we saw was that the footer

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:25.135 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.726$ diversity immediately dropped when

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

00:27:26.726 --> 00:27:28.566 patients come into a hospital,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:28.570 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.234$ and that that diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:30.234 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.650$ Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.202$ drops more for those patients who get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88154554

 $00:27:34.202 \longrightarrow 00:27:37.447$ stronger type of a conditioning regiment.

 $00:27:39.620 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.266$ You can then start to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

00:27:42.266 --> 00:27:44.237 certain food groups and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:27:44.237 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.493$ they are linked to a diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:27:46.500 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.996$ and that was very interesting because

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:27:48.996 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.731$ then you find something that we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:27:51.731 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.522$ really thought of and that is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:27:54.522 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.196$ intake of fruits and sugars and sweets

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

00:27:57.196 --> 00:27:59.484 and beverages that that is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:27:59.484 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.389$ linked negatively to the diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

00:28:01.390 --> 00:28:04.334 So we're still trying to figure out why

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:04.334 \longrightarrow 00:28:07.227$ that is and one of the theories that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00{:}28{:}07.227 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}10.180$ we have is that these these sugars.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00{:}28{:}10.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}11.904$ These very simple sugars.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:11.904 \longrightarrow 00:28:14.948$ That they actually might feed some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:14.948 \longrightarrow 00:28:17.615$ the pathogens or the bacteria that are

 $00:28:17.615 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.320$ taking over in times of low diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.560$ And in that case might make matters worse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.180$ as has been shown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

00:28:25.180 --> 00:28:27.205 For instance, for an enteritis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:27.205 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.420$ ferrea colitis model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

00:28:28.420 --> 00:28:31.276 And again you see there if you feed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

00:28:31.276 --> 00:28:34.087 these mice while they're getting DSS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:34.090 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.125$ Also, simple sugars and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00{:}28{:}36.125 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}38.620$ see him blossoming of again and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8777928

 $00:28:38.620 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.160$ bug like Accra Mencia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00{:}28{:}42.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}45.585$ So now we can start to make these kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00:28:45.585 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.914$ of tables where we can see what food

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00:28:48.914 \longrightarrow 00:28:52.048$ groups might have impact on certain tax.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00:28:52.050 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.030$ And of course this can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

00:28:54.030 --> 00:28:57.576 This can help us to start to a compose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00:28:57.580 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.628$ maybe a diet that would be a beneficial

 $00{:}29{:}00.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}02.677$ for specific patients in specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00{:}29{:}02.677 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}05.498$ settings and that is of course our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8706345

 $00:29:05.576 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.850$ ultimate goal with all of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:09.930 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.260$ Another category is drugs and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:14.260 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.852$ Patients who are getting an allogeneic

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:29:16.852 --> 00:29:18.580 bone marrow transplantation at

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:29:18.648 --> 00:29:20.790 any given moment are probably on

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:20.790 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.660$ seven or eight different drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:29:22.660 --> 00:29:25.324 And it was a very nice study a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:25.324 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.219$ of years back where it was demonstrated

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:29:28.219 --> 00:29:30.931 that many drugs that weren't antibiotics

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}29{:}30.931 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}33.769$ that they actually could also impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}29{:}33.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}36.700$ on many of the bacteria that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:36.700 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.559$ part of the commensal flora and just

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:39.559 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.959$ to highlight some of these drugs.

 $00:29:41.960 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.168$ These are all drugs that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}29{:}44.168 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}29{:}46.380$ frequently give to our patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:46.380 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.350$ including things like slight cyclosporin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:50.350 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.702$ So a very talented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:51.702 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.712$ say, graduate student.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:52.712 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.056$ It's the following thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:54.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.039$ She took all of the data that we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:29:57.039 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.286$ from all of the samples on 1100 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}00.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}03.242$ And she put them in a you map and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:03.242 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.868$ therefore could see all these clusters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}05.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}07.730$ Then she analyzed these clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:07.730 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.218$ a little bit better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:09.220 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.761$ She came up with 10 different clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:11.761 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.050$ and labeled them and then analyze.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:14.050 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.416$ Since we had to kinetic data if

