WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:57:11"

NOTE recognizability:0.796

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:05.495 Welcome to the Yale Ash 2021 highlights.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}05{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}06{.}690$ My name is Bob Bone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:06.690 \rightarrow 00:00:09.049$ I'm one of the hematologist at Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}09{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}11.175$ and I'm happy to facilitate

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:11.175 \longrightarrow 00:00:12.450$ this session today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:12.450 \rightarrow 00:00:15.672$ As we are focusing on some of the important

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:15.672 \rightarrow 00:00:18.541$ abstracts from the previous ash meeting

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:18.541 \rightarrow 00:00:20.976$ relating relating to classical hematology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:20.980 \rightarrow 00:00:23.732$ And today we have 3 presenters who will

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}23.732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.538$ each present abstracts for about 15 minutes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}26.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}28.640$ We'll take questions at the end of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}28.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}30.203$ session and they should be entered

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:30.203 \rightarrow 00:00:32.145$ into the chat room or to the Q&A.

00:00:32.145 --> 00:00:34.700 Before we start, let me take a

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}34.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37.549$ moment to introduce our presenters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:00:37.550 --> 00:00:38.738 First Kelsey Martin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}38.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}41.510$ who is an assistant professor in clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}41.581 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}44.136$ medicine at the Yale School of Medicine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:44.140 \longrightarrow 00:00:46.095$ and she practices hematology oncology NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}00{:}46.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}49.299$ at the Orange Care Center and has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:49.299 \rightarrow 00:00:51.274$ special interest in classical hematology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:51.280 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.040$ and particularly the intersection

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:53.040 \rightarrow 00:00:55.284$ of obstetrical care and hematology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:00:55.284 --> 00:00:58.056 Doctor Sudhanshu Mulay who is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:00:58.056 \rightarrow 00:01:00.467$ medical director of the anticoagulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:01:00.467 --> 00:01:02.812 clinic at Saint Francis Hospital

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}01{:}02.812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}05.582$ and Medical Center and he also has

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}01{:}05{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}07{.}247$ a strong interest in classical

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:07.247 \rightarrow 00:01:09.100$ hematology and transfusion medicine.

 $00{:}01{:}09{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}11.056$ He's an assistant professor of medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:11.056 \dashrightarrow 00:01:13.070$ at the University of Connecticut.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:01:13.070 --> 00:01:15.608 And then finally Doctor Alex Pine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:15.610 \rightarrow 00:01:18.185$ who's assistant professor of medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:18.185 \longrightarrow 00:01:22.300$ and hematology at the VA Medical Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:22.300 \dashrightarrow 00:01:24.256$ He and his colleagues have done

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:24.256 \rightarrow 00:01:26.479$ significant work over the past few years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:26.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.604$ detailing the mechanisms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:01:29.604 --> 00:01:31.166 COVID Coagulopathy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00:01:31.170 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.630$ So without further ado,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

00:01:32.630 --> 00:01:34.455 I'll introduce Doctor Martin and

NOTE Confidence: 0.815167712857143

 $00{:}01{:}34.455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}36.589$ let her begin the presentations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.819575348

 $00:01:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.190$ Great, thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.864340405714286

00:01:52.480 --> 00:01:53.902 Good afternoon everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.864340405714286

00:01:53.902 --> 00:01:56.696 Is my volume OK? Correct, alright,

00:01:56.696 --> 00:01:59.832 I'm going to be discussing A3 abstracts

NOTE Confidence: 0.864340405714286

 $00:01:59.832 \rightarrow 00:02:01.848$ relating to bleeding disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

00:02:04.190 --> 00:02:06.932 First, abstract is titled efficacy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

 $00:02:06.932 \rightarrow 00:02:10.309$ safety of the two Serin prophylaxis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

00:02:10.310 --> 00:02:12.700 a small molecule RNA interference

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

 $00:02:12.700 \dashrightarrow 00:02:15.090$ the rapeutic in a multicenter phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

00:02:15.090 --> 00:02:18.600 Three study called Atlas I NH in people

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

 $00:02:18.600 \rightarrow 00:02:21.645$ with hemophilia A or B with inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

 $00{:}02{:}21.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}24.188$ This was presented at the plenary

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

 $00{:}02{:}24.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}26.430$ scientific session by Doctor Gayoung

NOTE Confidence: 0.7091463225

00:02:26.430 --> 00:02:28.360 from University of Southern California.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

00:02:31.120 --> 00:02:32.880 1st, I'll provide some background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

00:02:32.880 --> 00:02:35.040 Hemophilia A&B are rare bleeding

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00{:}02{:}35{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}36{.}768$ disorders that are characterized

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00{:}02{:}36.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}38.980$ by ineffective clot formation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00:02:38.980 \rightarrow 00:02:41.038$ largely due to impaired thrombin generation.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992
- 00:02:41.040 --> 00:02:43.405 As a result of severe

 $00:02:43.405 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.070$ deficiency of factor 8 and 9.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00:02:46.070 \rightarrow 00:02:48.632$ Currently our standard of care largely

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00:02:48.632 \rightarrow 00:02:51.449$ relies on replacing the missing factor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00{:}02{:}51{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}53{.}704$ There is a high rate of development

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00{:}02{:}53{.}704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}55{.}379$ of anti factor inhibitors which

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00:02:55.379 \rightarrow 00:02:58.274$ is up to about 30% in some of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00:02:58.274 \rightarrow 00:03:00.200$ patients with hemophilia A and about

NOTE Confidence: 0.919775992

 $00:03:00.264 \dashrightarrow 00:03:02.220$ 5% of the patients with hemophilia B.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

00:03:04.640 --> 00:03:06.146 Subcutaneous fat isran

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:06.146 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.154$ is a novel the rapeutic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

00:03:08.160 --> 00:03:10.815 It's a small molecule RNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00{:}03{:}10.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}12.536$ interference the rapeutic that acts

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

00:03:12.536 --> 00:03:14.832 by binding and degrading at the M

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00{:}03{:}14.832 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17.398$ RNA which encodes for antithrombin,

 $00:03:17.400 \rightarrow 00:03:19.413$ thereby partially silencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00{:}03{:}19{.}413 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}22{.}097$ the expression of antithrom bin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00{:}03{:}22{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}24{.}220$ This rebalances hemostasis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:24.220 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.340$ restores thrombin generation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00{:}03{:}26{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}28{.}672$ patients with hemophilia or A

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:28.672 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.060$ and has been demonstrated to be NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

00:03:31.060 -> 00:03:33.233 effective in patients with or

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:33.233 \rightarrow 00:03:35.363$ without inhibitors as I'll discuss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00{:}03{:}35{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}37{.}090$ This study demonstrated that

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:37.090 \rightarrow 00:03:39.240$ prophylactic use of the two

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:39.240 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.032$ strands significantly reduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:41.032 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.967$ annualized bleeding rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

