WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:00:49" NOTE recognizability:0.882

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:02.471$ Today we have two speakers and our

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

00:00:02.471 --> 00:00:04.780 first speaker is Michaela Dine-in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.292$ who's an associate professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:06.292 \longrightarrow 00:00:08.560$ Epidemiology and Co leader of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

00:00:08.623 --> 00:00:10.858 Yale Cancer Center Cancer Prevention

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00{:}00{:}10.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}12.646$ and Control Research program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:12.650 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.736$ She joined us from Duke University last

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00{:}00{:}14.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}17.773$ year and is a Health Sciences features

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

00:00:17.773 --> 00:00:19.853 researcher specializing in using

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:19.853 \longrightarrow 00:00:21.837$ epidemiological methodologies to study

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00{:}00{:}21.837 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}24.027$ complex datasets with particular expertise

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:24.027 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.135$ and leveraging existing real-world

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:26.135 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.060$ datasets to examine cancer outcomes.

00:00:30.060 --> 00:00:33.390 Is also a leading researcher lean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:33.390 \longrightarrow 00:00:35.550$ and then I NCI funded study

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:35.550 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.026$ looking at health disparities

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

00:00:37.026 --> 00:00:38.916 in patients with kidney cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:38.920 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.108$ And so I think we'll hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:40.108 \longrightarrow 00:00:41.220$ about some of that today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

00:00:41.220 --> 00:00:42.990 So Michaela welcome and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.820927715833333

 $00:00:42.990 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.760$ have to have to unmute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921427352857143

00:00:48.230 --> 00:00:50.498 Great, just pulling up my slides here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:00:52.970 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.553$ OK, looks like we're ready to rock and roll.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}00{:}55.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}58.248$ Alright so thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:00:58.250 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.432$ Good afternoon everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:00:59.432 \longrightarrow 00:01:02.190$ I'm actually in Chicago right now and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:02.261 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.486$ attending the Astro annual meeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:01:04.490 --> 00:01:06.787 So technically it's still morning here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}01{:}06.787 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}08.569$ but either way I'm delighted to

00:01:08.569 --> 00:01:10.566 be speaking with you today so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:01:10.566 --> 00:01:12.750 Uhm, as was mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:12.750 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.605$ I'm a health outcomes researcher by training

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:14.605 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.845$ and I can bucket my current research

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:01:16.845 --> 00:01:18.590 projects into three broad categories,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:01:18.590 --> 00:01:21.470 including emerging technology in oncology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:01:21.470 --> 00:01:22.041 survivorship,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}01{:}22.041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.896$ and patient outcomes and molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8713450022222222

00:01:24.896 --> 00:01:26.609 oncology outcomes research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}01{:}26.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}28.335$ But the running theme throughout

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:28.335 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.060$ these example projects is leveraging

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}01{:}30.115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}32.145$ real-world data to answer questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}01{:}32.145 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}33.363$ about dissemination outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:33.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.432$ costs and disparities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:34.432 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.556$ and how I think about answering

 $00:01:36.556 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.690$ these types of questions using

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:38.690 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.980$ real-world data resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:39.980 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.140$ So what is the value added?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:01:45.116$ Of health outcomes research and while

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:01:45.120 --> 00:01:46.974 RCT's are considered higher up in

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:46.974 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.327$ the food chain than cohort and case

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}01{:}49.327 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51.077$ control studies in the traditional

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:51.077 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.479$ levels of evidence pyramid shown here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8713450022222222

 $00:01:53.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:55.124$ there are many types of questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:55.124 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.734$ that are not feasible to examine

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:56.734 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.114$ in the context of a trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:01:58.120 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.829$ but that are feasible within health outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:00.830 --> 00:02:01.584 study methodologies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:01.584 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.223$ and here are some examples of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:04.223 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.312$ types of questions we can answer about

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}02{:}07.312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}09.072$ emerging diagnostics and the rapeutics

 $00{:}02{:}09.144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}11.160$ using real-world data resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:11.160 --> 00:02:12.800 Randomized trials are required.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:12.800 --> 00:02:15.260 Approval of a novel therapeutic agent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:15.260 --> 00:02:17.230 but approvals of diagnostics and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}02{:}17.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}19.200$ other biomarkers are more complex

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:19.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.168$ and not always evaluated by ARC.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:21.170 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.425$ Prior to their approval or

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:23.425 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.778$ coverage by insurance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:24.780 --> 00:02:27.230 However, even for therapeutic agents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}02{:}27.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}29.590$ initial approvals often arise from

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:29.590 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.950$ RCT comparisons with another single

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}02{:}32.025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34.150$ treatment which may be outdated

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}02{:}34.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}36.275$ by the time approvals received.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222 00:02:36.280 --> 00:02:37.106 In reality, NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:37.106 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.758$ more and more cancers.

 $00:02:38.760 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.515$ Have increasing numbers of possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:40.515 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.919$ treatment options and combinations

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:41.919 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.909$ and it's just not feasible to

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:43.909 --> 00:02:45.181 examine all possible treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:02:45.181 --> 00:02:46.778 strategies in a head-to-head fashion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:46.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.640$ and oftentimes there's honestly

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:48.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.500$ not adequate financial incentives

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:50.500 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.229$ to support such trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8713450022222222

 $00:02:52.230 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.764$ We also know that patients who participate

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:54.764 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.798$ in RCT's differ systematically from

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}02{:}56.798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}58.883$ the average real world patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:02:58.890 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.504$ where life and treatment is just

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:03:00.504 --> 00:03:02.886 a lot messier as compared to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}02.886 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04.554$ highly curated patient population

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:04.554 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.410$ and controlled environment of an RCT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:06.410 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.730$ And this is an example study,

 $00:03:07.730 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.949$ not mine of a patient of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}09.949 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}12.144$ with primary CNS lymphoma treated at

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}12.144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}14.502$ the same institution who received the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:14.502 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.180$ same treatment both on and off protocol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:17.180 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.720$ and the investigators showed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:18.720 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.958$ patients who were treated in the real

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:20.958 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.558$ world practice meaning off protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222 00:03:22.560 --> 00:03:23.244 Or older,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}23.244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}25.296$ sicker had worse disease and had

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}25.296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}26.698$ dramatically worse survival than

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:26.698 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.348$ the patients who were treated

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:28.348 \longrightarrow 00:03:29.740$ on the clinical trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}29.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}31.450$ So here I have presented an

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:31.450 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.926$ overview of many different types

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:32.926 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.126$ of data that can be used to conduct

 $00:03:35.126 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.780$ real-world health outcomes research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:36.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.484$ and what I really want to drive home

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:38.484 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.291$ is that it's important to remind folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:40.291 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.449$ that there is no perfect single data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:42.450 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.388$ But by leveraging the major strengths

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

00:03:44.388 --> 00:03:45.980 and weaknesses of different data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:45.980 \longrightarrow 00:03:47.400$ different types of datasets

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:47.400 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.820$ as they currently exist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:48.820 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.048$ or improving upon them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:50.048 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.520$ we can answer some pretty cool questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00{:}03{:}52.520 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}03{:}54.002$ So this is an example of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871345002222222

 $00:03:54.002 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.990$ a past fully completed

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:03:55.051 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.158$ study that I conducted in breast cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:03:57.160 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.805$ and this was a five year study

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:03:58.805 \longrightarrow 00:03:59.969$ that was funded by AHRQ.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:03:59.970 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.410$ Where we were looking at adoption,

 $00:04:01.410 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.858$ chemotherapy, use and costs

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}02.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}04.306$ associated with Oncotype DX,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}04.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}07.040$ in brand and breast cancer and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:07.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.510$ lot has changed in the subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:04:08.510 --> 00:04:10.210 years since this work was completed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:10.210 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.130$ but at the time in CC and guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:04:12.130 --> 00:04:13.285 Recommended consideration of

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}13.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.595$ chemotherapy and all of early stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}15.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}17.506$ disease patients with primary tumors

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:17.506 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.346$ greater than one centimeter node.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}19.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.882$ Negative ER positive disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:20.882 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.414$ and patients characteristics that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}22.414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}24.110$ were consistent with chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}24.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}25.951$ Candidacy and uncle Type DX was still

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:04:25.951 --> 00:04:27.889 relatively new to the scene at this time,

 $00:04:27.890 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.989$ and no one had looked at its

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:04:28.989 --> 00:04:30.170 use in real world population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235 00:04:30.170 --> 00:04:30.870 Case studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:30.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.970$ So let's consider the gaps in

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:32.970 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.948$ knowledge that existed at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:34.950 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.900$ so we know that randomized trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:36.900 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.567$ had confirmed the prognostic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:04:38.567 --> 00:04:40.137 predictive value of Oncotype DX,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:40.140 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.324$ and there had been some single

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:42.324 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.780$ institution series that suggested

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:43.840 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.484$ that decreased chemotherapy was

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:45.484 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.539$ associated with archetype DX use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235 00:04:47.540 --> 00:04:47.955 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:47.955 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.030$ there hadn't been any nationally

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:50.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.275$ representative studies conducted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:51.280 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.212$ There were still questions about whether

 $00:04:53.212 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.535$ or not the adoption and diffusion of

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}04{:}55.535 \to 00{:}04{:}57.497$ Archetype DX was being done equitably

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:57.497 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.916$ across different subgroups in the population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:04:59.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:01.045$ and there are questions about

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:01.045 \longrightarrow 00:05:01.720$ the impact that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:05:01.720 --> 00:05:03.628 Architect DX was having on chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:03.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.440$ utilizations and costs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:04.440 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.520$ In the real world.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235 00:05:05.520 --> 00:05:06.064 And finally, NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}06.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}07.696$ there was limited data on patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:07.696 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.238$ who are 65 years and older.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}09.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}11.180$ Because these were underrepresented

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:05:11.180 --> 00:05:14.090 in any of the child data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:14.090 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.036$ So in thinking about the types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:16.036 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.158$ questions about architects that

00:05:17.158 --> 00:05:18.586 I was interested in looking at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}18.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}20.930$ I chose to use the seer Medicare linked data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:20.930 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.940$ which combines the detailed clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:22.940 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.950$ pathologic data from this year

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:25.015 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.615$ registry with the LOGITUDINAL

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}26.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}28.615$ claims from the Medicare data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}28.620 \longrightarrow 00{:}05{:}30.650$ So we use the Medicare claims portion

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.037$ of the SEER Medicare data to detect the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}33.037 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}35.799$ use of Oncotype DX in our study population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:35.800 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.210$ Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}36.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38.630$ there was no specific CPT procedure

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:38.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.110$ code for Oncotype DX.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235 00:05:40.110 --> 00:05:40.980 In fact, NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:05:40.980 --> 00:05:44.971 the test is build using the CPT code 84999.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:44.971 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.526$ Defined as unlisted chemistry procedure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235 00:05:47.530 --> 00:05:47.907 However,

 $00:05:47.907 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.169$ using the knowledge that all Oncotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}50.169 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}52.570$ DX tests are processed by single

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}05{:}52.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54.570$ provider in a single location,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.714$ we were able to use an algorithm to

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:05:56.714 --> 00:05:59.005 detect the archetypes DX code in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:05:59.005 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.695$ Medicare claims data and confirm

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:00.761 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.085$ that all tests were performed by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}06{:}03.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05.305$ same single provider from the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:05.305 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.993$ single location with 95% of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:06:07.993 --> 00:06:10.753 tests having identical payment of \$3414.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:10.753 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.571$ So this was considered a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:12.571 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.020$ creative approach at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:14.020 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.370$ Again, this was a while ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:15.370 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.734$ and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

00:06:15.734 --> 00:06:17.190 And I believe ultimately,

 $00:06:17.190 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.690$ this creative approach is what

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:18.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.890$ got the study funded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:19.890 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.540$ but I've seen this approach recreated

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:21.540 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.209$ for other diagnostics many times signs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:23.210 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.055$ And this is just a side note to suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:25.055 \longrightarrow 00:06:27.076$ that if you can think of novel ways to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:27.076 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.910$ data that have been around a long time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:28.910 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.310$ you can still make real

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:30.310 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.430$ contributions to the field.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:31.430 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.865$ Interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00{:}06{:}31.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}34.475$ the Seer Medicare data now actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:34.475 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.453$ includes the Oncotype DX rescored

NOTE Confidence: 0.932342130588235

 $00:06:36.453 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.265$ data in the data set itself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}06{:}38.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}40.094$ but back then this data was

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:06:40.094 --> 00:06:41.006 not publicly available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:06:41.010 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.599$ so we were only able to detect

 $00:06:42.599 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.888$ receipt of testing at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}06{:}43.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}45.994$ but did not know what the test results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:06:46.000 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.168$ Actually were so we were able to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:06:48.168 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.156$ that archetype decks used in the real

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:06:50.156 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.960$ world increased over the study period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:06:51.960 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.192$ particularly with in the younger age

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:06:54.192 --> 00:06:56.720 group in the SEER Medicare data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}06{:}56.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58.488$ And since the use of Oncotype DX was

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:06:58.488 \longrightarrow 00:07:00.232$ supposed to inform whether or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:07:00.232 --> 00:07:01.480 a patient received chemotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.448$ we wanted to see how often the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:03.448 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.449$ use of diagnostic or sorry we wanted

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}05.449 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08.081$ to see how the use of the diagnostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:08.081 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.325$ was impacting the use of chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:10.330 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.930$ And here we can see that in patients

 $00:07:11.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.179$ who would traditionally be considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}13.179 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}15.479$ high risk due to their tumor size or stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:15.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.364$ that chemotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:07:16.364 --> 00:07:18.574 He's appeared to decline following

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:18.574 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.939$ the introduction of architect Deacs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:20.940 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.140$ So in multivariable analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:22.140 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.354$ we did not see an overall association

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:24.354 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.129$ between receipt of Archetype DX

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:26.129 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.549$ and receipt of chemo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 00:07:27.550 --> 00:07:27.912 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}27.912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.084$ we did see that patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}30.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32.008$ clinical markers of more aggressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:32.008 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.928$ disease such as tumor size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:33.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.253$ grade and NCCN,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}35.253 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}37.899$ defined clinical pathologic risk had an

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:37.899 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.449$ increased likelihood of receiving chemo.