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}16.416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}18.608$ the starting or stopping of a

00:30:18.608 --> 00:30:20.443 certain drug would have impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:20.443 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.980$ on the flora in these patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:22.980 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.039$ moving from one cluster to another cluster

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:26.039 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.187$ or staying put in that same a cluster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}29.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}32.205$ And when she did that kind of an analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:30:32.210 --> 00:30:34.226 what was very striking is that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:34.230 \longrightarrow 00:30:36.270$ of course the antibiotics will have

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}36.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}38.779$ impact if you a transition to another

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:38.779 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.657$ cluster or if you stay where you are

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:30:41.657 --> 00:30:43.969 so you can see here from this data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:43.970 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.112$ But all of these other drugs and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:46.112 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.865$ she looked at a grand total of 6063

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}48.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}51.030$ different drugs can have impact also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:51.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.347$ So it's a little bit early to

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:30:53.347 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.730$ show you data yet,

00:30:54.730 --> 00:30:57.218 but we have we have some data now

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}57.218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}59.509$ that seem to indicate a certain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}30{:}59.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01.095$ Pain medicines might have impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:01.095 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.070$ on changes within the gut flora,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:03.070 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.290$ so there's a lot of work still

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:06.290 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.248$ there that we can expand on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:31:09.250 --> 00:31:10.243 Now of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:10.243 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.560$ the ultimate goal for many people is

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:12.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.835$ to take this back into the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:31:14.840 --> 00:31:16.820 and we've been thinking, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:16.820 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.496$ about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:31:17.496 --> 00:31:17.834 Also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:31:17.834 --> 00:31:19.862 I'm still very cautious because I

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}31{:}19.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}22.078$ feel that we're in the early going,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:22.080 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.066$ so we still need to know much, much more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:25.066 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.124$ But if you categorize the difference

 $00:31:27.124 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.330$ in therapies in four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}31{:}28.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}30.298$ then you can think about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:30.298 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.282$ use of antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.733$ and that is probably the lowest hanging

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:33.733 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.753$ fruit because those are drugs that

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:35.753 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.867$ we given that we can easily monitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:37.870 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.570$ The second category would be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}31{:}39.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}41.454$ Pre biotics were thinking of there

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:41.454 \longrightarrow 00:31:43.523$ is to maybe give specific nutrients

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}31{:}43.523 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}45.773$ that would help that would feed

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:45.773 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.577$ that would favor texture that

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:47.577 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.545$ we think could be of benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:49.550 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.482$ The one that most people are

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:31:51.482 --> 00:31:53.330 focused on is Pro Biotic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:53.330 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.790$ So now we're talking bout fecal

 $00:31:55.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.430$ transplant engineered microbes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:31:57.495 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.631$ so on and so on and there certainly

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

00:31:59.631 --> 00:32:01.254 with an allergen Aker transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:32:01.254 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.641$ there's a lot of work going on

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:32:03.650 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.932$ within that field and then a fourth

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:32:05.932 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.070$ category would be post biotics so

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}32{:}08.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}10.248$ those could be certain products made.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00:32:10.250 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.590$ By bacteria I mentioned already short

NOTE Confidence: 0.89225054

 $00{:}32{:}12.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}15.128$ chain fatty acids such as a butyrate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:15.130 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.130$ and there are trials going on with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:32:18.130 --> 00:32:20.748 What are we doing at the moment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:20.750 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.630$ Well, as I said already,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:22.630 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.395$ for us the lowest hanging fruit is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:25.395 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.274$ antibiotic stewardship avoids the use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:27.274 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.479$ as much as possible of these broad

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:29.479 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.472$ spectrum antibiotics that do damage

 $00{:}32{:}31.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}33.492$ to the commensal enrolled flora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:33.500 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.908$ So we have a a trial open at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:32:35.908 --> 00:32:38.011 the moment where patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:32:38.011 --> 00:32:40.376 get fever neutropenia will be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:40.380 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.236$ A randomized to either getting our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:43.236 \longrightarrow 00:32:46.277$ standard of care which is piperacillin