00:03:42.970 - 00:03:44.446 which is essentially bleeding

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:44.446 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.660$ events on an annual basis in

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

00:03:46.731 --> 00:03:48.766 patients with hemophilia A or

NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571

 $00:03:48.766 \rightarrow 00:03:50.801$ hemophilia B that have inhibitors,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:03:50.810 \rightarrow 00:03:53.578$ and demonstrated both efficacy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:03:53.578 \longrightarrow 00:03:55.654$ and safety data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:03:55.660 \rightarrow 00:03:56.812$ In this study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- 00:03:56.812 --> 00:03:58.348 57 patients were randomized,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:03:58.350 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.030$ 2 to one in an open label phase.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00{:}04{:}00{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}01{.}930$ Three trial patients were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:04:01.930 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.780$ males over the age of 12,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:04:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.796$ again with either hemophilia A or B,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00:04:06.800 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.868$ with with inhibitors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00{:}04{:}07.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}09.648$ and these were patients that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- 00:04:09.648 --> 00:04:11.770 had been receiving on demand
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00{:}04{:}11.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}13.558$ treatment with by passing agents
- NOTE Confidence: 0.734905561428571
- $00{:}04{:}13.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.510$ for Blake breakthrough bleeding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714
- $00{:}04{:}17.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.105$ There was 38 patients in the phase, two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714
- $00:04:20.105 \dashrightarrow 00:04:22.225$ Syrian group and the dosing of this medic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:22.230 \rightarrow 00:04:24.258$ This is a subcutaneous therapy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:24.258 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.826$ was given at 80 milligrams once a

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:26.826 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.550$ month versus 19 patients in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

00:04:29.550 --> 00:04:31.890 on demand bypassing Agent Group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:31.890 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.766$ They were followed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:32.766 \rightarrow 00:04:34.810$ The primary endpoint was looking at annual

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:34.864 \rightarrow 00:04:36.610$ bleeding rate in the efficacy period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:36.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.718$ which was nine months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00{:}04{:}39{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}41{.}936$ Secondary endpoints looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:41.936 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.598$ spontaneous bleeding rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00{:}04{:}43.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}44.616$ joints, bleeds,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:44.616 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.648$ quality of life metrics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:46.650 \rightarrow 00:04:50.332$ which by a validated quality of life

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00{:}04{:}50{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}52{.}780$ tool and also frequency of the bleeding

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:52.780 \rightarrow 00:04:55.019$ episodes that happened in the onset period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714

 $00:04:55.020 \rightarrow 00:04:57.020$ which was the first month of therapy as

- NOTE Confidence: 0.761360574285714
- $00:04:57.020 \rightarrow 00:04:59.120$ well as safety and tolerability data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838069712142857
- $00{:}05{:}03.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}04.925$ And and this was demonstrated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838069712142857
- $00:05:04.925 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.153$ to be extremely effective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838069712142857
- $00:05:06.153 \rightarrow 00:05:07.790$ in the future and patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838069712142857
- $00:05:07.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.094$ So you can see here on this first
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838069712142857
- $00:05:10.094 \dashrightarrow 00:05:12.046$ line the median annual annualized
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838069712142857
- $00:05:12.046 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.116$ bleeding rate was actually 0.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00{:}05{:}17{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21{.}046$ The estimated rate was 1.7 versus
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00:05:21.046 \dashrightarrow 00:05:23.476$ in the bypassing agent group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00:05:23.480 \rightarrow 00:05:28.260$ The median annualized bleeding rate was 16.8.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00:05:28.260 \rightarrow 00:05:30.534$ And there was actually the median
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00{:}05{:}30{.}534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32{.}443$ for spontaneous bleeds with zero
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00:05:32.443 \rightarrow 00:05:34.098$ in the future and category.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- $00{:}05{:}34{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}35{.}908$ There was also demonstration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116
- 00:05:35.908 --> 00:05:38.168 of significant quality of life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116

 $00{:}05{:}38{.}168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}40{.}054$ improvements based on the validated

NOTE Confidence: 0.929359116

 $00:05:40.054 \rightarrow 00:05:41.870$ quality of life screening tool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}05{:}44{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}46{.}890$ And it was effective in both

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}05{:}46.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.140$ patients with hemophilia A and

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00:05:49.140 \dashrightarrow 00:05:51.355$ in patients with hemophilia B.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}05{:}51{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54{.}930$ And we can see that 29 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

00:05:54.930 --> 00:05:56.898 And we received for two strand

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00:05:56.898 \rightarrow 00:05:58.800$ in the hemophilia A category

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}05{:}58{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}00{.}645$ and nine patients received it

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00:06:00.645 \rightarrow 00:06:02.490$ in the hemophilia B category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

00:06:02.490 --> 00:06:05.178 And again this is compared with

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}06{:}05{.}178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}07{.}138$ the second second line here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}06{:}07{.}138 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}09{.}023$ But patient to receive that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

 $00{:}06{:}09{.}023 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}10{.}652$ by passing agent only with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.93286991

00:06:10.652 --> 00:06:11.816 very significant P value.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

 $00:06:15.280 \rightarrow 00:06:17.980$ Overall, the agent was well tolerated,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00{:}06{:}17{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}21{.}436$ although the main side effect of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:21.436 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.460$ special interest was thrombotic events.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:24.460 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.230$ Uhm? There was no deaths of any
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:29.230 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.779$ kind in either group of note.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:31.780 \rightarrow 00:06:34.398$ Of the patients that had thrombotic events,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00{:}06{:}34{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}35{.}990$ the authors reported that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:35.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.580$ occurred in some patients that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00{:}06{:}37.638 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}39.073$ seemed to have the antithrombin
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:39.073 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.172$ levels at the lower end of the range
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:41.172 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.266$ and seen some as low as 10 to 20%,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:43.266 \rightarrow 00:06:45.930$ and which is what they attributed to and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:46.003 \rightarrow 00:06:48.614$ only one patient who had a thrombotic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- 00:06:48.614 --> 00:06:50.290 event ended up coming off study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00{:}06{:}50{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}53{.}314$ and this was a patient who had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333
- $00:06:53.314 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.030$ a thrombosis in a spinal vein.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

 $00:06:56.030 \dashrightarrow 00:06:58.770$ Other side effects were increases

NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

00:06:58.770 --> 00:06:59.866 in transaminases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

00:06:59.870 --> 00:07:01.998 but the authors reported that this did not NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

00:07:01.998 --> 00:07:03.987 impact any of the treatment scheduling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

 $00:07:03.990 \rightarrow 00:07:06.312$ and no patients had to come off trial for

NOTE Confidence: 0.836984533333333

 $00:07:06.312 \dashrightarrow 00:07:08.590$ any changes in hepatic enzyme changes. NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00{:}07{:}13.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.640$ So the conclusions were that the two

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00:07:16.640 \rightarrow 00:07:18.840$ Serin had significant improvements