 $00:07:40.450 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.700$ The most nuanced and interesting finding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 00:07:42.700 --> 00:07:43.095 however, NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:43.095 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.860$ was that when we looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:45.860 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.927$ interaction between receipt of Oncotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:47.927 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.339$ DX and NCCN defined clinical risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 00:07:50.340 --> 00:07:51.558 we saw that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:07:51.558 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.994$ Receipt of Oncotype DX was associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}53.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.314$ with decreased chemo in NCCN

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}56.314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}58.604$ high risk patients and increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}07{:}58.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}01.138$ chemo and NCCN low risk patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:01.140 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.340$ So at the time it was a foregone

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:03.340 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.361$ conclusion by many that the use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}05.361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07.909$ Oncotype DX would not only be cost effective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:08:07.910 --> 00:08:09.918 but also costs saving.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 00:08:09.918 --> 00:08:10.420 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 $00:08:10.420 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.520$ there was a meta analysis of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:12.520 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.057$ ability of AC type DX to reduce costs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:15.060 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.698$ and it revealed that there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:16.698 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.643$ a wide range in the perceived

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:18.643 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.628$ benefit cost benefits of archetype

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:20.628 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.360$ deacs according to weather.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:22.360 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.216$ A study had been funded by Genomic Health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.998$ The sponsor, which is those studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}27.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}28.876$ are shown in blue on this graph.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:28.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.620$ As opposed to other funding sources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:30.620 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.168$ So interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:32.168 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.146$ the five studies that suggested

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:35.146 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.114$ Archetype DX was cost saving were

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}37.114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}38.830$ all funded by genomic health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 $00:08:38.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.180$ Ultimately, NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222 $00:08:39.180 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.530$ however,

 $00:08:39.530 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.980$ these were all modeling studies and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:41.980 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.185$ wanted to try to look at real-world data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:44.190 \longrightarrow 00:08:45.162$ so this is important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:45.162 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.377$ because when you look closely

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:46.377 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.700$ at these modeling studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:47.700 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.138$ 18 of them assume that T stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:51.138 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.800$ and tumor grade had no impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:08:52.866 --> 00:08:54.339 on chemotherapy decisions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}54.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}55.964$ which we clearly saw in the data

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}55.964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}57.380$ I showed previously was not the

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}57.380 --> 00{:}08{:}58.495$ case in our real-world data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:08:58.500 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.788$ and only five studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}08{:}59.788 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}09{:}01.398$ Accounting for the fact that

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}09{:}01.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}03.211$ architect at DX testing might

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:09:03.211 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.647$ actually increase chemotherapy use

 $00:09:04.647 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.370$ in clinically low risk patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}09{:}06.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}08.218$ So what did we find when we looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}09{:}08.218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}09.702$ at costs associated with Oncotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:09:09.702 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.634$ DX in the real world setting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

00:09:11.640 --> 00:09:13.789 So the main takeaway lesson was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:09:13.789 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.991$ the impact of these tests depends

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:09:15.991 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.016$ strongly on the patient population

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}09{:}18.016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}20.444$ and pretest likelihood that a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:09:20.444 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.766$ was going to get chemotherapy anyway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00:09:22.770 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.080$ So in patients who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.921729892222222

 $00{:}09{:}24.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}25.390$ planned for chemo or high

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:09:25.450 --> 00:09:27.868 risk patients, Oncotype DX can

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}09{:}27.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}30.923$ can reduce costs, chemo and costs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:09:30.923 --> 00:09:33.228 However, for lower intermediate patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.390$ there is no evidence that Oncotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}09{:}35.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}37.750$ DX will reduce costs in actuality.

 $00:09:37.750 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.018$ And it's it's use is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:40.018 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.480$ associated with higher non cancer costs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:42.480 \longrightarrow 00:09:44.685$ likely due to just general

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:09:44.685 --> 00:09:46.449 overall increased health care

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:46.449 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.190$ utilization in this population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:09:48.190 --> 00:09:50.178 And then finally using these same data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:50.180 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.399$ we were able to look at questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:52.399 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.170$ regarding what physician or provider

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:54.170 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.304$ characteristics were associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}09{:}55.304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}57.703$ with the use of archetype DX and

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:57.703 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.694$ what we saw was that about 70% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:09:59.694 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.279$ patients who were receiving Oncotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}10{:}01.279 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}03.882$ DX had the Oncotype DX test ordered

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}10{:}03.882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}05.470$ by their medical oncologists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

00:10:05.470 --> 00:10:07.566 But we were also able to look at

 $00:10:07.566 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.585$ factors physician characteristics

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:08.585 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.785$ that were associated with increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:10.785 --> 00:10:12.545 likelihood of receiving Oncotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:12.603 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.360$ DX and these were having been seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:14.360 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.836$ by a surgical oncologist having

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:15.836 --> 00:10:17.984 been seen having had your surgery

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}10{:}17.984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}20.269$ at an academic Medical Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:20.270 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.769$ Having been treated by a female medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}10{:}22.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24.882$ on cologist and having been treated by

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:24.882 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.844$ a medical oncologist who was within

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}10{:}26.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}29.229$ five years of finishing their training.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:29.230 --> 00:10:31.330 So I'm going to move on to my next example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:31.330 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.185$ which is from my current NCI funded

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:33.185 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.358 R$ 01 where we are examining access

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:35.358 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.332$ and adherence to oral anti cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:37.390 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.502$ agents and drivers of real world

 $00:10:39.502 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.355$ disparities in patients with metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:41.355 --> 00:10:42.690 renal cell carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:42.690 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.090$ As is the case in many cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:46.090 --> 00:10:48.792 the number of available therapies for kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:48.792 --> 00:10:50.755 cancers have expanded dramatically over

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:50.755 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.707$ the past decade and a half and interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:53.710 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.946$ ten of these therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:54.946 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.491$ ten of the therapies approved

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:10:56.491 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.300$ between 2005 and 2016.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

 $00:10:58.300 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.800$ Of those 10.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:10:59.800 --> 00:11:01.912 Seven of them were oral agents and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:01.912 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.478$ can use real world data to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:04.478 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.212$ issues pertaining to patients ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}11{:}06.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08.718$ to access and then stay adherent to

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:11:08.718 --> 00:11:10.480 these potentially lifesaving drugs.

00:11:10.480 --> 00:11:12.040 So once again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}11{:}12.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}13.992$ let's take a look at what what was

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00{:}11{:}13.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}15.394$ known versus the knowledge gaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

 $00:11:15.394 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.110$ surrounding a a use in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.798$ with kidney cancer at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:18.800 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.912$ So we know we knew that oral anti

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:11:20.912 --> 00:11:23.080 cancer agents and we know that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:23.080 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.056$ pose unique challenges to delivery and

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:25.056 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.084$ also there was clinical trial data

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:11:27.084 --> 00:11:28.582 that showed increased progression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:28.582 \longrightarrow 00:11:30.992$ free survival and overall survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:30.992 \longrightarrow 00:11:33.349$ for several different ways and

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:33.349 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.897$ typically always have shown to have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:35.897 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.617$ more favorable toxicity profile than

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:38.617 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.537$ traditional cytotoxic chemotherapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:40.540 \longrightarrow 00:11:41.650$ However their continued.

 $00:11:41.650 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.870$ To be gaps in the knowledge

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:43.870 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.379$ around whether outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:45.380 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.540$ what outcomes and toxicities looked like

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:11:47.540 --> 00:11:50.199 in older and comorbid patient populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:50.200 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.655$ there were few head-to-head OA

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:52.655 \longrightarrow 00:11:55.110$ comparisons and there were additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:55.189 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.174$ unknown adherence barriers as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:11:57.174 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.299$ as impacts of out of cost out of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:00.299 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.423$ pocket costs on adherence and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

00:12:02.423 --> 00:12:04.868 the impact of non what the impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:04.868 \longrightarrow 00:12:06.794$ of nonadherence had on outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:06.794 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.198$ for these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

 $00:12:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.096$ So for this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:09.096 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.440$ we once again decided to leverage

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

 $00:12:10.488 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.608$ the strengths of the Seer,

 $00:12:11.610 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.956$ Medicare and the Medicare claims data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:12:13.960 --> 00:12:16.088 and in this case, Medicare Part D,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:16.090 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.490$ which is includes prescription drug claims,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:18.490 \longrightarrow 00:12:19.970$ was crucial for this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90212894333333

 $00:12:19.970 \longrightarrow 00:12:21.916$ But we also added an additional data

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

00:12:21.916 --> 00:12:23.708 source called the North Carolina Cypher

NOTE Confidence: 0.902128943333333

 $00:12:23.708 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.801$ data now North Carolina Cypher is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:12:25.858 --> 00:12:27.592 example of a state cancer registry

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}12{:}27.592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}29.356$ that's been linked to claims data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:29.356 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.477$ and in this case it's the North

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}12{:}31.477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}33.555$ Carolina Cancer Registry data that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:12:33.555 --> 00:12:35.292 been linked to Medicare, Medicaid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}12{:}35.292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}37.464$ and Blue Cross Blue Shield data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:37.470 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.510$ So you can see here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:12:38.510 --> 00:12:40.330 That strengths include the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}12{:}40.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}42.150$ detailed clinical pathologic data that's

 $00:12:42.205 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.228$ contained in the SEER Medicare data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:12:44.230 --> 00:12:46.228 But for patients of all ages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:46.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.730$ we receive Medicare is limited to

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:12:47.730 --> 00:12:49.907 those who are 65 years and older and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:49.907 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.587$ with unsafe Cypher has patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:51.645 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.550$ different types of insurance coverage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:53.550 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.100$ Where senior Medicare is limited,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:12:55.100 \longrightarrow 00:12:58.790$ obviously, to just the Medicare population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}12{:}58.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01.198$ So here I show the seer Medicare rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}13{:}01.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}03.092$ of utilization of oral anti cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:03.092 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.934$ agents in patients with renal cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}13{:}04.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}06.838$ carcinoma and we also reproduce this

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}13{:}06.838 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}08.956$ data in the North Carolina cypher

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:08.956 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.614$ data where we saw highly similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:11.614 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.870$ trajectories and rates of OH agents.