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:46.277 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.907$ tazobactam versus cefepime and try

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:48.907 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.287$ to win these patients as quickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00{:}32{:}52.287 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}54.575$ as possible off antibiotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:54.580 \longrightarrow 00:32:57.058$ A second study that we have finished

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:57.058 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.749$ already as an auto fecal transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:32:59.750 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.599$ So the thinking there was when patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00{:}33{:}02.599 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}05.228$ come off antibiotics which is about 14

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:05.228 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.110$ days out from the allergen acre transplants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:33:08.110 --> 00:33:10.679 why don't we give them back their

 $00:33:10.679 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.889$ original flora from pre transplant?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00{:}33{:}12.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.683$ And since this was led by Eric

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:15.683 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.354$ Pamer Ann Young Tower our primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:18.354 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.574$ focus was the prevention of C diff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:21.580 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.950$ So we looked at that mostly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:23.950 \longrightarrow 00:33:27.110$ and as these things go in this series,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:27.110 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.480$ the incidence of a C diff

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:29.480 \longrightarrow 00:33:31.060$ was actually relatively low,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:31.060 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.430$ so we didn't see much there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:33.430 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.915$ But what we did notice is first

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00{:}33{:}35.915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}38.568$ of all that's the concept worked.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:38.570 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.762$ You could indeed this is the pre transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:33:41.762 --> 00:33:44.098 and diversity pattern of a patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:44.100 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.075$ who then was transplant again

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:46.075 \longrightarrow 00:33:48.050$ with an auto fecal transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:48.050 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.070$ and indeed would get pretty

 $00:33:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:33:51.686$ much their own flora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:33:51.690 --> 00:33:54.714 Back so the concept seemed to be working,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:54.720 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.380$ but in terms of clinically relevant outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:33:57.380 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.868$ the only thing that we saw in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:33:59.868 --> 00:34:01.903 very small series was actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:34:01.903 --> 00:34:04.579 something that we weren't counting on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:34:04.580 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.841$ and that is that the activation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:34:06.841 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.754$ certain viruses which commonly happens

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

00:34:08.754 --> 00:34:11.394 within the context of allogeneic transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00{:}34{:}11.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}13.990$ such as CMV and EBV was somewhat

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:34:13.990 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.111$ lower in those patients who have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:34:17.111 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.997$ treated with an auto fecal transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00{:}34{:}20.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}23.290$ Another thing that we notice is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:34:23.290 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.667$ auto fecal transplant seemed to favor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8246579

 $00:34:26.667 \longrightarrow 00:34:29.179$ the engraftment reconstitution of

00:34:29.179 --> 00:34:31.448 neutrophils, lymphocytes and monocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:34:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.748$ A study that we're working on

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:34:35.748 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.654$ that is not open yet is to really

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:34:38.654 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.970$ rationally design A consortia of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:34:41.042 --> 00:34:43.640 bacteria pretty much based upon that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}34{:}43.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}46.237$ we'll that I started out with that

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}34{:}46.237 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}48.659$ whole a cladograms where I indicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}34{:}48.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.724$ how certain flora elements were

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}34{:}50.724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}53.300$ linked to good or bad outcomes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:34:53.300 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.684$ based upon that we have created a

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:34:55.684 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.148$ consortium and we want to give these

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:34:58.148 --> 00:35:00.560 bacteria back again at that time

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:35:00.560 --> 00:35:02.152 point of neutrophil engraftment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:02.160 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.422$ which is about 14 days out

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:04.422 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.553$ from allogeneic transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:05.560 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.096$ As I've said many times by now.