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

00:07:18.840 --> 00:07:21.342 in the treatment arm compared with

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00{:}07{:}21.342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}23.590$ the on demand by passing agents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00{:}07{:}23.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}25.638$ And this is seen as somewhat of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00:07:25.638 \dashrightarrow 00:07:27.870$ game changer in the sense that it's NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

10112 Connuclice: 0.970921090

 $00{:}07{:}27.870$ --> $00{:}07{:}29.202$ given monthly and subcutaneous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00{:}07{:}29{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}31{.}172$ which is a tremendous change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

00:07:31.172 --> 00:07:32.980 compared to the current standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00:07:32.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.180$ of practice where patients are

- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:35.180 \rightarrow 00:07:36.940$ needing intravenous therapies and.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00{:}07{:}36{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}40{.}050$ In a much higher frequency.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:40.050 \dashrightarrow 00:07:42.269$ Nearly 2/3 of the patients treated with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:42.269 \rightarrow 00:07:44.390$ fattoush Rand had zero treated bleeds,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00{:}07{:}44.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}46.355$ and the mean median annualized
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- 00:07:46.355 --> 00:07:47.927 bleeding rate was zero.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.920$ And of note,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00{:}07{:}48.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}50.900$ this is also efficacious in both
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:50.900 \dashrightarrow 00:07:52.890$ patients with hemophilia and hemophilia
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:52.890 \rightarrow 00:07:55.278$ B and its patients with hemophilia
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:55.339 \dashrightarrow 00:07:57.326$ B have really had not had similar
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- 00:07:57.326 --> 00:07:58.694 prophylactic similar prophylactic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:07:58.694 \dashrightarrow 00:08:01.430$ options as our hemophilia A patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00{:}08{:}01{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}05{.}382$ So creating a new sort of treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658
- $00:08:05.382 \dashrightarrow 00:08:07.265$ approach 7 patients in the treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

00:08:07.265 -> 00:08:09.629 arm had at least one adverse event,

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

00:08:09.630 --> 00:08:09.911 including.

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00{:}08{:}09{.}911 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}11.316$ The four thrombotic events and

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

00:08:11.316 --> 00:08:13.068 one of those patients did require

NOTE Confidence: 0.970921658

 $00:08:13.068 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.228$ withdrawal from this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00{:}08{:}17{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}19{.}070$ That concludes my discussion

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00:08:19.070 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.230$ in the first abstract,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00:08:20.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.770$ and I'll move on to the second.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00{:}08{:}21.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}23.760$ The second abstract was titled

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00{:}08{:}23.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.750$ rate of prolonged response after

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

00:08:25.819 --> 00:08:27.583 stopping THROMBOPOIETIN receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

00:08:27.583 --> 00:08:29.935 agonist treatment in primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00:08:29.935 \rightarrow 00:08:31.699$ immune thrombocytopenia results

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00{:}08{:}31.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}34.041$ from a nationwide prospective

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00:08:34.041 \rightarrow 00:08:35.748$ multicenter interventional study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91085635625

 $00:08:35.750 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.956$ And this was out of France.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- 00:08:43.470 --> 00:08:44.709 Some background information.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:08:44.709 \rightarrow 00:08:46.361$ There's been several retrospective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:08:46.361 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.469$ studies and a recent prospective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:08:48.469 \rightarrow 00:08:50.504$ study that reported unexpected cases
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00{:}08{:}50{.}504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}52{.}504$ of durable remission after TPO
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:08:52.504 \rightarrow 00:08:53.940$ receptor agonist were discontinued
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:08:53.940 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.631$ in adult patients with ITP.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- 00:08:55.631 --> 00:08:57.639 This has been seen in up to up
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00{:}08{:}57{.}639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}00{.}365$ to 30% of these patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:09:00.365 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.834$ However, it felt that perhaps some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:09:02.834 \rightarrow 00:09:05.287$ the newly diagnosed ITP cases in which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:09:05.287 \rightarrow 00:09:06.939$ such spontaneous remissions occurred,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00:09:06.940 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.245$ may may have been included
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848894783
- $00{:}09{:}08.245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}09.550$ in most of these studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127
- $00{:}09{:}11{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}14.838$ So the question this study has is what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:14.838 \rightarrow 00:09:16.959$ proportion of patients with either

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}09{:}16{.}959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}20{.}036$ persistent or chronic phase ITP and no

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:20.036 \rightarrow 00:09:22.574$ recent exposure to any potentially curative NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:22.574 \rightarrow 00:09:25.369$ therapy such as splenectomy or rituximab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}09{:}25{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}28{.}172$ achieve a long term remission off

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:28.172 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.238$ treatment at 24 weeks and 52 weeks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:31.240 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.347$ After having on at least three months

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:33.347 \rightarrow 00:09:35.879$ of their TPO receptor agonist exposure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}09{:}35{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}38{.}400$ who had a complete response

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:38.400 \rightarrow 00:09:39.441$ and persistent phase,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}09{:}39{.}441 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}41{.}870$ ITP is is defined as those with

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:41.943 \rightarrow 00:09:43.779$ ITP between 3 and 12 months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:43.780 \rightarrow 00:09:48.456$ whereas chronic phases lasting for beyond 12.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:48.460 \rightarrow 00:09:50.590$ Months, so the inclusion criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:50.590 \rightarrow 00:09:53.355$ So again, this was a nationwide prospective

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:09:53.355 \rightarrow 00:09:54.540$ multicenter interventional study.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127
- $00{:}09{:}54{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}56{.}120$ The inclusion criteria included

 $00{:}09{:}56{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}59{.}439$ patients over the age of 18 with either

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

00:09:59.439 --> 00:10:01.639 persistent or chronic primary ITP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:01.640 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.632$ They needed to have a stable

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:03.632 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.296$ complete response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:04.300 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.704$ which was defined as a platelet

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:05.704 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.855$ count of more than 100,000 for more

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}07.855 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}10.690$ than two months on their on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}10{.}775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}13{.}190$ TPO RA the rapy and they needed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}13.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}15.110$ have been on treatment with their

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}15{.}176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}17{.}206$ TPO RA for at least three months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

00:10:17.210 --> 00:10:18.938 Exclusion criteria was patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}18{.}938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}21{.}098$ who are on either anticoagulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}21.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}22.939$ or antiplate let therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}22{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25{.}257$ A patient who had previously failed the

 $00{:}10{:}25{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28{.}046$ TPRA agent and the patient could not

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00{:}10{:}28.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}30.219$ have been receiving any concomitant

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

00:10:30.219 --> 00:10:32.937 steroid or cortico steroid or IVIG,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:32.940 \rightarrow 00:10:34.580$ and they could not have had Rituxan mab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:34.580 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.415$ nor splenectomy within either the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:36.415 \longrightarrow 00:10:38.250$ two months preceding or after