 $00:13:13.870 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.830$ We found that roughly 1/3 of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:13:15.830 --> 00:13:17.423 were receiving an oral anti cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:13:17.423 --> 00:13:19.429 agent at all within a year of being

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:19.429 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.004$ diagnosed with advanced disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:13:21.004 --> 00:13:23.112 that the majority of these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:23.112 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.217$ were initially treated with sunitinib.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:25.220 \longrightarrow 00:13:27.722$ A multivariable analysis of CR Medicare

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:27.722 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.390$ factors associated with utilization

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:29.449 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.549$ did not show evidence of differential

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:13:31.549 --> 00:13:33.898 receipt of oral therapies by patient race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}13{:}33.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}36.380$ ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667 00:13:36.380 --> 00:13:37.000 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:37.000 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.580$ we did see decreased utilization

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:13:38.580 --> 00:13:40.160 in patients who were unmarried,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:40.160 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.904$ older, or that lived in the South.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:42.910 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.555$ So one of the strengths of the

00:13:44.555 --> 00:13:45.936 North Carolina cipher data is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:45.936 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.184$ it includes adults of all ages

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:47.184 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.618$ as well as private insurance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:13:48.620 --> 00:13:50.620 As I've already mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:50.620 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.120$ we adjusted for age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:52.120 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.370$ There were large differences in utilization

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:54.431 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.596$ by private versus Medicare insurance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:56.600 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.040$ However, in multivariable adjusted analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:13:59.040 \longrightarrow 00:14:00.874$ we saw that there was no difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}14{:}00.874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}02.339$ in the utilization by insurance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667 00:14:02.340 --> 00:14:02.647 Instead, NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:14:02.647 --> 00:14:04.796 this was likely driven entirely by age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}14{:}04.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}06.455$ with older patients being less

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:06.455 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.779$ likely to receive therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:07.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.246$ We also observed that frailty and

00:14:10.246 --> 00:14:11.890 having multiple kohram abilities

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}14{:}11.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}13.578$ were both associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:13.580 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.988$ Decrease to a utilization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:14.988 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.482$ And lastly we looked at patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:17.482 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.736$ all stages of kidney cancer and saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:19.736 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.917$ that patients who were diagnosed with

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:21.917 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.131$ stage one disease but that experienced

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:24.140 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.090$ progression to metastatic disease were

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:26.090 \longrightarrow 00:14:28.490$ less likely to utilize Inoue within

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:14:28.490 --> 00:14:30.788 a year of metastatic disease diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}14{:}30.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}33.275$ and this is likely due to slower

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:33.275 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.564$ growing disease with a less urgent

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:35.564 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.096$ need to treat immediately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.086$ Come for oral anti cancer agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667 00:14:39.090 --> 00:14:39.426 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:39.426 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.106$ it's important to remember that

00:14:41.106 --> 00:14:42.450 in addition to utilization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:42.450 \longrightarrow 00:14:44.640$ there's also the concept of adherence

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:44.640 \longrightarrow 00:14:47.191$ or the percentage of time a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:47.191 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.243$ was taking their anti cancer drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:49.250 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.430$ We know that in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}14{:}50.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}52.548$ adherence to oral medications is often

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:52.548 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.410$ far from 100% due to any number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}14{:}55.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}57.950$ reasons such as side effects or costs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:14:57.950 \longrightarrow 00:15:00.148$ We looked at adherence in both the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}15{:}00.148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02.228$ Seer Medicare and the Cypher cohorts

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:15:02.228 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.013$ and we observed slightly higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}15{:}04.013 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06.664$ rates of adherence within the North

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}15{:}06.664 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}08.540$ Carolina cypher patient population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:15:08.540 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.948$ As compared to the CR Medicare cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00:15:10.950 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.934$ we think this is largely due to the

 $00:15:12.934 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.700$ difference in age between the cohorts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

 $00{:}15{:}14.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}16.345$ As both cohorts showed evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.915946695666667

00:15:16.345 --> 00:15:17.990 of either older patients or

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:18.053 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.701$ those with Medicare insurance

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:15:19.701 --> 00:15:21.349 having lower adherence rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:15:21.350 --> 00:15:23.282 North Carolina Cypher was somewhat limited

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:23.282 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.018$ in power due to the smaller sample sizes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}15{:}26.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}27.922$ and it did not examine adherence

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:27.922 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.689$ by by different agents in

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:29.689 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.988$ the multivariable analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:30.990 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.540$ However, there was evidence of substantially

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.457$ lower adherence to soften it in both cohorts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:36.460 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.772$ We saw a strong impact of poverty on

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:38.772 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.657$ adherence within the SEER Medicare data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:40.660 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.655$ but not the North Carolina cypher data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:42.660 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.478$ And although it is unclear why,

 $00:15:44.480 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.405$ we hypothesize that older patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:46.405 \longrightarrow 00:15:49.660$ living on a fixed income may be more

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:49.660 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.340$ sensitive to financial stressors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:51.340 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.315$ Consistent with this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:52.315 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.615$ we saw that OAS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:53.620 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.539$ with out of pocket costs over \$200,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:15:56.539 \rightarrow 00:15:59.084$ were associated with decreased adherence

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:15:59.084 --> 00:16:01.700 within the SEER Medicare cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}16{:}01.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03.326$ So these real world datasets also

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:03.326 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.109$ allow you to look at survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:05.110 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.558$ And here is a three month landmark survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:07.558 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.118$ curve of all 'cause mortality for a pass.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:10.120 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.672$ Open abusers by whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:16:11.672 --> 00:16:13.224 they received the trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:16:13.230 --> 00:16:15.900 Recommended dose of 800 milligrams of

00:16:15.900 --> 00:16:19.130 pheasant per day in the three months

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}16{:}19.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}21.410$ following a a initiation for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:21.410 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.535$ patients getting the prescribed dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:16:22.535 --> 00:16:24.270 for the first three months of treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:24.270 \longrightarrow 00:16:26.394$ we saw superior outcomes and survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:26.394 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.354$ was assessed beginning at three

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:28.354 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.286$ months post postoperative initiation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:30.290 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.930$ In order to avoid introducing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:31.930 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.558$ Immortal time bias in the analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:34.560 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.660$ So I think it's incredibly critical to

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}16{:}36.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}38.389$ acknowledge that a key limitation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:38.389 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.597$ all these data sets is that the patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:40.597 \longrightarrow 00:16:43.040$ perspective and the patient voice is missing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:43.040 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.727$ I also feel it's incredibly important to

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:16:44.727 --> 00:16:46.800 do our best to include this perspective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:16:46.800 --> 00:16:48.616 even when working exclusively

 $00:16:48.616 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.978$ with secondary data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:49.980 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.702$ and one way that we address this

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:51.702 \longrightarrow 00:16:53.299$ for the renal cell carcinoma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:16:53.300 --> 00:16:55.764 A study was by partnering with patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:55.764 \longrightarrow 00:16:58.012$ advocacy groups who helped us identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:16:58.012 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.644$ questions that were most important to them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:00.650 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.008$ So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:01.008 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.724$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:17:01.724 --> 00:17:03.514 these patients and their families,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:03.520 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.319$ they wanted to know how often providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:05.319 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.650$ were switching their medications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}06.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.200$ Which is something we hadn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.130$ planned on examining,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}09.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}11.086$ but we were absolutely capable of

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:17:11.086 --> 00:17:12.930 examining in our real-world data set.

 $00:17:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.522$ So we looked at the request of the patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}15.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}17.567$ and we found that while only 6%

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:17.570 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.155$ of RCC patients switched aways

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:17:20.155 --> 00:17:22.740 within 90 days of diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:17:22.740 --> 00:17:25.905 that number increased to 20% of RCC patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:25.905 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.485$ switched to their always

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:27.485 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.649$ within one year of diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}29.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31.730$ So now I'd like to move on to an example

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}31.788 \to 00{:}17{:}33.769$ of current future work that I'm doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:33.770 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.849$ So I was recently awarded in American

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:17:35.849 --> 00:17:37.808 Cancer Society 5 year Research Scholar

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:37.808 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.160$ Grant and this grant will be developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:40.215 \longrightarrow 00:17:41.920$ algorithms to inform risk stratified

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}41.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}43.962$ care for long term cancer survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:43.962 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.286$ So this figure was modified from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:17:46.286 --> 00:17:48.343 paper by Effinger and McCabe which

 $00:17:48.343 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.770$ shows at the top the current model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:50.770 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.994$ care for cancer survivors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:51.994 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.252$ which is more of a one size

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:54.252 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.329$ fits all approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}17{:}55.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}57.245$ Once the patient is diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:57.245 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.394$ with their cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:17:58.400 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.444$ their care is transferred to an oncologist

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:18:00.444 \longrightarrow 00:18:02.110$ for an indefinite period of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}18{:}02.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}03.900$ Little to no ongoing participation

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:18:03.900 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.974$ from the PCP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:18:04.980 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.770$ The bottom shows the proposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00{:}18{:}06.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}08.560$ shared practice model care based

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

00:18:08.621 --> 00:18:09.950 on risk stratification,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:18:09.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.902$ which helps to inform

NOTE Confidence: 0.910958852777778

 $00:18:10.902 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.330$ the point in time when a

 $00{:}18{:}12.385 \rightarrow 00{:}18{:}14.145$ cancer survivors care might be

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:18:14.145 --> 00:18:16.245 appropriately transferred back to you or

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:16.245 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.955$ shared with the primary care physician

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:17.955 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.162$ with the idea being that the new

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:20.162 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.190$ model represents both a more efficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:22.258 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.220$ and better quality model of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.152$ So this figure is from a study

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}18{:}26.152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}27.715$ where McConnell and colleagues used

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:27.715 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.400$ National Cancer Registry data from

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}18{:}29.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}31.565$ the UK and Northern Ireland tourist

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}18{:}31.565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}33.390$ stratify patients with twenty of

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:33.390 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.716$ the most common cancers into three

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:35.716 \longrightarrow 00:18:38.110$ groups based on overall survival at

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:38.179 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.339$ one in five years from diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:40.340 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.531$ And this is just to demonstrate that

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}18{:}42.531 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}44.121$ crude risk categorization is possible

 $00:18:44.121 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.909$ and is currently being used to

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:45.909 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.519$ inform treatment in other countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:47.520 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.236$ So the authors noted that important

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:49.236 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.769$ caveats of this analysis included

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:50.769 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.439$ the absence of treatment information

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:52.439 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.090$ which was not available, and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:54.090 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.260$ That their data was unable to assess

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:56.260 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.680$ treatment related complications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:18:57.680 --> 00:18:59.738 both of which I propose to improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:18:59.738 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.358$ upon in our models for this ACS grant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.497$ So once again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:19:03.497 --> 00:19:05.392 we return to existing currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:19:05.392 --> 00:19:06.500 existing knowledge gaps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:06.500 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.135$ which real-world data and outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:08.135 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.770$ methodologies can help to address,

 $00:19:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.052$ so we know that Uncle logic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:19:12.052 --> 00:19:13.915 noncaloric risks vary substantially by

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:13.915 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.785$ cancer stage and treatment and cancer type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:16.790 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.500$ We also know that cancer site

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:18.500 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.517$ and stage alone can provide broad

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:20.517 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.145$ uncle logic risk categories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}19{:}22.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.560$ However, non uncle logic disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:19:25.560 --> 00:19:28.240 Risks have been defined qualitatively,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:28.240 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.034$ but not quantitatively,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:30.034 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.828$ and cancer survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}19{:}31.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}34.598$ And we do not know how Uncle Logic

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}19{:}34.598 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}19{:}38.114$ and on non uncle logic risks compare

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}19{:}38.114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}40.854$ or compete within cancer survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:40.860 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.639$ And there's also a need to estimate

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:43.639 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.338$ these risks at the point of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:46.340 \longrightarrow 00:19:48.260$ So we will once again use this year

 $00:19:48.260 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.340$ Medicare and the North Carolina cipher data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}19{:}50.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}52.405$ But the new data set addition to

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:19:52.405 --> 00:19:54.133 this project will be incorporating

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:54.133 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.479$ data from the Veterans Health system

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:19:56.480 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.524$ and the overarching plan is to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}19{:}58.524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00.175$ inputs that are available from

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:00.175 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.965$ all three of these datasets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}01.970 \longrightarrow 00{:}20{:}03.980$ such as cancer or specific variables

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:03.980 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.980$ like site and stage treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}05.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07.776$ Personal characteristics like age

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:20:07.776 --> 00:20:10.470 and gender and race and ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:10.470 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.074$ and then aging related concerns like

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}13.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}14.810$ comorbidities and functional status

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:14.810 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.820$ to develop risk prediction models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:16.820 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.026$ In breast, breast,

 $00:20:18.026 \longrightarrow 00:20:19.634$ prostate and colorectal cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}19.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}21.776$ To predict both ankle logic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:20:21.776 --> 00:20:22.844 non oncologic events,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:22.850 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.780$ for which long term cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:24.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.710$ survivors are at increased risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:20:26.710 --> 00:20:28.882 So these risk algorithm algorithms will

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:28.882 \longrightarrow 00:20:31.449$ separate long term cancer survivors into low,

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:20:31.450 --> 00:20:33.610 medium and high risk categories to

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}33.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35.050$ help inform discussions between

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:35.109 \longrightarrow 00:20:37.019$ survivors and physicians about their

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}37.019 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}38.909$ optimal care going forward and

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:20:38.909 --> 00:20:41.063 ultimately the final product will be