 $00:35:10.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.196$ So with that I would like to stop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.516$ I would like to summarize basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:15.516 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.172$ that what I've been trying to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:18.172 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.580$ you is that changes within the gut

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:20.657 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.255$ flora are linked to overall survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:35:23.260 --> 00:35:25.190 Lethal graft versus host bacteremia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:25.190 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.518$ sepsis, engraftment and even a relapse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}35{:}27.520 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}35{:}30.061$ I gave you a specific story about

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:30.061 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.163$ how the dominance with Enterococcus

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:32.163 \longrightarrow 00:35:34.513$ within the post transplant period

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:35:34.513 --> 00:35:37.419 is linked both in mouse and men

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:37.419 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.199$ to lethal graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}35{:}39.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}41.783$ And I told you about the various

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:41.783 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.095$ factors that we think can have

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:44.095 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.970$ impact on the gut flora,

 $00:35:45.970 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.220$ such as the use of antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:48.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.476$ but also other types of drugs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:35:50.480 \dashrightarrow 00:35:52.104$ diet and conditioning regiments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:35:52.104 --> 00:35:55.626 So with that I would like to of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

00:35:55.626 --> 00:35:58.383 thank all of my funding agencies in my

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}35{:}58.383 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}00.686$ fantastic lap and the many folks who

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:36:00.686 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.010$ we have worked with at other centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:36:03.010 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.971$ So with that I would like to stop and

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00{:}36{:}05.971 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09.258$ I should probably stop sharing also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374

 $00:36:09.260 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.390$ If I can do that? It seems to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83641374 00:36:14.390 --> 00:36:14.790 But NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

00:36:14.790 --> 00:36:17.196 thank you myself for this really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:17.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.295$ really fascinating talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

00:36:18.295 --> 00:36:21.325 I have to say I coming up with

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:21.325 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.695$ questions and was every next step

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00{:}36{:}23.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}26.049$ you answered my first question,

 $00:36:26.050 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.178$ so maybe I can start with one so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00{:}36{:}31.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}34.127$ Right, so you are receiving these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

00:36:34.127 --> 00:36:36.662 for transplant after they have gone

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:36.662 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.068$ through months and months of treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:39.070 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.390$ And have you looked at how you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:42.390 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.218$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

00:36:43.218 --> 00:36:46.068 you know whether patients receive, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00{:}36{:}46.068 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}36{:}48.791$ is decided in or targeted the rapy or

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:48.791 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.099$ chemotherapy before coming to transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:51.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.819$ does that effect?

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

 $00:36:52.819 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.946$ What you see, then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83835495

00:36:54.946 --> 00:36:56.976 in terms of transplant outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:36:56.980 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.608$ yes. So this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:36:58.610 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.645$ of course, where we still

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

00:37:00.645 --> 00:37:02.680 don't have very good data.

 $00:37:02.680 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.235$ We do have some collection also of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:05.235 \longrightarrow 00:37:07.570$ samples from patients before transplant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:07.570 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.749$ specifically with AML.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:08.749 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.340$ We see a bit of the same patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:12.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.482$ but it hasn't been analyzed that well

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:14.482 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.143$ yet that we see with allogeneic bone

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:17.143 \dashrightarrow 00:37:19.238$ marrow transplantation that an AML

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

00:37:19.238 --> 00:37:21.196 patient getting in induction regiment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:21.196 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.074$ will have the same pattern of the loss

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:24.074 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.066$ of a diversity dominance with certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00{:}37{:}26.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}28.579$ tax are specifically with with again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

00:37:28.580 --> 00:37:28.949 Enterococcus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:28.949 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.270$ but we need much more work to analyze that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:32.270 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.108$ and as I hinted at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

00:37:34.110 --> 00:37:36.595 almost every drug that they might have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:36.595 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.647$ seen in the year prior to a transplant,

00:37:39.650 --> 00:37:40.050 potentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00{:}37{:}40.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}42.450$ Could have impacted on their floor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8748975

 $00:37:42.450 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.410$ so it's very worthwhile to look at that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81575745

 $00:37:46.260 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.732$ OK, awe some. So we have questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.81575745

00:37:48.732 --> 00:37:51.339 from the audience from Lucas Cauda,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81575745

00:37:51.340 --> 00:37:53.860 who says great talk in his first

NOTE Confidence: 0.81575745

 $00:37:53.860 \longrightarrow 00:37:56.949$ question is how well does this correlate