NOTE Confidence: 0.90684127

 $00:10:38.313 \rightarrow 00:10:40.525$ initiation of their TPO or RA therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:10:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.936$ And the patients underwent a progressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:10:45.936 \rightarrow 00:10:48.229$ dose reduction and they had to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:10:48.230 \rightarrow 00:10:50.113$ There are TPO therapy or a therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

00:10:50.113 --> 00:10:52.635 had to be stopped by 10 weeks and

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:10:52.635 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.285$ they proposed a method whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

00:10:54.353 --> 00:10:55.908 it was a Rama, Plasty, Morrell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:10:55.908 \rightarrow 00:10:59.521$ Trumbo bag of a protocol of how to how

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:10:59.521 \rightarrow 00:11:01.777$ to taper off their doses accordingly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

00:11:01.780 --> 00:11:04.060 And if a patient relapsed during

- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:04.060 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.200$ after this discontinuation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:05.200 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.160$ the decision to start a new therapy was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:07.160 \rightarrow 00:11:09.320$ left at every investigators discretion,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00{:}11{:}09{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}11{.}012$ and so the primary endpoint was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00{:}11{:}11{.}012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}12.850$ what was the proportion of patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00{:}11{:}12.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}14.495$ who achieved an overall response,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00{:}11{:}14{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}16{.}544$ which was defined as CR plus R
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:16.544 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.278$ at week 20 at week 24.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:18.280 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.760$ So six months afterwards,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:19.760 \rightarrow 00:11:22.400$ and the secondary outcomes looked at those,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:22.400 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.885$ the overall response rate after
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:23.885 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.828$ a year or 52 weeks, they look.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- 00:11:25.828 --> 00:11:26.973 I didn't looked at patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00{:}11{:}26{.}973 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}28{.}000$ who had bleeding events,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333
- $00:11:28.000 \rightarrow 00:11:30.058$ and they aimed to try to identify
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:11:30.058 \rightarrow 00:11:31.859$ any predictive factors to see which

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:11:31.859 \rightarrow 00:11:33.575$ patients might be those who achieve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932198718333333

 $00:11:33.580 \rightarrow 00:11:35.460$ Such an overall prolonged response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:11:38.910 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.512$ So 49 patients which included a 30

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}11{:}43{.}512 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}45{.}244$ females with either persistent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}11{:}45{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47{.}356$ There was an end of two

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}11{:}47.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}49.469$ or chronic and a 47 ITP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:11:49.470 \rightarrow 00:11:52.838$ The median age of 58.5 years were evaluated

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:11:52.838 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.406$ in this two year period over 22 centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:11:56.410 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.834 40$ of the patients had received

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}11{:}58.834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}01.340$ eltrombop ag and nine around the plastic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}12{:}01{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04{.}310$ And intention to treat analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:04.310 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.330$ 56.2% so 27 of the 48 patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}12{:}07{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09{.}210$ achieving the primary endpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}12{:}09{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}11{.}528$ achieved the primary endpoint and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:11.528 \rightarrow 00:12:13.724$ maintained an overall response at 24

00:12:13.724 --> 00:12:16.130 weeks after TPO RA discontinuation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

00:12:16.130 --> 00:12:17.936 And of those, half of those,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

00:12:17.940 --> 00:12:20.430 essentially 55 percent, 15 of those,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:20.430 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.590$ 27 had a complete response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00{:}12{:}22{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}25{.}164$ which again is defined as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:25.164 \rightarrow 00:12:26.880$ platelet count over 100,000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:26.880 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.468$ Bleeding events did occur in 61.9% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:30.468 \longrightarrow 00:12:33.228$ the patients and 65.2% of the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.920319333333333

 $00:12:33.228 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.229$ who did relapse at the 24 week and 50.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7839765325

 $00{:}12{:}38{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41{.}402$ Should be weeks or 52 weeks with the median

NOTE Confidence: 0.7839765325

 $00:12:41.402 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.006$ platelet count of 31,000 at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7839765325

 $00:12:44.006 \rightarrow 00:12:46.276$ No severe bleeding episodes occurred.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:12:48.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.562$ And they could not identify any

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}12{:}51{.}562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}53{.}224$ predictive factors. Neither age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:12:53.224 \rightarrow 00:12:55.009$ Which agent the patient had,

 $00:12:55.010 \longrightarrow 00:12:56.138$ how long they'd had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

00:12:56.138 --> 00:12:57.830 ITP none of these things were

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}12{:}57.887 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59.462$ able to predict which patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:12:59.462 \rightarrow 00:13:01.450$ were those who were going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}13{:}01{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}03{.}185$ achieve such a sustained response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}13{:}03{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}05{.}092$ So the conclusions of this was

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}13{:}05{.}092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}07{.}130$ that after 52 weeks and this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:13:07.130 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.402$ you can seen by the diagram on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

00:13:09.402 --> 00:13:11.369 right hand side after TPR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

00:13:11.370 --> 00:13:13.580 a discontinuation overall response was

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}13{:}13{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}16{.}969$ seen in about half of these patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00{:}13{:}16{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}20{.}130$ 52.1% for those who did relapse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:13:20.130 \rightarrow 00:13:21.918$ The median time of relapsing after

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

00:13:21.918 --> 00:13:23.590 tapering was at about 8 weeks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:13:23.590 \rightarrow 00:13:25.096$ but the majority of those actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125

 $00:13:25.096 \rightarrow 00:13:26.570$ happened within the first two weeks,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125
- $00{:}13{:}26{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}28{.}556$ and none of those patients who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93675410125
- 00:13:28.556 --> 00:13:29.880 relapsed developed severe bleeding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8847062966666667
- 00:13:32.990 --> 00:13:35.558 In among 21 patients who did
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8847062966666667
- $00:13:35.558 \rightarrow 00:13:37.141$ relapse before week 2413,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8847062966666667
- $00:13:37.141 \rightarrow 00:13:39.469$ of those were able to be re challenged
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884706296666667
- $00{:}13{:}39{.}469 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41{.}815$ with their TPO RA and they were still
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884706296666667
- $00{:}13{:}41.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}43.655$ able to achieve a complete response
- NOTE Confidence: 0.884706296666667
- $00{:}13{:}43.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}45.811$ with a medium time of two weeks.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- $00{:}13{:}47.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.022$ So the conclusion is that there was a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- $00:13:50.022 \rightarrow 00:13:52.187$ high rate of sustained off treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- $00:13:52.187 \rightarrow 00:13:54.137$ remission after TPO RA discontinuation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- $00{:}13{:}54{.}137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}56{.}725$ in patients with chronic ITP who had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- $00{:}13{:}56{.}725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}58{.}481$ initially achieved at stable CR.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- $00{:}13{:}58{.}481 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}01{.}129$ They were unable to die and identify a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333
- 00:14:01.129 --> 00:14:03.345 predictive factor of which patients were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00:14:03.345 \rightarrow 00:14:05.850$ would achieve such a lasting remission.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00{:}14{:}05{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07{.}806$ But this study strongly supports use