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:41.063 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.298$ a freely available web calculator in

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:43.298 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.488$ which patients and or physicians can

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:45.488 \longrightarrow 00:20:47.248$ input their individual information

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}47.248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49.468$ to help categorize their individual

00:20:49.468 --> 00:20:51.560 risk and inform pathways of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:51.560 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.230$ So next on the horizon for me is

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:54.230 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.235$ tackling additional unmet needs of

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:20:56.235 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.899$ traditional health services research

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}20{:}57.899 \rightarrow 00{:}21{:}00.305$ through novel data linkages and I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:21:00.305 \longrightarrow 00:21:02.194$ developing studies that will include

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:21:02.194 --> 00:21:03.904 actual physical tumor samples so

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}21{:}03.904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06.004$ that we can run genomic sequence

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:21:06.004 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.356$ analysis on them and then link that

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}21{:}08.422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}09.790$ additional biologic information

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:21:09.790 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.526$ to both tumor registry data and

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

00:21:12.526 --> 00:21:13.636 longitudinal claims data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00{:}21{:}13.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}15.574$ So there are a couple existing

NOTE Confidence: 0.917677370333333

 $00:21:15.574 \longrightarrow 00:21:16.220$ resources which

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:16.284 \longrightarrow 00:21:18.348$ I have already tapped into to get this

 $00:21:18.348 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.648$ work off the ground and the first of which

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:20.648 \longrightarrow 00:21:22.371$ is the SEER residual tissue repository,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:22.371 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.332$ which is a program that used to be funded

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:25.332 \longrightarrow 00:21:27.467$ by NCI to maintain physical tumor samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:27.467 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.772$ for patients contained in the SEER

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:29.772 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.712$ registry for three participating sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:31.720 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.388$ which were Iowa, Hawaii and Los Angeles, CA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:34.388 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.672$ So like I said, the program

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:37.672 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.776$ consists of pathologic specimens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:39.780 \longrightarrow 00:21:41.555$ These are old specimens were

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:41.555 \longrightarrow 00:21:43.644$ collected between 1992 and 2006.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:43.644 \longrightarrow 00:21:44.560$ I've already.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:44.560 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.680$ Mention the participating see registries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:46.680 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.907$ but they do allow the ability to

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:49.907 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.486$ physically analyze tumor samples and So

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:52.486 \longrightarrow 00:21:55.308$ what I did was we recently completed a

00:21:55.308 --> 00:21:57.740 proof of concept study on a very small

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:57.802 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.777$ breast cancer cohort to demonstrate

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:21:59.777 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.120$ the process for combining the sear,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:02.120 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.762$ the Medicare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:02.762 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.009$ and the genomic or biologic data obtained

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}05.009 \to 00{:}22{:}06.927$ from running gene expression analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:06.927 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.857$ on the tumor samples themselves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:08.860 --> 00:22:09.542 So unfortunately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:09.542 --> 00:22:12.270 LA did not participate in this pilot study

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:12.334 \longrightarrow 00:22:14.838$ due to an inability to procure large enough.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:14.840 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.465$ Funds to cover their participation

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}16.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.992$ costs and this left us with two

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}18.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}21.102$ very distinct and racially and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:21.102 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.368$ ethnically homogeneous populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:22.426 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.076$ which were not was not ideal.

 $00:22:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.256$ We would have liked it to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}25.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}26.370$ been much more representative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:26.370 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.917$ but it did allow us to proceed with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:28.917 --> 00:22:31.535 proof of concept study and here is a brief

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:31.535 --> 00:22:33.769 summary of some of our major findings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}33.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35.646$ so this publication is in press and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:35.646 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.612$ will be published in two days in JAMA

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:37.612 --> 00:22:39.334 Network and I'm happy to share that

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:39.334 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.002$ publication with folks to go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:41.002 --> 00:22:42.844 in more detail once it's published.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}42.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}45.769$ But you can see that our major findings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:45.770 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.933$ Really show how we were able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}47.933 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}49.687$ leverage the different aspects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:49.687 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.607$ these three different data linkages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:22:51.610 --> 00:22:53.105 The three different datasets that

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}22{:}53.105 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}55.192$ we linked together so we were able

00:22:55.192 --> 00:22:56.800 to show from the Medicare claims

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:56.800 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.426$ data that symptomatic detection of

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:22:58.426 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.151$ breast cancer was associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:23:00.151 --> 00:23:01.975 a higher mortality hazards ratio

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}01.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}04.225$ as from the SEER registry data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:04.230 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.170$ We were able to show that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:23:07.170 --> 00:23:09.252 Low levels of high school graduation

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:09.252 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.345$ rates were associated with a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}11.345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}12.970$ mortality mortality hazard ratio and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}12.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}15.300$ then from the tumor samples and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}15.300 \to 00{:}23{:}17.581$ genetic analysis that we conducted on these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}17.581 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}19.898$ we were able to show that and rogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}19.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21.806$ receptor macrophage set of toxicity and T.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:21.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.085$ Rex signaling were all associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:24.085 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.450$ with reduced mortality.

 $00:23:25.450 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.466$ But the key thing that I want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}27.466 \to 00{:}23{:}29.128$ highlight here is that factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}29.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}30.953$ related to socioeconomic status and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:30.953 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.520$ screening access remained associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.455$ with mortality even after adjusting

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}34.455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}38.170$ for clinical and genomic factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:23:38.170 --> 00:23:39.696 So what does the future look like

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:39.696 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.350$ for this work?

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128 00:23:40.350 --> 00:23:40.654 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:40.654 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.478$ I'm getting ready to submit a

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}42.478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}44.608$ narrow one which would leverage the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:44.608 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.538$ sear virtual tissue repository and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:46.538 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.470$ proposes the first in kind linkage

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:48.470 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.224$ ever of the tumor samples with ceron,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:23:51.224 --> 00:23:52.667 Medicare longitudinal claims.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

00:23:52.670 --> 00:23:55.340 So the server consists of

 $00:23:55.340 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.408$ seven participating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00{:}23{:}56.410 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}23{:}59.317$ See registry, so we're up to 7 from 3,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:23:59.320 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.055$ and the pathologic specimen location

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:24:01.055 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.809$ is known for the most recent 10 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:24:03.810 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.266$ So this is, this is the the oldest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915641128

 $00:24:06.270 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.538$ The tissue samples are ten years old.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:08.540 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.210$ But the collection is ongoing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:10.210 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.520$ so these are recent tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:24:11.520 --> 00:24:13.164 And once again we must physically

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}24{:}13.164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}14.706$ request and fund the acquisition

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}24{:}14.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}16.635$ of the pathologic specimens from

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:16.635 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.360$ the pathology labs storing them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:18.360 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.493$ But what are we proposing to do? So?

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:20.493 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.754$ We're calling this a retro genomic approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:22.760 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.189$ which we are defining as a combination

 $00:24:25.189 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.263$ of population level cohort studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}24{:}27.263 \to 00{:}24{:}29.203$ followed by retrospective retrospective

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:24:29.203 --> 00:24:31.563 selection of patient cases in

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:24:31.563 --> 00:24:33.358 which to pursue genomic analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:33.360 \longrightarrow 00:24:35.424$ and this allows us to bypass a common

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:35.424 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.165$ weakness of traditional trials where

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:37.165 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.110$ patients are assigned to specific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:39.110 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.190$ Groups and then we wait to see what

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:24:41.190 --> 00:24:42.898 outcomes they have and this approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}24{:}42.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}44.952$ we can use the Medicare claims data

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:44.952 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.800$ to cherry pick specific outcomes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}24{:}46.800 \to 00{:}24{:}49.120$ interest and then go and pull the tumor

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:49.120 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.898$ samples for the patients who experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:24:50.898 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.866$ these outcomes in the real world

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:24:52.866 --> 00:24:54.970 and study which treatment patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:24:54.970 --> 00:24:55.830 SES factors,

 $00:24:55.830 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.550$ or clinical pathologic characteristics

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}24{:}57.550 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}25{:}00.229$ appear to be driving those outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:00.230 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.190$ And in the case of RRCC proposal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:02.190 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.500$ that we're getting ready to

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:03.500 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.613$ submit in February, February,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:04.613 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.874$ we're going to look at two rare

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:06.874 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.247$ events experienced by patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:08.247 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.575$ related to amino therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:09.580 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.114$ Namely,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:10.114 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.318$ severe IO toxicities and durable responders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.730$ so we're calling this project

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:14.730 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.858$ the virtual siert issue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}25{:}15.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}18.120$ registry Genomics and Medicare cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:18.120 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.248$ or a Verge cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:19.248 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.376$ And as I mentioned,

 $00:25:20.380 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.742$ our first application to go in

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:21.742 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.248$ will be in renal cell carcinoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:23.248 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.874$ since this study will be following

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:24.874 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.680$ on the heels of my current R 01,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:26.680 \longrightarrow 00:25:28.269$ but our intention always has been and

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:28.269 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.025$ remains to have several different bridge

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:30.025 \longrightarrow 00:25:31.740$ cohorts across different disease sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:31.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.584$ Answering all types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:33.584 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.967$ different clinical questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:34.970 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.002$ So in summary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}25{:}36.002 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}37.722$ there are many questions relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:37.722 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.708$ to cancer care that can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:25:39.708 --> 00:25:41.248 informed and enhanced by real

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:41.248 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.110$ World Health services research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:43.110 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.840$ Many questions cannot be feasibly or

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.600$ ethically addressed by clinical trials alone,

 $00:25:48.600 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.220$ and novel linkages may pave

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}25{:}50.220 \to 00{:}25{:}51.840$ the way to novel opportunities

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}25{:}51.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53.467$ in health services research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:53.470 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.395$ There are several datasets that

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}25{:}55.395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}57.320$ are available for research in

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:25:57.392 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.972$ real world outcomes data and

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:25:58.972 --> 00:26:01.250 each data has its own strengths,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:01.250 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.503$ weaknesses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}26{:}01.503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03.527$ and nuances that you need to know how

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}26{:}03.527 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}05.538$ to work with in order to get the best.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:05.540 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.646$ And most accurate data and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:07.646 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.050$ the incorporation of genomics

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}26{:}09.111 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.806$ and biology into health service

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:10.806 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.501$ research is on the horizon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:12.510 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.984$ With that,

 $00:26:12.984 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.643$ I want to thank the team members

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00{:}26{:}14.643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}16.265$ who participated in all the various

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:16.265 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.459$ studies that I that I presented today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:18.460 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.242$ All of the work I do is team based

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:20.242 \longrightarrow 00:26:22.170$ science and I couldn't do it without

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:22.170 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.584$ the clinical collaborators and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

 $00:26:23.584 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.306$ support staff who are helping me with

NOTE Confidence: 0.916855962

00:26:25.306 --> 00:26:26.790 this work. Thank you for your time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

00:26:29.390 --> 00:26:30.488 Thank you Michaela.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:26:30.488 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.586$ Very interesting work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

00:26:31.590 --> 00:26:33.585 If there are any questions, I I guess

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:26:33.585 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.600$ what we do is we type them into the chat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:26:37.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:40.036$ While we're waiting now to question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00{:}26{:}40.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}43.320$ I I thought the most interesting thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:26:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.720$ he showed was the effect of ZIP code.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:26:46.720 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.758$ The five fold increase in mortality.

 $00:26:48.760 \longrightarrow 00:26:50.520$ Yes, 'cause of course in within

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00{:}26{:}50.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52.300$ the ZIP code there are many people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00{:}26{:}52.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}55.216$ There's a range of educational levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

00:26:55.220 --> 00:26:58.758 so if you if you just actually broke it down.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

00:26:58.760 --> 00:27:00.659 Are you able to break it down by actual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:27:00.660 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.070$ whether or not a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:27:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.198$ has graduated or not?