NOTE Confidence: 0.81575745

 $00:37:56.949 \longrightarrow 00:37:59.364$ with a mino acid magic biomarkers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.81575745

00:37:59.370 --> 00:38:01.490 Rank 3 S, T2, etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

00:38:04.640 --> 00:38:07.028 So as you know, since you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:07.028 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.620$ know about these markets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00{:}38{:}08.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}11.329$ then you know of course those are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00{:}38{:}11.329 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.759$ the markets that have been developed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:13.759 \dashrightarrow 00:38:16.524$ by Jamie by Jamie Ferrara an he

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:16.606 \longrightarrow 00:38:18.976$ is doing these kind of studies

00:38:18.976 --> 00:38:21.356 with Ernst Holler at the moment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:21.356 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.140$ within the context of the Magic Consortium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:24.140 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.528$ and I haven't seen direct connections

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

00:38:26.528 --> 00:38:28.124 yet between, for instance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:28.124 \longrightarrow 00:38:30.506$ which would be really interested rectally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

00:38:30.510 --> 00:38:31.728 gamma and form.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:31.728 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.164$ So those are the studies that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:34.170 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.181$ They are doing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:35.181 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.249$ but I haven't seen any data from them yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.356$ We have only very limited data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:40.356 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.148$ because we haven't used that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8281397

 $00:38:42.148 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.367$ panel that they are using so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043221

 $00:38:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.739$ OK, awe some and I'm gonna read you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043221

 $00{:}38{:}46.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}48.615$ The second question from Lewis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043221

 $00:38:48.615 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.490$ is one of our transplanters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8043221

 $00:38:50.490 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.356$ Is the New York poupan commercialized

 $00:38:52.356 \longrightarrow 00:38:53.990$ for other sites to study?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:38:55.590 --> 00:38:58.990 The New York School bank. Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:38:58.990 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.118$ we we don't have a New York school bank.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:02.118 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.639$ I wish actually that we have one

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:04.639 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.810$ and the one that most people have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:39:06.810 --> 00:39:09.446 used is open open Biome and I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:09.446 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.542$ just reading that they might have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}11.542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}13.702$ some trouble and that they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:13.702 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.089$ closing and that is a company and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:16.089 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.003$ not for profit company in Boston.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}18.003 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}20.194$ So that's where a lot of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:39:20.194 --> 00:39:22.108 have been getting flora from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}22.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}24.784$ We at the moment are working with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}24.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26.917$ some companies also and I put

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:26.917 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.038$ didn't put that into my slide 2.

 $00:39:29.040 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.280$ Potentially do a sequel transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}31.280 \longrightarrow 00{:}39{:}34.330$ for Graft versus host and you might

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:34.330 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.892$ have seen very small as series from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:36.892 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.192$ all over the world where people

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:39.192 \longrightarrow 00:39:41.625$ have tried that for steroids or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:39:41.625 --> 00:39:43.245 refractory graft versus host.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}43.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}45.686$ They would do a fecal transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}45.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}47.494$ Different concepts sometimes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}39{:}47.494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}51.058$ you just do a normal donor or even

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:39:51.058 --> 00:39:53.404 one company is sponsoring a trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:53.404 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.836$ where they take a whole bunch of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:55.840 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.864$ healthy healthy folks and literally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:57.864 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.958$ mix all of the feces.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:39:59.960 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.745$ And give One Giants and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:01.745 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.816$ transplants with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:02.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.654$ and they seem to have some benefit,

 $00:40:05.654 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.269$ so there is a lot of focus at the moment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}40{:}09.269 \to 00{:}40{:}12.407$ on doing fecal transplant for steroids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:12.410 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.798$ Refractory graft versus host and with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:40:14.798 --> 00:40:17.000 small series showing showing benefits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}40{:}17.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}19.745$ but we need much more work and I want

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:19.745 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.338$ to emphasize that there are also