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00:14:07.806 \rightarrow 00:14:09.849$ of a progressive tapering off of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00{:}14{:}09{.}849 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}11{.}431$ dose of TPRS and patients who do

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00{:}14{:}11{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}13{.}230$ achieve a stable CR on treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00{:}14{:}13{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}14{.}623$ And there may be opportunity for us

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00:14:14.623 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.131$ to be able to discontinue therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.871721324333333

 $00:14:16.131 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.995$ in such patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820428353333333

00:14:20.790 --> 00:14:22.660 The last abstract I'll discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.820428353333333

 $00{:}14{:}22.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}24.156$ was called obstetric obstetrical

NOTE Confidence: 0.820428353333333

 $00{:}14{:}24.156 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}25.910$ and perioperative management of

NOTE Confidence: 0.820428353333333

 $00:14:25.910 \rightarrow 00:14:28.110$ patients with factor 11 deficiency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820428353333333

00:14:28.110 --> 00:14:30.258 A retrospective observational study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831983915625

 $00{:}14{:}32{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34{.}772$ In the background information

NOTE Confidence: 0.831983915625

 $00{:}14{:}34{.}772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}36{.}684$ data regarding obstetrical and

NOTE Confidence: 0.831983915625

 $00{:}14{:}36{.}684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}38{.}024$ perioperative management of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.831983915625
- 00:14:38.024 --> 00:14:39.619 factor 11 deficiency is scarce.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00:14:41.930 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.088$ And the question at hand is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00:14:43.090 \rightarrow 00:14:45.538$ can we create a database of such patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00{:}14{:}45{.}538 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}47{.}464$ and identify factors associated with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00{:}14{:}47{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}49{.}559$ increased increased bleeding risk in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00{:}14{:}49{.}559 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}51{.}669$ patients with factor 11 deficiency
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00:14:51.669 \rightarrow 00:14:53.285$ during childbirth or surgery?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- 00:14:53.290 --> 00:14:54.988 And this was presented by Doctor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- 00:14:54.988 --> 00:14:56.483 Hanna from the Icahn School
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8889691266666667
- $00:14:56.483 \longrightarrow 00:14:57.998$ of Medicine at Mount Sinai.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- 00:15:00.600 --> 00:15:02.394 So they did a retrospective chart
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}02{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04{.}435$ review of patients with factor 11
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00:15:04.435 \rightarrow 00:15:06.011$ deficiency who underwent either
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}06{.}011 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}07{.}908$ child birth or surgical procedures over
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}07{.}908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10{.}052$ a 10 year period within the Mount Sinai
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

00:15:10.052 --> 00:15:12.156 health care system in New York City,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:12.160 \rightarrow 00:15:14.640$ and they collected data on age, sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

00:15:14.640 --> 00:15:17.200 ethnicity, genotype, family history,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:17.200 \rightarrow 00:15:18.696$ personal history of bleeding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:18.696 \rightarrow 00:15:20.940$ The type of an esthesia used the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00{:}15{:}21.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}23.474$ estimated blood loss and any evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00{:}15{:}23{.}474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}25{.}118$ of of periprocedural bleeding

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:25.185 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.455$ which patients needed blood product

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00{:}15{:}27{.}455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}29{.}271$ administration and which product

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00{:}15{:}29{.}271 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}31{.}206$ which patients needed hemostatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:31.206 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.666$ agents in the perioperative period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

00:15:33.670 --> 00:15:36.596 they defined a bleeding endpoint as acute

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

00:15:36.596 --> 00:15:39.389 postpartum or post operative hemorrhage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:39.390 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.480$ or any bleeding that warranted

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00{:}15{:}41{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}42{.}734$ non prophylactic administration

NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743

 $00:15:42.734 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.588$ of pack red blood cells.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}44{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47{.}850$ FFP or tranexamic acid.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}47.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}49.440$ They performed a logistic regression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}49{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51{.}030$ to test for the association
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00:15:51.086 \rightarrow 00:15:52.379$ between either historical,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}52{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}54{.}028$ laboratory and procedural variables
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893566743
- $00{:}15{:}54.028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}55.676$ with the bleeding endpoint.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- 00:15:58.350 --> 00:16:01.212 So overall, 198 patients were evaluated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00:16:01.212 \rightarrow 00:16:04.714$ who had undergone 252 procedures in total.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00{:}16{:}04{.}714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}06{.}626$ This included 143 vaginal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00:16:06.626 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.816$ deliveries in 64 city sections
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00{:}16{:}08{.}816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}11{.}809$ and 45 other surgical procedures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00{:}16{:}11{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}14{.}828$ 38 of the 252 procedures did
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00:16:14.828 \rightarrow 00:16:16.840$ result in bleeding complications,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00{:}16{:}16{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}19{.}024$ and they found that both a prior
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667
- $00{:}16{:}19.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}21.162$ history of bleeding and a lower
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667

 $00:16:21.162 \rightarrow 00:16:23.052$ factor 11 levels were independently

NOTE Confidence: 0.8924154066666667

 $00:16:23.052 \rightarrow 00:16:25.200$ associated with the bleeding endpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

00:16:28.000 --> 00:16:31.396 Interestingly, 8 out of 21 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00{:}16{:}31{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}34{.}238$ 38% who suffered a bleeding complication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

00:16:34.240 --> 00:16:38.280 This happened despite prophylactic FFP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00{:}16{:}38{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}40{.}434$ The mean factor level level for

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00{:}16{:}40{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}42{.}367$ with patients who receive neuraxial

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00{:}16{:}42.367 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}44.959$ anes
thesia was 50 units per deciliter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00{:}16{:}44{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}46{.}910$ In five patients with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00:16:46.910 \rightarrow 00:16:48.080$ negative bleeding history,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

00:16:48.080 --> 00:16:49.499 despite surgical challenges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00:16:49.499 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.864$ we're actually able to receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00{:}16{:}51.864 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}53.226$ neuraxial anesthesia effector

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00:16:53.226 \longrightarrow 00:16:55.320$ level levels less than 10 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00:16:55.320 \rightarrow 00:16:57.260$ without any bleeding complications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88016542

 $00:16:57.260 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.342$ and only one of these had

00:16:59.342 --> 00:17:00.383 received prophylactic FFP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}05{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}07{.}458$ So their conclusions were that a personal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}07{.}458 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}09{.}571$ history of bleeding was the strongest

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:09.571 \rightarrow 00:17:11.426$ predictor of perioperative or obstetrical

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}11.426$ --> $00{:}17{:}13.817$ bleeding and and that personal history of NOTE Confidence: 0.891877578666667

 $00{:}17{:}13.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}15.974$ bleeding was was actually defined as just