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:27:03.200 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.586$ 'cause I would assume then that

NOTE Confidence: 0.83374828

 $00:27:04.586 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.890$ difference would be much greater.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:06.260 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.034$ Yeah, I mean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:07.034 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.582$ so obviously that would be ideal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:08.590 \longrightarrow 00:27:09.898$ That's just that's just a limitation

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:09.898 --> 00:27:11.000 of this year Medicare data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:11.000 \longrightarrow 00:27:15.120$ so the the SES data is in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:15.120 --> 00:27:16.580 available in their Medicare data,

 $00:27:16.580 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.134$ and I could talk a whole another

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:18.134 --> 00:27:19.080 half hour about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:19.080 --> 00:27:20.648 Is zipcode level information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:20.648 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.216$ so it's not ideal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:22.220 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.218$ but it does give you a sense of you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.585$ You get zipcode level information

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:25.585 --> 00:27:26.677 about high school graduation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:26.680 --> 00:27:29.130 zipcode level, information about poverty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:29.130 --> 00:27:32.388 Uhm, about, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.050$ like the racial or ethnic makeup of

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

00:27:35.050 --> 00:27:36.840 a neighborhood somebody lives in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:36.840 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.050$ So obviously it's a proxy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00{:}27{:}38.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38.800$ It's not ideal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:38.800 \longrightarrow 00:27:40.300$ but it's it's better than what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.93183697777778

 $00:27:40.300 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.777$ in a lot of other datasets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931836977777778 00:27:41.780 --> 00:27:42.878 so it's still

 $00:27:42.910 \longrightarrow 00:27:45.856$ despite those very very striking difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858046683333333

 $00:27:45.860 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.060$ We have a question from Laos.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835911504285714

 $00:27:48.410 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.562$ Yes, Titan, congratulations

NOTE Confidence: 0.835911504285714

 $00:27:49.562 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.098$ is clearly very exciting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835911504285714

 $00:27:51.100 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.175$ What you described I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835911504285714

 $00:27:52.175 \longrightarrow 00:27:53.708$ I wonder who is your year

NOTE Confidence: 0.835911504285714

 $00:27:53.710 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.320$ collaborator Co investigator for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.707717595

 $00:27:56.330 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.710$ genomic analysts piece of Euro one who

NOTE Confidence: 0.707717595

 $00:27:59.710 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.720$ will actually do the the sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:01.730 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.938$ and data analysts and

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:02.938 \longrightarrow 00:28:04.448$ linking to the clinical data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:04.450 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.350$ Yeah, so we're still working

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:05.350 \longrightarrow 00:28:06.250$ through the details of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7342020744444445

 $00:28:06.250 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.224$ but we've been talking to all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:08.224 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.872$ various cores and thinking about

 $00{:}28{:}09.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}12.425$ exactly what what we want to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:12.425 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.090$ in terms of the genomic analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:15.090 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.625$ Obviously there's a couple things

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:16.625 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.380$ that are going to weigh in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:18.380 \longrightarrow 00:28:19.370$ This is a big study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:19.370 --> 00:28:20.914 It like I said, it's going to involve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00{:}28{:}20.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}23.456$ It's all ecipes from all of the six

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00{:}28{:}23.456 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}25.948$ registries I mentioned are all on board.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:25.950 --> 00:28:27.258 We're going to have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:27.258 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.893$ so that'll be six sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00{:}28{:}28.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}30.755$ and so a lot of this unfortunately

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:30.755 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.689$ is gonna be driven by what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:32.689 --> 00:28:34.290 can afford in terms of, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7342020744444445

 $00:28:34.290 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.739$ So we're going to start with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:35.739 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.788$ very focused analysis and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:36.788 \longrightarrow 00:28:37.556$ from there you know.

00:28:37.560 --> 00:28:39.989 I'm hoping to build on that with

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:39.989 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.030$ either administrative supplements

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:41.089 \longrightarrow 00:28:42.509$ or other funding mechanisms to

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:42.509 --> 00:28:44.250 build out and expand on that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:44.250 --> 00:28:46.056 so that's still that that specific pieces

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:46.056 --> 00:28:47.968 build still being in development right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445 00:28:47.970 --> 00:28:48.816 but we're. NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:28:48.816 --> 00:28:51.354 Talking with all the Yale course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:28:52.596$ There's a lot to follow up

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:52.596 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.581$ with you because you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7342020744444445

 $00:28:53.581 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.284$ I I couldn't write the Yale Genetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:28:55.284 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.018$ Genomics program and you may know

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00{:}28{:}57.018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}58.436$ that we have a similar large

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00{:}28{:}58.436 \to 00{:}29{:}01.398$ initiative that's run by like Murray.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:29:01.398 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.904$ The generations project,

 $00:29:02.910 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.368$ and I think there is a lot of synergy

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00{:}29{:}04.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}05.577$ that you could you could leverage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

00:29:05.577 --> 00:29:07.059 Yeah, it'd be great to talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:29:07.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.315$ and we're still we're still

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:29:08.315 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.319$ developing that specific piece.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734202074444445

 $00:29:09.320 \longrightarrow 00:29:10.336$ I would love to talk about it more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86150755

 $00:29:12.280 \longrightarrow 00:29:15.115$ Thanks Flash any other questions or comments?

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

00:29:18.950 --> 00:29:22.088 How the work is obviously critically

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

 $00{:}29{:}22.088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}25.809$ dependent on how good the datasets are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

00:29:25.810 --> 00:29:27.754 Which you have not a lot of control over

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

 $00{:}29{:}27.754 \longrightarrow 00{:}29{:}29.436$ other than select which ones to use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

 $00:29:29.440 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.828$ I mean for example other VA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

 $00:29:31.830 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.856$ How does that compare to see?

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

00:29:32.860 --> 00:29:34.477 Or how does that compare to Medicare?

NOTE Confidence: 0.828124807692308

 $00:29:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.570$ Or are there systematic differences?

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.730$ Yeah, so great question.

00:29:38.730 --> 00:29:41.980 Again, I have a whole other talk just

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:41.980 \longrightarrow 00:29:43.680$ talking specifically about these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:43.680 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.640$ Uhm, so you know it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:29:45.640 --> 00:29:46.816 It's all about like I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:29:46.820 --> 00:29:48.296 like knowing the datasets well knowing

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:48.296 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.823$ what their strengths or weaknesses are

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:49.823 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.573$ and knowing how to leverage them so

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:51.573 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.834$ specifically for the wrist ratification

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:29:52.834 --> 00:29:54.286 grant that I'm talking about where

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:29:54.290 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.370$ we're going to be using serum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:29:55.370 --> 00:29:57.266 Medicare cipher and the VA data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:29:57.270 --> 00:29:58.765 we're specifically focusing on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}29{:}58.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00.260$ variables of interest on things

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:00.312 \longrightarrow 00:30:01.720$ that we know we can get out of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:01.720 \longrightarrow 00:30:03.369$ Each of those three datasets, right?

 $00:30:03.369 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.041$ So because we want to be able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}30{:}05.041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}06.660$ like develop and then validate

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:06.660 \longrightarrow 00:30:08.016$ the risk prediction algorithms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:08.020 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.649$ I mean, I, I said it from the beginning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:30:09.650 --> 00:30:11.400 There's no perfect data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:11.400 \longrightarrow 00:30:12.435$ There are things that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:12.435 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.470$ really strong about this year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}30{:}13.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}14.166$ Medicare data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:14.166 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.602$ It is probably the most widely used

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:30:16.602 --> 00:30:18.269 real-world data set for oncology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:18.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:19.562$ Specific research is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:30:19.562 --> 00:30:20.854 incredibly strong data set,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:20.860 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.582$ but the two big limitations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:22.582 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.492$ everyone can tell you right off the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:24.492 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.446$ top of their head is that it's limited

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:26.446 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.526$ to those who are 65 years and older.

 $00:30:28.530 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.379$ It's Medicare only,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:29.379 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.077$ and then the other limitation is

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:30:31.077 --> 00:30:32.467 there's a pretty significant lag

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:32.467 \longrightarrow 00:30:34.555$ with the data because it relies on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:30:34.555 --> 00:30:36.363 linkage that's done every two years at NCI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:36.370 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.970$ so it's usually about three

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:37.970 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.454$ to four years behind, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:39.454 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.678$ So if you're trying to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:30:40.678 --> 00:30:41.290 at emerging technologies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}30{:}41.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}43.054$ it can be a little bit of a nuisance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:43.060 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.626$ So from the current R 01.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}30{:}44.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}47.878$ Using Seer Medicare data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}30{:}47.880 \to 00{:}30{:}49.350$ Actually getting ready to purchase

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:49.350 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.294$ a cohort of the Medicare 100% data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:51.294 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.953$ So the limitation to that data set

 $00:30:52.953 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.973$ is going to be that it doesn't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}30{:}54.973 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}56.360$ the seer registry information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:56.360 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.635$ so we're not going to know things

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:30:58.635 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.014$ like stage or like other clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:01.014 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.876$ pathologic variables.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:01.880 --> 00:31:02.130 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:02.130 --> 00:31:03.630 the whole you know we're trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:03.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.660$ to fill in the gaps that we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}31{:}05.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}07.193$ exist from the previous work that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:07.193 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.705$ we did with the other datasets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:31:11.440$ which is the lag that we saw in in this era.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:11.440 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.590$ Medicare data and the North

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:12.590 --> 00:31:13.280 Carolina cipher data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:13.280 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.026$ so we can't look at O as in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:15.026 --> 00:31:16.519 context of current immunotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:16.520 \longrightarrow 00:31:18.744$ which we know is playing a huge role.

00:31:18.750 --> 00:31:21.050 In a renal cell carcinoma

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.241$ treatment right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:22.241 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.226$ so the Medicare claims data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:24.230 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.790$ while it will have different gaps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:25.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.697$ is going to allow us to look at other

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:28.697 --> 00:31:30.498 questions alongside of what we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:30.498 --> 00:31:33.189 already done to look at how aydelette

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:33.189 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.769$ OAA utilization and adherence looks

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}31{:}35.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}38.608$ in the context of a mino therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:38.610 --> 00:31:40.170 So it's just about figuring out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:40.170 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.720$ like it's just about acknowledging

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00:31:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.960$ where the limitations exist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

 $00{:}31{:}42.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}45.179$ and then figuring out a way to

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:45.179 --> 00:31:47.688 kind of fill that information in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932014826

00:31:47.690 --> 00:31:48.110 Terrific,

 $00:31:48.120 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.060$ thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

00:31:49.060 --> 00:31:49.765 Very interesting talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:31:49.770 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.674$ We need to move on to our second

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:31:52.674 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.660$ speaker who's Gloria Wong and Gloria

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:31:55.660 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.712$ is a social professor of OBGYN

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

00:31:58.712 --> 00:32:00.440 and reproductive sciences here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:32:00.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.980$ and she specialized in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:32:01.980 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.520$ treatment and prevention of ovarian,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00{:}32{:}03.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}05.348$ uterine, and cervical cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

00:32:05.348 --> 00:32:07.633 She's a board certified gynecological

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00{:}32{:}07.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}09.505$ on cologist who performs minimally

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:32:09.505 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.322$ invasive surgery and her research

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

00:32:11.322 --> 00:32:12.538 interests are in Dimitriou,

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

00:32:12.540 --> 00:32:14.460 SIS associated and ovarian cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:32:14.460 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.380$ in the prevention and treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.899751644285714

 $00:32:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.388$ of endometrial cancer recurrence.

 $00:32:18.390 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.838$ So Gloria, the floor is yours.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900049427894737

 $00:32:21.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.852$ Hey, thank you so much for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900049427894737

00:32:23.852 --> 00:32:25.491 introduction and I really enjoyed

NOTE Confidence: 0.900049427894737

 $00:32:25.491 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.773$ the first talk and learns a lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900049427894737

 $00:32:27.780 \longrightarrow 00:32:30.460$ So let me just see if I can

NOTE Confidence: 0.900049427894737

 $00:32:30.460 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.580$ bring up my slides here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827367892

 $00:32:35.660 \longrightarrow 00:32:37.500$ Can you see those? Yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910976

00:32:37.510 --> 00:32:41.750 could you put in presentation? Yes perfect

NOTE Confidence: 0.8530016845

00:32:41.760 --> 00:32:44.064 great alright. Well today I wanted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8530016845

 $00:32:44.064 \longrightarrow 00:32:46.741$ to talk about a couple of topics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8530016845

 $00:32:46.741 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.212$ on near and dear to my heart,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8530016845

 $00:32:49.220 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.925$ which is translational science and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8530016845

 $00:32:51.925 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.630$ pivotal trials and gynecological cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837866694

 $00:32:56.960 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.728$ I have my disclosures on file with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837866694

00:32:59.728 --> 00:33:01.675 CME office, none of which are related

00:33:01.675 --> 00:33:03.670 to the content of this presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00{:}33{:}06.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}09.954$ In this talk, I want to first give a

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00:33:09.954 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.760$ epidemia brief overview of the epidemiology

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00:33:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.770$ and current trends in GYN cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00:33:15.770 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.140$ Challenges and successes in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

00:33:18.140 --> 00:33:20.510 field of GYN Cancer Research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00:33:20.510 \longrightarrow 00:33:22.601$ including highlighting some

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00:33:22.601 \longrightarrow 00:33:25.389$ recent practice changing trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00{:}33{:}25.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}28.780$ and example of how translational

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

00:33:28.780 --> 00:33:31.080 science in my personal experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00{:}33{:}31.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}34.105$ can be a driver for clinical trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

00:33:34.105 --> 00:33:36.169 development and team science,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

00:33:36.170 --> 00:33:38.738 and then also just touch briefly

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

00:33:38.738 --> 00:33:40.450 on some resources available

NOTE Confidence: 0.814904234761905

 $00:33:40.530 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.459$ for translational research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877565033333333

 $00:33:45.110 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.036$ And these are the learning objectives.