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:22.338 \longrightarrow 00:40:25.116$ risks because we all realize you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:40:25.116 --> 00:40:27.556 dealing with patients where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:27.556 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.022$ gut barrier is negatively impacted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:30.022 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.070$ by the conditioning regiment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}40{:}32.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}34.942$ I'm so any kind of bacteria that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:34.942 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.387$ give there have a higher likelihood

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00{:}40{:}37.387 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}40{:}355$ to pass the gut Scott Barrier and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:40.355 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.827$ you might know of the negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:42.827 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.784$ outcomes that we're seeing with

 $00:40:44.784 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.569$ some of these fecal transplants

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:40:46.569 --> 00:40:48.608 where the product wasn't carefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:48.608 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.868$ screened enough for certain bacteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:50.870 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.732$ which led to two patients getting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

00:40:53.732 --> 00:40:56.949 seriously ill and one of them dying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:56.950 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.455$ So there there are a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8375062

 $00:40:58.455 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.120$ a lot of risks there, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8816916

 $00:41:01.690 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.790$ Then you have a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8816916

 $00:41:02.790 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.316$ Do you want to ask it directly?

NOTE Confidence: 0.73999095

 $00:41:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.660$ Hi, fantastic talk thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73999095

 $00{:}41{:}10.660 \longrightarrow 00{:}41{:}13.124$ Do you see similar effects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8718298

00:41:13.130 --> 00:41:15.660 microbiome in auto transplants?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:15.660 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.593$ Yeah, so I showed some of the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:18.593 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.308$ So for autotransplant we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:20.308 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.690$ the same drop in the diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:22.690 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.170$ again starting immediately and

 $00:41:24.170 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.390$ we see also links to outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

00:41:26.390 --> 00:41:27.542 So for instance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

00:41:27.542 --> 00:41:29.846 for myeloma we could very nicely

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:29.846 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.857$ see that patients with a with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:31.857 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.304$ less of a loss in their diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

00:41:34.304 --> 00:41:36.746 would have better PFS and OS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:36.750 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.080$ so that that seems to be a real benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.670$ All of this needs to be studied

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

00:41:42.670 --> 00:41:45.293 in much more detail because now of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

00:41:45.293 --> 00:41:47.198 course you're talking about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:47.200 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.558$ Order whatever transplants are not talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:49.558 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.318$ about a graft versus host or something.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:52.320 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.313$ Things like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:53.313 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.630$ but there are signals there that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8167996

 $00:41:55.693 \longrightarrow 00:41:57.837$ absolutely worthwhile studying for.

 $00:42:00.300 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.520$ Now, so I think it's it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:02.520 \longrightarrow 00:42:04.390$ fascinating where that in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:04.468 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.853$ population you are studying the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:06.853 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.238$ immune system so intricately and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:09.240 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.860$ And can some of this work

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:10.860 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.940$ trying to be transplanted?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:11.940 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.675$ You know their translator to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:13.675 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.750$ patients who are not in the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00{:}42{:}15.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}17.755$ Transplant setting in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:17.755 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.359$ you know immune interaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00{:}42{:}19.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.766$ I think you were mentioning the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8480624

 $00:42:21.766 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.370$ the effects on immunotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:25.150 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.446$ So I think that is of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:27.446 \longrightarrow 00:42:29.867$ where a number of companies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:42:29.867 --> 00:42:32.573 number of centers and number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:32.573 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.629$ scientists are going with this.

00:42:34.630 --> 00:42:36.850 The general concept being that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}42{:}36.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}38.980$ gut flora can modulate immunity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:38.980 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.080$ which it almost has to write

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:42:41.080 --> 00:42:43.002 because you're in a constant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:43.002 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.690$ interaction there with God for us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:45.690 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.826$ So it's very clear that T cell repertoire

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:42:48.826 --> 00:42:51.645 and activation of innate cells is very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:51.645 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.379$ much modulated by changes within the floor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:54.380 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.619$ That is obvious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:55.619 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.684$ So people have taken this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:42:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.154$ of course within the field of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:00.154 \longrightarrow 00:43:02.089$ checkpoint blockade much much further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:02.090 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.826$ You might know there was a back