NOTE Confidence: 0.891877578666667

 $00:17:15.974 \rightarrow 00:17:17.913$ one one report of heavy menstrual period

NOTE Confidence: 0.891877578666667

 $00:17:17.913 \rightarrow 00:17:20.036$ or bleeding in the operative period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}20.040$ --> $00{:}17{:}23.068$ It just took sort of one one event in time to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}23.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}25.504$ define a personal history of bleeding factor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}25{.}504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}27{.}936$ 11 levels were found to correlate with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:27.936 --> 00:17:29.973 slightly slightly lower but statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:29.973 \rightarrow 00:17:32.073$ significant odds of surgical bleeding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}32.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33.538$ and they found that a factor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:33.538 --> 00:17:35.520 11 level cutoff of 40 units per

 $00:17:35.520 \rightarrow 00:17:37.105$ deciliter may predict bleeding risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:37.110 --> 00:17:39.518 With reasonable specificity at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:39.518 --> 00:17:41.296 83% but lacked sensitivity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:41.296 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.648$ they also found that factor 11

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:43.648 --> 00:17:45.909 levels are stable during pregnancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:45.910 - 00:17:48.020 as demonstrated by the diagram

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:48.020 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.708$ on the bottom right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:49.710 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.990$ showing that repeat measurements

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

00:17:50.990 --> 00:17:52.270 may not be necessary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:52.270 \rightarrow 00:17:56.064$ which is something commonly done in practice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00{:}17{:}56{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}58{.}184$ and they also found that neuraxial anesthesia

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:17:58.184 \rightarrow 00:18:00.510$ appeared to be safe to use in this cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:18:00.510 \longrightarrow 00:18:02.550$ which clinically is a question

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:18:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.182$ that comes up frequently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.891877578666667

 $00:18:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.668$ Hey, thank you for your time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667

 $00:18:06.670 \rightarrow 00:18:08.560$ Forward to hearing from our next speaker,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8918775786666667
- $00{:}18{:}08{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}09{.}150$ Doctor Malik.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.737128475
- 00:18:13.340 --> 00:18:14.130 Thanks, Kelsey.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92882802111111
- $00:18:25.970 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.560$ Right, thank you for the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92882802111111
- $00:18:28.560 \rightarrow 00:18:30.632$ opportunity to talk today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928828021111111
- 00:18:30.640 --> 00:18:33.778 I'm going to focus on thrombosis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92882802111111
- $00:18:33.780 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.694$ so I'm hoping to present three
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92882802111111
- $00{:}18{:}35{.}694 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}37{.}790$ studies that I found of interest.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- $00:18:40.020 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.372$ Have one focus study and then as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- $00:18:42.372 \rightarrow 00:18:44.642$ time permits and go through the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- $00:18:44.642 \rightarrow 00:18:46.617$ other two studies with quickly.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- 00:18:46.620 --> 00:18:49.245 The focus state I would I would
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- $00:18:49.245 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.053$ like to present is 1 listed here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- 00:18:52.053 --> 00:18:55.225 by Murs ET al from the Brigham
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- $00{:}18{:}55{.}225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}57{.}778$ and Women's Hospital in Boston who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556
- $00{:}18{:}57{.}778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}00{.}168$ looked at anticoagulation use and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:00.168 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.850$ outcomes among patients with atrial

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00{:}19{:}02.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}06.780$ fibrillation and vanilla brand disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:06.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.130$ Oral presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:09.130 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.250$ The background is that estimated

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:12.250 \rightarrow 00:19:15.370$ prevalence of symptomatic 1 willibrand

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00{:}19{:}15{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}18{.}010$ disease is about one in 1000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:18.010 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.330$ It is estimated that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00{:}19{:}21{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}22{.}974$ Patients with one milligram

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

00:19:22.974 --> 00:19:24.618 disease have similar prevalence

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:24.618 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.786$ of atrial fibrillation as general

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:26.786 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.870$ population is about .84%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

00:19:29.870 --> 00:19:32.105 The American College of Cardiology

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:32.105 \rightarrow 00:19:34.340$ recommends using anticoagulation for those

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:34.405 \rightarrow 00:19:36.727$ with atrial fibrillation who have chads,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:36.730 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.054$ vascor of two or greater in men

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:39.054 \rightarrow 00:19:41.438$ or three or greater in women.

00:19:41.440 --> 00:19:48.234 The recent as
h ISTHNHF&
amp; W SH guidelines

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:48.234 \rightarrow 00:19:51.128$ recommend using anticoagulation or

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00{:}19{:}51{.}128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53{.}718$ antiplatelet the rapy as clinically indicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:53.720 \rightarrow 00:19:57.024$ It was a suggestion with low certainty

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:57.024 \rightarrow 00:19:59.119$ of evidence and importantly when

NOTE Confidence: 0.816056465555556

 $00:19:59.119 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.417$ I looked into the the actual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9015014766666667

00:20:03.790 --> 00:20:05.830 Basis of this recommendation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9015014766666667

 $00{:}20{:}05{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}08{.}810$ it was based on a case series of about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9015014766666667

00:20:08.810 --> 00:20:11.180 60 patients or really low quality data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00:20:13.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.106$ So this the study that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}16.106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.185$ presented was a retrospective study

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}18.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}20{.}729$ in which data was obtained from

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}20{.}729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}22{.}640$ the Electronic medical records.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}22{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}24{.}584$ Patient was selected if they had

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00:20:24.584 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.117$ a diagnosis of 1 lip and disease

00:20:27.117 --> 00:20:29.067 noticed or seeking cofactor activity

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

00:20:29.067 --> 00:20:31.896 or any abnormal one will event factor

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}31{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}34{.}582$ measurements and also selected for those

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00:20:34.582 \rightarrow 00:20:37.910$ who had diagnosis of atrial fibrillation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}37{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}40{.}381$ The primary endpoint was rate of major

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}40{.}381 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}42{.}730$ bleeding as defined by the IST criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00:20:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.038$ which is fatal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

00:20:44.038 --> 00:20:45.782 Bleeding, bleeding in critical

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00:20:45.782 \longrightarrow 00:20:47.828$ organs or bleeding causing more

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

00:20:47.828 - > 00:20:50.810 than two grams of two grams per DL,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

00:20:50.810 --> 00:20:53.510 drop in hemoglobin or more than two

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}53.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}54.950$ units of red blood cell transfusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}54{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}58{.}078$ Sorry with the typo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00{:}20{:}58.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}02.274$ The results were that patients in

NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191

 $00:21:02.274 \rightarrow 00:21:04.730$ tribulation patients were between

- $00:21:04.730 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.780$ diagnosed between 1980 and 2020.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- 00:21:08.780 --> 00:21:09.616 For 340,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00{:}21{:}09.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11.288$ patients were screened and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- 00:21:11.288 --> 00:21:12.960 89 patients were selected.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00:21:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.880$ For the final analysis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- 00:21:14.880 --> 00:21:18.490 Out of those 64 patients were female,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- 00:21:18.490 --> 00:21:19.915 28% patients were deceased at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00:21:19.915 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.690$ the time of the data pool.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- 00:21:21.690 --> 00:21:25.650 Medium Chance Best Score was three and 89,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00{:}21{:}25{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29{.}708$ so close to 90% had a score of two or higher.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00:21:29.710 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.894$ A third of the patients also had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- 00:21:31.894 --> 00:21:34.130 a quote acute coronary syndrome,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00{:}21{:}34{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36{.}110$ which the authors lumped together
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855000820476191
- $00{:}21{:}36{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}38{.}090$ STEMI non STEMI and Angela.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818
- $00:21:40.990 \rightarrow 00:21:45.310$ In the in the figure over here as we can see,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818
- $00:21:45.310 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.890 42.7\%$ of the patients in the

00:21:47.890 - 00:21:50.362 study were on aspirin or they

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:21:50.362 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.866$ were ever prescribed aspirin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00{:}21{:}51{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}56{.}854$ About 13.4% of the patients were ever

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:21:56.854 \rightarrow 00:22:01.100$ prescribed P2Y2 inhibitors and 56.2%

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:22:01.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.700$ were ever prescribed an anticoagulant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:22:04.700 \rightarrow 00:22:08.418$ The green color represents people

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:22:08.418 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.694$ with antiplatelet agents who also had

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:22:11.700 \rightarrow 00:22:14.280$ diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:22:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:22:17.046$ About 1/4 of the patients were

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00{:}22{:}17.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.890$ never prescribed any anticoagulant

NOTE Confidence: 0.853843228181818

 $00:22:18.968 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.528$ or antiplatelet agent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00{:}22{:}23.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}25.974$ In these two graphs we can see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00{:}22{:}25{.}974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}28{.}320$ median time to 1st bleeding event

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00{:}22{:}28{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}30{.}702$ on the left we have antiplate let

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00{:}22{:}30.783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}33.495$ agents and on the right it's
$00:22:33.495 \rightarrow 00:22:36.170$ anticoagulants as we can see in both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00{:}22{:}36{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39{.}820$ It looked like the median or

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00:22:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.920$ the time taken for median first

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00:22:41.920 \rightarrow 00:22:43.950$ meeting was greater than 15 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894028072222222

 $00:22:43.950 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.098$ For both of these study groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:22:49.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.570$ Just going into the raw numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:22:52.570 \longrightarrow 00:22:55.630$ 10.2 events per hundred patient years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:22:55.630 \rightarrow 00:22:57.870$ So the rate of major bleeding was

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00{:}22{:}57{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}59{.}490$ 10.2 events per hundred patient years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:22:59.490 \rightarrow 00:23:02.430$ For those on platelet agents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:23:02.430 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.710$ 8.9 events per hundred person years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:23:04.710 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.502$ For those on anticoagulants

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00{:}23{:}06{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}07{.}846$ without any statistical

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:23:07.846 \rightarrow 00:23:09.920$ difference between the two groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00{:}23{:}09{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}12{.}458$ Baseline risk of bleeding was one

NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

00:23:12.458 --> 00:23:14.660 event per hundred patient years,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- 00:23:14.660 -> 00:23:17.264 so these were the patients who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- 00:23:17.264 --> 00:23:19.000 never got antiplatelet therapy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00:23:19.071 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.850$ or anticoagulant therapy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00{:}23{:}20.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}22.218$ Concomitant anticoagulant and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00{:}23{:}22{.}218$ --> $00{:}23{:}24{.}042$ antiplate let agents resulted in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- 00:23:24.042 --> 00:23:26.179 much higher risk of bleeding,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00:23:26.180 \longrightarrow 00:23:28.495$ which was about 28 events
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- 00:23:28.495 --> 00:23:30.347 per hundred patient years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00{:}23{:}30{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}33{.}157$ The lifetime risk of major beating was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00:23:33.157 \rightarrow 00:23:35.168$ also calculated by the investigators,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00:23:35.168 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.794$ which was 32% in those who were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00:23:38.800 \rightarrow 00:23:41.158$ ever prescribed anticoagulants,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00{:}23{:}41.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}43.978$ and 25.6% who were never
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- 00:23:43.978 --> 00:23:44.810 prescribed anticoagulants,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145
- $00:23:44.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.845$ and there was no statistical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.825370145

 $00:23:46.845 \rightarrow 00:23:48.880$ difference between the two groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00{:}23{:}51{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}52{.}460$ Looking at the stroke risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00{:}23{:}52{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}54{.}960$ the incidence of stroke was

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00:23:54.960 \rightarrow 00:23:57.650$ about 15 point 7%. And notably,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00{:}23{:}57{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}00{.}065$ 11 out of the 14 patients had

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00{:}24{:}00{.}065 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02{.}360$ never used and equivalent for more NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00{:}24{:}02{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}04{.}771$ than sorry had not been prescribed

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00:24:04.771 \rightarrow 00:24:07.549$ anticoagulant for 90 days or more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

00:24:07.550 --> 00:24:09.464 The median chance best score was NOTE Confidence: 0.879458732

 $00:24:09.464 \rightarrow 00:24:11.500$ three in those who had stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}13.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}17.100$ And and also those who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:17.100 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.340$ not anti quietly therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:19.340 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.266$ One of those patients who had

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}21{.}266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}25{.}510$ a stroke had a fatal stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:25.510 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.075$ So the authors concluded that 50% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}28.075 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}31.105$ the patients in their study group

 $00:24:31.105 \rightarrow 00:24:33.960$ were ever prescribed anticoagulant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:33.960 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.886$ There was no benefit in choosing anti

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:36.890 \rightarrow 00:24:39.220$ platelet therapy or anticoagulant therapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:39.220 \rightarrow 00:24:42.529$ if bleeding rate is taken into account.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}42{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}44{.}348$ There was no difference in lifetime

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}44{.}348 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}46{.}711$ risk of bleeding in those who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}46.711 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}48.167$ prescribed anticoagulants versus those

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:24:48.167 \rightarrow 00:24:50.750$ who were not prescribed anticoagulants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}50{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54{.}422$ Limited use of anticoagulant and antiplatelet

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:24:54.422 --> 00:24:57.210 therapy has much higher risk of bleeding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}24{:}57{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}00{.}970$ which is not surprising and 57% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}25{:}00{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}03{.}050$ patients had thromboembolic strokes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:03.050 \rightarrow 00:25:06.560$ Most of those who were not therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:25:06.560 --> 00:25:08.366 So my take away from this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}25{:}08{.}366 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}10{.}970$ was that it was one of the largest