 $00{:}33{:}51.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}53.732$ Endometrial cancer has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:33:53.732 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.047$ increasing in both incidence and

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}33{:}56.047 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}57.968$ mortality in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:33:57.970 --> 00:34:00.556 Currently, the lifetime risk of developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:00.556 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.150$ under mutual cancer is about one in

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:03.150 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.135$ 32 and over 800,000 women in the US

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:06.135 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.320$ are living with endometrial cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.930$ Ovarian cancer mortality has slightly

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:10.930 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.136$ declined in recent years and currently

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:34:14.136 --> 00:34:16.706 the lifetime risk of developing

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:16.706 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.700$ ovarian cancer is about one in 83

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:19.700 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.638$ and over 200,000 women in EU S R.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}34{:}21.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}24.718$ Living with ovarian cancer. In EU.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:24.720 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.370$ S. Thanks to HPV vaccination

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:27.370 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.960$ and cervical screening.

 $00:34:28.960 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.996$ The cervical cancer rate has declined

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}34{:}31.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}36.182$ over the past decades to about 167 women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:34:36.182 --> 00:34:38.946 However, there are significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:38.946 \longrightarrow 00:34:41.884$ disparities related to access

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:41.884 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.624$ of care and affecting outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143 00:34:45.630 --> 00:34:46.718 She whined. NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}34{:}46.718 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49.438$ Cancers arise from the reproductive

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:34:49.438 --> 00:34:51.802 tract organs, including the ovary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:51.802 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.194$ fallopian tube, uterus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:34:53.194 --> 00:34:55.370 cervix, ***** and vagina,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:34:55.370 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.920$ and these organs are remarkable in

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}34{:}57.920 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}35{:}00.221$ their ability to respond rapidly

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:35:00.221 --> 00:35:02.776 to endocrine signals, produce sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:02.776 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.241$ hormones and their remarkable capacity

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:35:05.241 --> 00:35:06.676 for proliferation, regeneration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}35{:}06.676 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}08.014$ and morphological changes,

 $00:35:08.014 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.153$ and some of these do relate to

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:11.153 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.118$ underlying risk factors and protective

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:13.118 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.290$ factors for GY and cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:15.290 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.940$ Full fearing cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:16.940 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.690$ there's a correlation with increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:19.690 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.370$ lifetime ambulatory cycles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:21.370 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.698$ whereas oral contraceptive use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:23.698 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.444$ pregnancy and risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:25.450 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.550$ and breastfeeding decrease risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:28.550 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.650$ A MWe now that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:35:31.650 --> 00:35:33.815 Term line genetic testing has

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:35:33.815 --> 00:35:36.340 become much more widespread and may,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:36.340 \dashrightarrow 00:35:38.748$ you know, be available to the general public.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:38.750 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.334$ It is available now for out of

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:42.334 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.013$ pocket cost for you know about \$250

00:35:46.013 --> 00:35:49.254 to determine if one carries a BRCA

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:49.254 \longrightarrow 00:35:52.861$ one or two mutation and for those

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:52.861 \longrightarrow 00:35:55.146$ patients risk reducing surgery is

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:55.146 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.957$ highly protective for women at average risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:35:57.960 \longrightarrow 00:36:00.560$ There is a benefit to

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:36:00.560 --> 00:36:02.120 opportunistic salpingectomy so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143 00:36:02.120 --> 00:36:02.646 uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}36{:}02.646 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05.802$ a surgical removal of the flippin

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}36{:}05.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}10.174$ tubes at the time of other pelvic

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:36:10.174 --> 00:36:12.858 surgery for benign indications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}36{:}12.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}17.882$ Endometrial cancer is linked to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:17.882 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.834$ rising obesity rate unopposed estrogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:20.834 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.494$ as well as hereditary factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:23.500 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.804$ and we know that use of progestin

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:36:26.804 --> 00:36:28.220 containing oral contraceptive

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:28.302 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.732$ pills or progestin IUD can offer

 $00:36:30.732 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.365$ protection as well as risk reducing

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:33.365 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.173$ surgery for patients at higher risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:36.180 \longrightarrow 00:36:40.879$ And cervical cancer can be really

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:40.879 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.931$ eliminated with widespread implementation

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:36:42.931 --> 00:36:46.140 of HPV vaccination and cervical screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:36:46.140 --> 00:36:49.175 which currently consists mainly of

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:49.175 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.639$ liquid cytology and high risk HPV detection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:53.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.016$ We are still facing notable challenges

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:56.016 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.680$ in the fields of GI and cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:36:58.680 \dashrightarrow 00:37:01.686$ and I'm going to focus today on and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:37:01.686 --> 00:37:04.460 mutual cancer which has an increasing

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:04.460 \longrightarrow 00:37:07.432$ incidence and mortality rate as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:07.432 \dashrightarrow 00:37:10.624$ as substantial racial disparity in outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143 00:37:10.630 --> 00:37:11.144 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:11.144 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.228$ this is buffeted by recent successes

 $00:37:14.228 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.110$ and pivotal trials in GI and cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.120$ in just in the past 18 months alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:20.120 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.796$ we've seen new first line maintenance

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:22.796 \longrightarrow 00:37:25.130$ therapy options for ovarian cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:37:25.130 --> 00:37:27.338 New indications for immunotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:37:27.338 --> 00:37:29.546 including for mismatch repair,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

00:37:29.550 --> 00:37:31.590 proficient at a mutual cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}37{:}31.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}33.862$ as well as new first line and second

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:33.862 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.079$ line standard of care for cervical cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:36.080 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.280$ So really quite amazing how many.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00{:}37{:}40.280 \to 00{:}37{:}42.655$ Pivotal trials have resulted in

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:42.655 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.182$ the recent 18 to 24 months leading

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:46.182 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.530$ to practice changing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:49.530 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.330$ Approaches,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:51.330 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.818$ so in 2000 end of 2019 the results

NOTE Confidence: 0.896806442857143

 $00:37:55.818 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.434$ of Primon Paolo one were published

00:37:58.434 --> 00:38:00.899 in the New England Journal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:00.900 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.609$ leading to the approval of two different

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

00:38:03.609 --> 00:38:05.872 options for first line maintenance

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:05.872 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.447$ therapy of epithelial ovarian cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

00:38:08.450 --> 00:38:10.110 Fallopian tube for primary piratini,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:10.110 \longrightarrow 00:38:12.170$ oh cancer. Following complete or

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:12.170 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.916$ partial response to first line platinum

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:14.916 \dashrightarrow 00:38:18.900$ based chemotherapy, the new rap rib.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00{:}38{:}18.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}21.660$ Demonstrated a significant improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:21.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.316$ in progression free survival in both

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:25.316 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.004$ the overall intent to treat population

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00{:}38{:}28.004 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}30.227$ and the homologous recombination

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00{:}38{:}30.227 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}33.935$ deficient population with a hazard risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:33.935 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.840$ of 0.43 in progression free survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.608$ Come with clear divergance of the

 $00:38:42.610 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.938$ progression free survival curves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00{:}38{:}45.938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}50.082$ Similarly, Palo one which tested elapp rib

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:50.082 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.040$ and bevacizumab for first line maintenance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:54.040 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.364$ showed remarkable

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

00:38:55.364 --> 00:38:57.350 improvement and progression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:38:59.290$ Free survival on the upper

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:38:59.290 \longrightarrow 00:39:00.842$ left in the bracket.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:39:00.850 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.650$ Mutated population hazard ratio

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00{:}39{:}03.650 --> 00{:}39{:}07.158$ of 0.31 and on the lower right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:39:07.160 \dashrightarrow 00:39:09.200$ Patients without a BRAC mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:39:09.200 \dashrightarrow 00:39:13.314$ But with a molecular test demonstrating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

00:39:13.314 --> 00:39:15.666 Homologous recombination deficiency

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:39:15.666 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.370$ as tested by genomic instability also

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:39:20.467 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.584$ showed a progression free survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.863152505882353

 $00:39:22.584 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.710$ benefit with a hazard ratio of 0.4.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835525848

00:39:35.170 --> 00:39:37.380 And outcomes for patients who,

 $00:39:37.380 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.620$ unfortunately often prevent present

NOTE Confidence: 0.835525848

 $00:39:39.620 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.420$ with advanced stage ovarian cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835525848

 $00{:}39{:}42.420 \to 00{:}39{:}45.894$ and we know that upon recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.835525848

 $00:39:45.894 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.209$ becomes more difficult to treat and

NOTE Confidence: 0.835525848

 $00:39:49.210 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.328$ more likely to be chemo resistant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:39:53.820 --> 00:39:57.278 In mutual cancer, just to review some

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:39:57.278 --> 00:40:00.468 of our recent exciting new options.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}40{:}00.468 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}03.780$ And this has been really a big deal

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}40{:}03.867 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}06.842$ because actually progress has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}40{:}06.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}09.817$ quite slow and endometrial cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:40:09.820 --> 00:40:13.720 Progestin therapy Megace was approved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:13.720 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.450$ You know, many decades ago for

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}40{:}16.450 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{0}}} 00{:}40{:}18.270$ palliative treatment of enemy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:18.270 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.700$ enemy, troll, and breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:20.700 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.852$ However, really many decades

00:40:22.852 --> 00:40:25.542 elapsed without any new trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:25.550 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.635$ new indicate indicated therapies for

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:40:28.635 --> 00:40:32.425 endometrial cancer of a big benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:40:32.425 --> 00:40:35.095 for our patients without mutual cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}40{:}35.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}37.915$ with seen with the accelerated

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:37.915 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.604$ approval of pembrolizumab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:39.610 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.118$ For a minute, solid tumors that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:40:44.118 --> 00:40:46.994 mismatch repair deficient as about

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:46.994 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.118$ 20% of endometrial cancers are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:40:50.118 --> 00:40:52.149 or microsatellite instability

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:52.149 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.108$ high or more recently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:54.108 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.664$ with the addition of the accelerated

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:40:56.664 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.525$ approval for the tumor mutation burden high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636 00:40:59.530 --> 00:41:00.488 Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:00.488 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.320$ Tumors more recently this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:04.320 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.125$ Here we have an additional

 $00:41:07.125 \longrightarrow 00:41:09.369$ option for mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:09.369 --> 00:41:11.798 deficient and demetral cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:11.800 --> 00:41:13.480 just Starla Mob,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:13.480 --> 00:41:15.720 which received accelerated approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:15.720 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.310$ in August and then most recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:20.310 \longrightarrow 00:41:23.886$ the keynote 775 updated results were

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:23.886 --> 00:41:27.125 presented at ESMO following previous

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:27.125 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.925$ presentation at SGO showing combination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}41{:}30.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}35.430$ Of pembrolizumab and lymphatic nib.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:35.430 \longrightarrow 00:41:38.270$ Showing actually with this combination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:38.270 --> 00:41:40.926 In proficient mismatch repair.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00{:}41{:}40.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}42.918$ Proficient endometrial cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78430238636363600:41:42.920 --> 00:41:43.510 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:43.510 --> 00:41:46.460 an improvement in overall survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:46.460 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.865$ leading to regular approval of

 $00:41:48.865 \longrightarrow 00:41:51.159$ this combination for patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:51.159 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.374$ endometrial cancer that is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:53.374 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.615$ MSI high that is mismatch repair

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

 $00:41:56.615 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.455$ proficient and have disease progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.784302386363636

00:41:59.455 --> 00:42:01.888 following prior systemic therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:42:04.930 --> 00:42:09.046 Next, I want to move into how we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:09.046 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.427$ as clinicians scientists, participate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:11.427 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.769$ And a example for trial in

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:14.769 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.909$ progress that I'd like to share.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:42:17.910 --> 00:42:20.458 So I have a couple of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00{:}42{:}20.458 \to 00{:}42{:}22.740$ projects moving into clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:22.740 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.945$ This one that's currently in

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:42:25.945 --> 00:42:28.509 enrolling in clinical trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00{:}42{:}28.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}31.926$ And emerged from what began as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:42:31.926 --> 00:42:34.140 collaborative team science project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:34.140 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.325$ funded by a narrow one and then

 $00:42:37.325 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.540$ another trial, which I'm in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:40.540 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.302$ process of moving towards the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:42:43.302 --> 00:42:46.690 which is which I won't talk about today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:46.690 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.180$ which was based on translational

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:48.180 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.670$ science done in my lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:49.670 \longrightarrow 00:42:52.046$ Supported by DoD grant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:52.046 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.828$ For this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:42:53.830 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.210$ which began quite a long time ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:42:56.210 --> 00:43:00.670 UM, I collaborated with, UM,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:00.670 \longrightarrow 00:43:02.490$ Epidemia Cancer epidemiology experts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:02.490 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.220$ and we wanted to ask the

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:05.300 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.988$ question of what could,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00{:}43{:}06.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}09.954$ what we know about the development

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:09.954 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.384$ of endometrial cancer and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

00:43:12.384 --> 00:43:14.604 obesity is a major risk factor

00:43:14.604 --> 00:43:17.028 for Type 1 endometrial cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00{:}43{:}17.028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}20.093$ which has been increasing steadily

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:20.093 \longrightarrow 00:43:22.240$ and underlies the primary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:22.240 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.540$ Increase in the endometrial cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.868508536666667

 $00:43:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.318$ incidence as shown here in this graph.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:29.880 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.406$ See. A man is dorceau tick tick

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:43:34.406 --> 00:43:36.536 tick lining rate of hysterectomy

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:36.536 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.188$ is another contributing factor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:39.190 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.502$ Uh, what was known?