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:03.826 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.941$ to back to back science articles

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:05.941 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.689$ demonstrating that certain compositions

 $00:43:07.689 \longrightarrow 00:43:10.713$ of the flora were linked to better

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}43{:}10.713 \to 00{:}43{:}12.365$ outcomes with checkpoint blockade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:12.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:14.200$ foreign Melanoma and so on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:14.200 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.395$ and that has led to a series of trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:17.395 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.070$ that are going on at the moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:20.070 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.060$ It has also and I always tell that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}43{:}23.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}26.000$ story because I want to warn people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:26.000 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.289$ It has led to negative outcomes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}43{:}28.289 \to 00{:}43{:}31.515$ what I mean by that is that because so

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:31.515 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.009$ many patients heard about these stories?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:43:34.010 --> 00:43:36.558 Oh, you can do something with microbiome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:36.560 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.735$ and my checkpoint therapy is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:38.735 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.475$ going to go better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:43:40.480 --> 00:43:43.078 They went to their own pharmacy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:43:43.080 --> 00:43:45.690 They started to buy local Pro,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:43:45.690 --> 00:43:46.083 Pro,

00:43:46.083 --> 00:43:48.834 Biotic and Drugs etc and A and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:43:48.834 --> 00:43:51.398 a scientist at Anderson had

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:51.398 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.646$ actually carefully analyzed it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:53.650 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.620$ And found that those people

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:43:55.620 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.345$ who did do it do it yourself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:00.350 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.710$ Probiotics had worse outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:01.710 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.730$ from their check.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:02.730 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.090$ One blockades then patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:04.090 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.450$ who didn't do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}44{:}05.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}08.242$ So there are certain dangers and I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}44{:}08.242 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}10.847$ we have to warn people also about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}44{:}10.847 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}13.973$ This is not sort of a free for all and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:13.973 \longrightarrow 00:44:17.005$ and we still need to understand much more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:17.010 \longrightarrow 00:44:18.710$ What are the dietary elements?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:18.710 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.750$ What are the bacteria that really

00:44:20.750 --> 00:44:22.110 matter for certain outcomes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00{:}44{:}22.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}23.915$ As I illustrated also simply

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:23.915 \longrightarrow 00:44:26.460$ telling people to eat a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:26.460 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.458$ fruit well in certain context it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

 $00:44:28.458 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.660$ might be a bad thing actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8356063

00:44:30.660 --> 00:44:31.770 Who would have thought that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:44:33.360 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.650$ Dance, it's understand the questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

00:44:35.650 --> 00:44:38.494 I think it's fascinating that cross

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

00:44:38.494 --> 00:44:41.598 centers you know in in the world,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:44:41.600 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.545$ whereas diet is probably quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00{:}44{:}43.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}46.144$ different that you have such homogeneous

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:44:46.144 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.468$ or similar starting populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

00:44:48.470 --> 00:44:51.676 Yeah, yeah, that we found very fascinating,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

00:44:51.680 --> 00:44:54.416 right? I mean, you're talking with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:44:54.416 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.628$ patients from by iron versus the North

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

00:44:57.630 --> 00:45:00.836 of and of Japan, and you would

 $00:45:00.840 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.832$ really think the diets

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:02.832 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.326$ are completely different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:04.330 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.766$ And they will go into these transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:06.766 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.200$ with completely different flora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.600$ But as I mentioned during my talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:45:12.840$ also, we really think that that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.114$ because most of these people have

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:15.114 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.999$ injured microbiomes to start with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

00:45:17.000 --> 00:45:19.406 They come, they come into transplant

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:19.406 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.927$ already having steam for a year or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:21.930 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.690$ So many drugs and antibiotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7930988

 $00:45:23.690 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.147$ That is probably why it's so simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783098002857143

 $00{:}45{:}28.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}29.650$ Something something so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783098002857143

00:45:29.650 --> 00:45:32.994 Do you have a? Do you have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.783098002857143

 $00:45:32.994 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.724$ suggestion of a simple measure?

 $00:45:34.730 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.707$ So we ask our hospital to change the diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783098002857143

 $00:45:39.710 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.398$ What food is served in the cafeteria?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783098002857143 00:45:42.400 --> 00:45:43.549 Well, I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:45:43.550 \longrightarrow 00:45:45.405$ first of all, when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:45:45.405 \longrightarrow 00:45:47.770$ started to look at the diet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

00:45:47.770 --> 00:45:51.226 I don't know how it is at your center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:45:51.230 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.920$ But on our transplants floor we it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

00:45:53.920 --> 00:45:56.599 almost like an like an ICU, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:45:56.599 \longrightarrow 00:45:58.873$ We have such detailed data about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:45:58.873 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.423$ everything finals every eight

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00{:}46{:}00.423 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}46{:}02.168$ hours and daily chemistries

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:02.168 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.290$ and blood counts and everything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:04.290 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.594$ But when it comes to what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:06.594 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.130$ do patients actually eat?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:08.130 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.506$ Most of what we saw is?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

00:46:10.510 --> 00:46:12.694 Eight half sandwich or something like that,

 $00:46:12.700 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.578$ so we have no detail about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

00:46:14.578 --> 00:46:15.830 what we're actually eating,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:15.830 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.860$ so I think that is a moment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:17.860 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.590$ where we need to operate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:19.590 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.790$ We need to take that a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00{:}46{:}21.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}23.778$ more serious now that we know that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:23.778 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.054$ it's a major factor that can have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:26.054 \longrightarrow 00:46:27.730$ impacts on microbiome microbiome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00{:}46{:}27.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}30.860$ I hope that you got that out of this lecture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:30.860 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.420$ Really seems to impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:32.420 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.356$ clinically relevant outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:33.360 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.397$ so that's one of the things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00{:}46{:}35.397 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}37.339$ I'm trying to fight for within

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00{:}46{:}37.339 --> 00{:}46{:}39.304$ our hospital so that we take

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:39.304 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.254$ that a little bit more serious.

00:46:41.254 --> 00:46:44.390 We really need to know what our patients eat,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

00:46:44.390 --> 00:46:46.826 not just nurses scribbling down like well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:46.830 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.524$ at something,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:47.524 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.540$ and then we can learn a lot from it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:50.540 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.400$ And then we need to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.308$ in much more detail which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297896

 $00:46:54.308 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.218$ of dietary elements do what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:46:57.500 --> 00:46:58.604 OK, that's that's fascinating,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00{:}46{:}58.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}01.079$ so I'm not going to get more questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:01.080 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.340$ so I get to have all the questions in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00{:}47{:}03.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}05.548$ entire conversation here for every body.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:05.550 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.671$ But you know that that seems like

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:07.671 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.791$ a fantastic project where you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:09.791 --> 00:47:11.706 potentially engage the patient right

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:11.706 --> 00:47:14.093 in documenting using Epic using. Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:14.093 \longrightarrow 00:47:19.340$ I maybe maybe we close on the House and.

 $00:47:19.340 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.452$ Maybe a fantastic collaboration

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:20.452 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.410$ that we would could then do with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:22.410 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.801$ You have to do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:23.801 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.172$ Take that epic interface and

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:25.172 --> 00:47:27.150 put it to use for patient care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:27.150 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.207$ That'd be wonderful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:28.207 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.698$ Thank you awe some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00{:}47{:}29.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}31.686$ So we're not getting more questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:31.686 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.679$ you have answered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:32.680 --> 00:47:34.550 Everybody's questions so thank you

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00{:}47{:}34.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}37.196$ so much again for giving a fantastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:37.196 --> 00:47:39.326 talk and you certainly have my

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:39.326 --> 00:47:41.620 mind spinning and I don't know if I

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:41.620 --> 00:47:44.191 should drink on my ginger tea now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:44.191 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.776$ Let's see how that goes.

 $00{:}47{:}46.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}48.840$ OK, thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

00:47:48.840 --> 00:47:50.070 Much is great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842861

 $00:47:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.808$ Thank you.