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:43:40.502 --> 00:43:41.814 And for many studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00{:}43{:}41.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}44.196$ including prospective study of

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:43:44.196 --> 00:43:46.218 the Women's Health Initiative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:46.218 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.074$ that some of the underlying biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:49.074 \longrightarrow 00:43:52.354$ mechanisms linking obesity to endometrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:52.354 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.158$ cancer include increased estrogen

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:43:55.158 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.584$ levels increased by availability of

 $00:43:58.584 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.156$ estrogens and insulin resistance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00{:}44{:}01.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}04.256$ Uhm, and the question that we asked was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:44:07.422$ do these factors that underlie the

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:07.422 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.530$ development of endometrial cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:09.530 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.813$ Do they play a role in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:12.813 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.588$ recurrence and progression of women

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:44:15.588 --> 00:44:18.128 diagnosed with endometrial cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:44:18.130 --> 00:44:19.693 For this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:19.693 \longrightarrow 00:44:22.298$ we utilized the tissue by

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:44:22.298 --> 00:44:25.316 repository of the GOT 210 study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:25.316 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.040$ This is a study that was over

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:44:29.162 --> 00:44:32.024 60 sites around the USFRGOG

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00{:}44{:}32.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}34.280$ Gynaecologic oncology group sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:34.280 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.102$ now under the auspices of NRG

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:38.102 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.700$ Oncology and enrolled patients who

 $00:44:40.700 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.660$ were undergoing standard surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00{:}44{:}42.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}45.309$ care for endometrial cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:45.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.242$ prospective specimen banking was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:48.242 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.664$ Performed and sent to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

00:44:50.664 --> 00:44:51.618 centralized tissue bank,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:51.620 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.676$ the jioji tissue bank.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:54.676 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.585$ And and prospective epidemiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:57.585 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.730$ surveys and outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:44:59.730 \longrightarrow 00:45:01.825$ Treatment and outcomes data was

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00{:}45{:}01.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}03.920$ obtained in order to facilitate

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:45:03.989 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.519$ translational research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00{:}45{:}05.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}08.995$ including a variety of molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:45:08.995 \longrightarrow 00:45:11.775$ and genetic genomic assays

NOTE Confidence: 0.781636

 $00:45:11.775 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.650$ and data integration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:18.490 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.380$ So we proposed a study

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:21.380 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.688$ within this G210 cohort,

00:45:23.688 --> 00:45:26.558 which we obtained funding for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00{:}45{:}26.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}29.380$ and this focused on the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

00:45:29.380 --> 00:45:31.260 who had endometrioid Histology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:31.260 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.452$ and we investigated the sex hormone

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:34.452 \longrightarrow 00:45:37.919$ and insulin like growth factor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:37.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.590$ signaling pathways implicated in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

00:45:40.590 --> 00:45:42.726 development of endometrial cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:45:45.410$ to determine if these factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00{:}45{:}45.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}47.954$ More related to the recurrence or

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00{:}45{:}47.954 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}50.525$ progression of higher risk and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

00:45:50.525 --> 00:45:52.572 Metroid under mutual cancers and

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

00:45:52.572 --> 00:45:55.224 this study included over 800 women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00{:}45{:}55.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57.936$ of whom 35% experienced a recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.83187726

 $00:45:57.936 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.159$ in a follow-up of over five years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:46:06.180 --> 00:46:09.650 Or the, UM, the methods?

 $00:46:09.650 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.356$ The models were adjusted for known

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00{:}46{:}12.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.080$ clinical risk factors of recurrence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:46:15.080 --> 00:46:17.220 including age, stage and grade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:17.220 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.586$ which were all significant risk factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:46:20.590 --> 00:46:24.076 for recurrence and just to summarize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:46:27.260$ some of the interesting findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:27.260 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.236$ which we presented at an ASCO

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:30.236 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.848$ plenary and we published this

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:46:32.848 --> 00:46:35.470 year in cancer epidemiol AMPDCEP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:35.470 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.410$ We found that circulating estradiol is

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:38.410 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.010$ positively associated with recurrence risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:41.010 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.534$ independent of other factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:43.534 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.427$ and in addition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:45.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.650$ a particular tissue biomarker that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:46:47.650 --> 00:46:50.550 was interested in based on some of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.610$ laboratory research that phosphorylated

 $00:46:52.610 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.370$ expression of insulin receptor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:55.370 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.504$ IGF one receptor was also independently

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:46:59.504 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.260$ associated with recurrence risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:02.260 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.222$ And this is an example of immunohistochemical

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:06.222 \longrightarrow 00:47:08.756$ staining for the phosphorylated

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:08.756 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.246$ activated form of the receptor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:47:12.250 --> 00:47:14.290 Because of the, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:14.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.146$ large number of patients we did utilize

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:47:17.146 --> 00:47:19.368 high throughput approaches for this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00{:}47{:}19.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}21.095$ which included construction

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:47:21.095 --> 00:47:25.060 of tissue microarrays and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:25.060 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.980$ And in real time PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:28.980 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.002$ So the translational impact of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00{:}47{:}31.002 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}32.823$ findings is that we identified

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:32.823 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.878$ novel sex hormone and insulin,

00:47:34.880 --> 00:47:36.930 IGF axis tissue and circulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.980$ biomarkers of recurrence in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:39.051 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.697$ prospective study of high stage enemy

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:41.697 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.728$ troydan mutual cancer and this led to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:45.730 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.090$ A motivation to test strategies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

00:47:49.090 --> 00:47:51.678 target these pathways for prevention

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00:47:51.678 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.948$ and treatment of endometrial cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.645219144

 $00{:}47{:}53.948 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}56.060$ and endometrial cancer recurrence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:00.970 \longrightarrow 00:48:03.162$ Come in my lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:03.162 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.810$ We looked at different potential

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}48{:}06.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}09.863$ the rapies for treating and demetral

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:09.863 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.869$ cancer that could be superior to

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:12.869 \longrightarrow 00:48:15.480$ the previously used strategies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}48{:}15.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}18.960$ So the most commonly used strategies

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:18.960 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.176$ in in the past have been protesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}48{:}23.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}26.238$ agents aromat ACE inhibitors or

00:48:26.238 --> 00:48:28.706 combination tamoxifen and megace,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:28.710 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.814$ and all of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:30.814 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.918$ Resulted in really modest

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:32.918 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.170$ efficacy with progression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}48{:}35.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}37.354$ Free survivals even in the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:37.354 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.739$ line setting of around three months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:39.740 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.868$ so this indicated a need for more effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:48:43.870 --> 00:48:46.234 Effective approaches for endocrine

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}48{:}46.234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}50.271$ the rapy and we found both in cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}48{:}50.271 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}53.217$ line models demonstrate we found that

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:48:53.220 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.210$ combination cyclin D kinase CDK 46

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:00.210 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.110$ inhibition with AROMATISSE inhibitors

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}49{:}02.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}04.553$ was potently synergistic and endometrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:04.553 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.342$ cancer cell lines and and this is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:09.342 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.434$ Something that it's been very

 $00:49:12.434 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.370$ successfully implemented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:13.370 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.540$ Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:14.540 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.050$ in estrogen receptor positive breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:18.050 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.338$ And this just shows in vivo data of

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:21.338 \longrightarrow 00:49:25.153$ showing on the Y axis the tumor volumes

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:25.153 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.070$ of the endometrial cancer xenograft.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:28.070 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.360$ And this was a RB wild type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:31.360 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.224$ As expected,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:32.224 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.816$ we found that RB mutant mutual

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:34.816 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.486$ cancers are not responsive to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}49{:}37.486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}39.646$ combination and you could see

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:39.646 \longrightarrow 00:49:42.746$ in the red that the combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:42.746 \longrightarrow 00:49:44.818$ therapy was significantly superior

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:44.818 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.069$ to either agent alone and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:48.069 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.862$ Both and much was really able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:50.862 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.625$ inhibit growth of this aggressive

 $00:49:53.625 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.572$ endometrial cancer xenografted and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:49:56.572 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.820$ is work we presented at the AACR meeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:00.820 \longrightarrow 00:50:04.308$ And this led me to initiate a collaboration

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:50:04.308 --> 00:50:06.918 guided by valuable input from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:06.920 \longrightarrow 00:50:10.200$ you know my division colleagues here at Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:10.200 \longrightarrow 00:50:13.656$ who of course are leading clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:50:13.660 --> 00:50:17.280 researchers as well as colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}50{:}17.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}21.534$ and in breast cancer like Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:50:21.534 --> 00:50:25.596 Pusztai and my colleague Dr Santine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:25.600 \longrightarrow 00:50:26.797$ incorporating their input,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:26.797 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.170$ I was able to successfully submit a concept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}50{:}30.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}35.732$ For a clinical trial for two to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:35.732 \dashrightarrow 00:50:41.240$ supported by Lilly and in collaboration with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:41.240 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.365$ Leading clinical trialists in June

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:50:43.365 --> 00:50:46.469 ecology and the in the Jioji group,

 $00:50:46.470 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.085$ which is our major cooperative

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:49.085 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.654$ group for research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:50.660 \longrightarrow 00:50:56.295$ We we actually were able to successfully

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:50:56.295 \longrightarrow 00:51:00.070$ propose and activate an investigator

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:00.070 \longrightarrow 00:51:03.080$ initiated trial which is GOG 3039,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:03.080 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.330$ a phase two study of abemaciclib

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:51:05.411 --> 00:51:08.246 in combination with lectures on

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}51{:}08.246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}10.514$ advanced recurrent or metastatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:10.514 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.630$ endometrioid in Dimitriou cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

00:51:12.630 --> 00:51:14.910 This is a phase two single arm trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:14.910 \longrightarrow 00:51:17.134$ to evaluate the efficacy of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:17.134 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.124$ drug combination for endometrioid and

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:19.124 \longrightarrow 00:51:20.910$ imaginal cancer with dosing based

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00{:}51{:}20.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}22.902$ on the current FDA approval for

NOTE Confidence: 0.803527206

 $00:51:22.910 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.860$ combination therapy and breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:27.110 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.660$ The study endpoints is to evaluate

 $00:51:29.660 \longrightarrow 00:51:32.150$ the efficacy and in addition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:32.150 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.410$ the translational research component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:34.410 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.569$ which is all being done here at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:38.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.828$ We are. Collecting longitudinally

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}51{:}43.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}48.785$ whole whole blood for cell free DNA as

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:48.785 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.558$ well as FFP of the tissue samples for

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:52.558 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.238$ exploratory analysis and identification

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:51:55.238 --> 00:51:58.369 of novel biomarkers of response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:51:58.370 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.984$ And how does this trial the JIOJI 3039 trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:01.984 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.546$ fit into the rapidly evolving landscape

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:04.546 \longrightarrow 00:52:07.030$ of treatment for endometrial cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:52:07.030 --> 00:52:08.554 Well surgery, hysterectomy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}52{:}08.554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}11.602$ removal of the tubes and ovaries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:52:11.610 --> 00:52:14.232 and nodal valuation is still the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:14.232 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.980$ cornerstone of patients presenting

 $00:52:16.050 \longrightarrow 00:52:18.400$ with resectable ended mutual cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:52:18.400 --> 00:52:19.480 Following surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:19.480 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.180$ low end and intermediate risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:52:22.180 --> 00:52:25.209 patients are managed with observation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:25.210 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.194$ while high intermediate risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:27.194 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.178$ patients standard of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}52{:}29.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}31.170$ Some receive radiation the rapy or

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:31.170 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.160$ vaginal breakey therapy with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:33.229 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.434$ potential benefit of the additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:35.434 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.639$ of pembrolizumab for mismatch repair.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}52{:}37.640 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}52{:}40.012$ Deficient patients being evaluated

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:40.012 \longrightarrow 00:52:44.160$ in this trial we have open here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:52:44.160 --> 00:52:49.890 which is the Gio 24 high risk higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:49.890 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.230$ risk patients following surgery

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:52:52.230 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.170$ who are fully respected.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:52:54.170 --> 00:52:56.782 Admin therapy includes chemotherapy,

00:52:56.782 --> 00:53:00.066 usually tax on carboplatin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:00.070 \longrightarrow 00:53:01.756$ With a mentor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}01.756 \longrightarrow 00{:}53{:}03.442$ village individualized radio

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:03.442 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.566$ radiation therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:53:04.570 --> 00:53:06.294 often including pelvic radiation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:53:06.294 --> 00:53:08.449 if there's pelvic nodal involvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:08.450 \longrightarrow 00:53:11.122$ and whether or not pember Lism AB is

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:53:11.122 --> 00:53:13.184 going to offer additional benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:13.184 \longrightarrow 00:53:15.812$ to reduce the risk of distant

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}15.812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}18.870$ Mets in these higher risk women is

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:18.870 \longrightarrow 00:53:20.562$ being evaluated in keynote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:20.570 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.426 \to 21$ and what about first line therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}24.426 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}53{:}28.140$ for advanced patients measurable disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:28.140 \longrightarrow 00:53:29.744$ metastatic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

00:53:29.744 --> 00:53:32.150 or recurrent disease?

 $00:53:32.150 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.774$ So the standard of care currently is

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:35.774 \longrightarrow 00:53:40.233$ chemotherapy with GOG 209 showing tax sale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:40.240 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.663$ CARBO doublet therapy as to double as

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:43.663 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.948$ adopted from ovarian cancer is seems to

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:46.948 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.502$ be more tolerable than triplet therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}49.502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}52.379$ So that's become the standard of care

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}52.379 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}54.987$ and whether or not pember lism AB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}54.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}56.915$ Will improve outcomes in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}53{:}56.915 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}53{:}59.361$ patients who have a very high

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:53:59.361 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.616$ risk of progression and recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00{:}54{:}01.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}04.776$ is being evaluated in giot, oh.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:54:04.776 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.698$ Eighteen also actively enrolling and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:54:07.698 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.746$ in this patient population where NCCN.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:54:10.750 \longrightarrow 00:54:13.370$ Guidelines also described hormonal

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:54:13.370 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.990$ therapy as an option.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874475027272727

 $00:54:15.990 \longrightarrow 00:54:19.308$ Would definitely consider Geo G39 for

 $00:54:19.308 \longrightarrow 00:54:22.680$ these patients who would be eligible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:25.090 \longrightarrow 00:54:27.986$ And what about in the second line setting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:27.990 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.150$ Currently we have standard of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:30.150 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.310$ care options for patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:32.384 \longrightarrow 00:54:34.834$ progressed on previous chemo and

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:54:34.834 --> 00:54:37.284 those include for mismatch repair,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:37.290 \longrightarrow 00:54:40.596$ deficient pembrolizumab or just Starla mad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:40.600 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.796$ And then for the MMR proficient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}54{:}42.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}46.538$ we saw that pembrolizum ab and inland

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:46.538 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.922$ vatnik combination performed better

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:48.922 \longrightarrow 00:54:52.318$ than physicians choice of second line

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}54{:}52.318 \rightarrow 00{:}54{:}55.206$ chemo in the GY and art portfolio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:55.210 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.994$ We have a number of biomarker

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:57.994 \longrightarrow 00:54:59.850$ driven the rapies being evaluated

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:54:59.928 \longrightarrow 00:55:01.648$ in a phase two setting,

00:55:01.650 --> 00:55:04.485 and these are led by Doctor Santine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}55{:}04.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}07.070$ a fully receptor alpha targeting

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:55:07.070 --> 00:55:08.618 antibody drug conjugate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:55:08.620 --> 00:55:12.652 as well as a trope 2 targeting anti

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:12.652 \longrightarrow 00:55:16.062$ antibody drug conjugate and certainly

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:16.062 \longrightarrow 00:55:18.806$ for endometrioid endometrial cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:18.810 \longrightarrow 00:55:22.860$ would would recommend consideration

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:22.860 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.030$ of GOG 39 for these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}55{:}26.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}30.930$ So patients are eligible for GOG 3039

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:55:30.930 --> 00:55:34.290 with up to two prior systemic regimens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:55:34.290 --> 00:55:36.264 one of which could have been chemo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:36.270 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.420$ one of which could have been immunotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:55:43.305$ And we actually have activated over 20

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:43.305 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.294$ sites of the 25 selected sites and have

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:48.294 \longrightarrow 00:55:52.600$ really been having rapid accrual with the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.500$ Current rate of accrual

00:55:54.500 --> 00:55:56.875 exceeding our expectation of one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:55:59.286$ and it's currently one to two

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:55:59.286 \longrightarrow 00:56:00.489$ patients per week.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:56:00.490 --> 00:56:01.866 For this trial, which,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:01.866 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.930$ if it goes to second stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:03.930 \longrightarrow 00:56:08.095$ would enroll a maximum of 52 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.102$ I just wanted to briefly touch on

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:10.102 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.079$ that since this is relatively new.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}12.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}15.128$ Is this NCTM navigator or clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}15.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}17.871$ trial specimen resource and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:17.871 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.355$ available for validation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:20.355 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.712$ hypotheses following already completed

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}22.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}24.936$ exploratory and pilot studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}24.940 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}56{:}27.298$ and this includes a very vast

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:27.298 \longrightarrow 00:56:28.477$ number of specimens,

 $00:56:28.480 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.392$ including a lot of the specimens that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:56:31.392 --> 00:56:33.860 transferred over from the jioji tissue bank,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:33.860 \longrightarrow 00:56:38.246$ and there is a workflow available.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:56:42.040$ For exploring what specimens are

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.072$ available and submitting for

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:56:47.310$ for access to these specimens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}47.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}49.935$ for for addressing research questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:49.935 \longrightarrow 00:56:53.037$ that may require large number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}53.037 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}56.240$ samples that are collected in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:56:56.240 \longrightarrow 00:56:58.894$ very rigorous way and then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}56{:}58.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}01.786$ how do we fund translational research

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:01.790 \longrightarrow 00:57:06.186$ in the area of some declining support?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:06.190 \longrightarrow 00:57:08.170$ One of the mechanisms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:57:08.170 --> 00:57:11.140 Which has been super valuable for

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:11.238 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.160$ supporting translational support.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:14.160 \longrightarrow 00:57:15.752$ Is this poor mechanism,

 $00:57:15.752 \longrightarrow 00:57:18.140$ which of course yellows been very

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00{:}57{:}18.214 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}21.286$ successful and has spores and head and neck,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:21.290 \longrightarrow 00:57:22.954$ lung, and skin cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:57:22.954 --> 00:57:25.775 There are very few GYN funded spores,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:25.775 \longrightarrow 00:57:28.085$ currently only one and ended meet

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:28.085 \longrightarrow 00:57:29.619$ real one in cervical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:29.620 \longrightarrow 00:57:33.386$ 5 in ovarian and there's one new.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:33.390 \longrightarrow 00:57:37.308$ Sporen that focuses on health disparities

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:37.308 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.920$ and endometrial Varian cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:39.920 \longrightarrow 00:57:42.600$ So I hope I've relate some of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:57:42.600 --> 00:57:44.862 enthusiasm for team science and

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:57:44.862 --> 00:57:46.886 its essential ingredient for

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:46.886 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.377$ translational science and conduct of

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:49.377 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.617$ clinical trials for gene cancers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:51.620 \longrightarrow 00:57:53.900$ which are relatively rare

 $00:57:53.900 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.395$ cancers and really way for having

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:57:57.395 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.735$ exciting and meaningful impact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:57:59.740 --> 00:58:00.828 And I hope I've,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:58:00.828 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.441$ I hope to yell at people who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

 $00:58:03.441 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.257$ interested in collaborating with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94380326875

00:58:05.260 --> 00:58:07.465 Contact me in my emails listed here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820637492

00:58:10.390 --> 00:58:12.190 Thank you Gloria. Very interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.820637492

 $00:58:12.190 \longrightarrow 00:58:13.894$ very exciting to see the progress

NOTE Confidence: 0.820637492

 $00:58:13.894 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.560$ that's been made and all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.820637492

 $00:58:15.560 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.084$ trials that are underway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820637492

00:58:17.084 --> 00:58:18.780 They're underway, people can please.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

00:58:20.890 --> 00:58:22.948 Type your questions into the chat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:22.950 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.432$ While we're waiting, you might want

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:24.432 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.567$ to talk to Roy Herbst if you haven't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:26.570 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.838$ He's sort of taking the lead on

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:28.838 \dashrightarrow 00:58:30.801$ trying to organize new spores and

00:58:30.801 --> 00:58:32.427 has quite a bit of experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:32.430 \longrightarrow 00:58:33.710$ so he might be someone to talk to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00.58:33.710 \longrightarrow 00.58:36.006$ Be great to have this poor in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:36.006 \longrightarrow 00:58:38.362$ in this area in the Piola trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:38.362 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.230$ It it it was comparing bracket positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

00:58:41.230 --> 00:58:42.241 Projecting negative patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

00:58:42.241 --> 00:58:45.110 Was that bracket one or two or or both?

NOTE Confidence: 0.935592178333333

 $00:58:45.110 \longrightarrow 00:58:47.020$ Did they they stratify that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:58:48.620 \longrightarrow 00:58:51.662$ So in the data that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:58:51.662 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.690$ published in the paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00{:}58{:}53.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}55.916$ at least not in the main manuscript.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00{:}58{:}55.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}00.756$ I don't recall seeing a stratification

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00{:}59{:}00.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}04.830$ of the Braca one versus bracket two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:59:09.030$ They did show the hazard ratios and

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:09.030 \longrightarrow 00:59:13.717$ PFS curves for a few different groups,

 $00:59:13.720 \longrightarrow 00:59:16.780$ and that included the bracket

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00{:}59{:}16.780 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}59{:}18.616$ tumor mutation positive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:18.620 \longrightarrow 00:59:20.996$ The bracca tumor mutation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

00:59:20.996 --> 00:59:23.966 positive and HRD positive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:23.966 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.997$ then the bracket to mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:27.000 \longrightarrow 00:59:31.872$ Negative or wild type and HRD

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:31.872 \longrightarrow 00:59:34.938$ positive and then for so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

00:59:34.938 --> 00:59:39.066 The UM for that trial, the, UM,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:39.066 \dashrightarrow 00:59:44.330$ the benefit was seen in the Braca positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

00:59:44.468 --> 00:59:48.860 Braca mutated or the HRD positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

00:59:48.860 --> 00:59:51.185 which in that trial was

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:51.185 \longrightarrow 00:59:53.045$ determined by the myriad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:53.050 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.334$ My choice HRD thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:55.334 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.569$ Uhm and there was not a clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $00:59:59.569 \longrightarrow 01:00:02.888$ benefit in the HR proficient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

01:00:02.888 --> 01:00:04.742 Braka wildtype group.

01:00:04.742 --> 01:00:07.832 But that's an interesting question

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $01:00:07.832 \longrightarrow 01:00:10.430$ about if there are differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $01:00:10.430 \longrightarrow 01:00:12.795$ between Bracha one or two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

01:00:12.800 --> 01:00:13.592 Uhm, mutated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $01:00:13.592 \longrightarrow 01:00:15.572$ which I'm not sure I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.850228801

 $01:00:15.572 \longrightarrow 01:00:17.370$ look into that though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.712997873333333

01:00:17.430 --> 01:00:20.834 OK, alright, good. There any other

NOTE Confidence: 0.712997873333333

01:00:20.834 --> 01:00:22.026 questions from the audience?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9723501

 $01:00:26.480 \longrightarrow 01:00:27.530$ If not, will thank you Gloria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9723501

 $01:00:27.530 \longrightarrow 01:00:29.378$ It was very interesting and also Michaela.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9723501

01:00:29.380 --> 01:00:31.820 I thought we had a terrific series today

NOTE Confidence: 0.9723501

 $01:00:31.820 \longrightarrow 01:00:35.220$ and we'll see you all next week, bye. I.