 $00:25:10.970 \rightarrow 00:25:12.740$ studies looking specifically at this

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:12.800 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.062$ population of one will appendices.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:15.062 \rightarrow 00:25:18.026$ Individuals who also have April fibrillation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:18.030 \rightarrow 00:25:19.440$ It was a retrospective study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:19.440 \longrightarrow 00:25:21.200$ so has its own limitations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:21.200 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.154$ but it still provides one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:24.154 \rightarrow 00:25:26.919$ largest studies or largest evidence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:26.920 \rightarrow 00:25:29.174$ which makes us probably feel a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:25:29.174 --> 00:25:31.041 bit more comfortable using anticoagulant

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}25{:}31{.}041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}34{.}407$ in these patients with appropriate risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:34.410 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.780$ Assessment of bleeding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:25:36.780 --> 00:25:39.964 Oftentimes antiplate
let agents are

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}25{:}39{.}964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}41{.}840$ prescribed over antique violence as

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}25{:}41.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}44.180$ a way to reduce the risk of bleeding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:44.180 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.760$ but this study sort of makes

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:46.760 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.480$ us doubt that assumption.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477
- 00:25:48.480 --> 00:25:50.580 Details of 1 milligram disease

00:25:50.580 -> 00:25:51.840 subtypes were missing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:51.840 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.564$ and as we know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:53.564 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.854$ the severity of lung disease or

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}25{:}55{.}854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58{.}110$ the type of 1 disease could make a

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:25:58.174 \rightarrow 00:26:00.084$ difference to the bleeding risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}00{.}084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}02{.}616$ We also have noted recently that

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:02.616 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.693$ ristocet in cofactor activity may not

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:04.693 \rightarrow 00:26:06.643$ be appropriate to diagnose patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}06{.}643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}08{.}750$ with type 21 blip and disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}08.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.934$ so some of those individuals were

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:26:10.934 --> 00:26:13.456 typed as one group and disease back

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:13.456 \rightarrow 00:26:15.495$ in the previous years may actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}15{.}495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17{.}800$ not have one web and disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:26:17.800 --> 00:26:18.195 Similarly,

 $00{:}26{:}18.195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}20.170$ practice patterns for A-fib management

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}20.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}22.967$ as well as the choice of anticoagulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

00:26:22.967 --> 00:26:25.648 has changed quite a bit since 1980s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:25.650 \rightarrow 00:26:30.510$ so that would certainly people founder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:30.510 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.150$ We're gonna move on to the next.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}34.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}38.190$ So this was a man and also an

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:38.190 \longrightarrow 00:26:39.200$ oral presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}39{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44{.}120$ Presented on behalf of Doctor Connors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:44.120 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.640$ It was it was a meta analysis of

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:46.640 \rightarrow 00:26:49.145$ direct oral anticoagulants versus low

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00:26:49.145 \rightarrow 00:26:51.746$ molecular weight heparin for treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.709424477

 $00{:}26{:}51.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53.358$ of cancer associated throm bus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894

 $00:26:57.490 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.356$ In the in this study, the authors

NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894

 $00:27:00.356 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.794$ looked at 6 randomized control trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894

 $00:27:03.800 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.935$ The. This was an update to

NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894

 $00:27:06.935 \rightarrow 00:27:08.107$ the previous meta analysis,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- $00:27:08.110 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.354$ which had four of these trials
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- $00{:}27{:}10{.}354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}12{.}419$ mentioned over here. The top four.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- $00{:}27{:}12.419 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}14.297$ So the two bottom ones were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- $00:27:14.297 \rightarrow 00:27:16.049$ included in this meta analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- 00:27:16.050 --> 00:27:19.558 so there were a total of 3690 patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- $00:27:19.558 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.450$ out of which 1850 got direct oral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883181894
- $00:27:23.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.288$ anticoagulants and 1840 got local.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00:27:28.460 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.574$ The authors looked at the risk of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- 00:27:30.574 --> 00:27:32.030 recurrent venous from embolism,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00:27:32.030 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.315$ and it favored use of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00{:}27{:}35{.}315 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}37{.}286$ direct or al anticoagulants.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00:27:37.290 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.740$ Incidence rate of recurrent VTE was 5.5%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00{:}27{:}42.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}44.448$ In the electrolytic group
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00:27:44.448 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.892$ and eight point 3% in the low
- NOTE Confidence: 0.735115040909091
- $00{:}27{:}46.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}47.868$ molecular Weight Heparin group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669

00:27:49.890 --> 00:27:56.870 With the risk ratio of .67 favoring director. NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 00:27:56.870 --> 00:27:59.372 Risk of major bleeding was about NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:27:59.372 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.089$ the same in the two groups, NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:02.090 \rightarrow 00:28:04.526$ so the incidence was four point 3% NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:04.530 \longrightarrow 00:28:06.075$ in the direct oral anticoagulants NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:06.075 \rightarrow 00:28:08.994$ group and three point 7% in the low NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 00:28:08.994 --> 00:28:10.826 molecular Weight Heparin group. NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:10.830 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.560$ And statistically, there was no NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00{:}28{:}12.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}14.290$ difference between the two groups. NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:14.290 \rightarrow 00:28:17.565$ The clinically non the clinically NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 00:28:17.565 --> 00:28:20.185 relevant non major bleeding. NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 00:28:20.190 --> 00:28:22.478 Favored use of heparin, NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:22.478 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.610$ so it was the incidence was 9.5%NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:27.610 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.550$ of this bleeding in the direct or NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:30.550 \rightarrow 00:28:33.192$ anticoagulant group and five point 7% in NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669 $00:28:33.192 \rightarrow 00:28:35.244$ the low molecular weight heparin group. 45

- NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669
- $00:28:35.250 \rightarrow 00:28:38.211$ The risk was 1.6 and statistically favoring
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79593669
- $00:28:38.211 \rightarrow 00:28:40.479$ low molecular weight heparin group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- 00:28:42.780 --> 00:28:43.980 All 'cause mortality was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:28:43.980 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.440$ similar in the two groups.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:28:47.440 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.894$ The conclusions drawn from this study
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00{:}28{:}49{.}894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}52{.}784$ of from this paralysis for that to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:28:52.784 \rightarrow 00:28:55.154$ act significantly reduce the risk of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:28:55.154 \rightarrow 00:28:57.255$ recurrent VTE compared with heparin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:28:57.255 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.680$ without increasing the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:28:58.680 \rightarrow 00:29:00.580$ risk of major bleeding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- 00:29:00.580 --> 00:29:02.610 However, use of direct oral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- 00:29:02.610 --> 00:29:03.828 anticoagulants was associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:29:03.828 \rightarrow 00:29:05.832$ with increased risk of clinically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.777690424285714
- $00:29:05.832 \rightarrow 00:29:07.344$ relevant non major bleeding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117
- $00:29:10.350 \rightarrow 00:29:13.906$ Finally, the last oral study that I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117

 $00:29:13.906 \rightarrow 00:29:17.575$ would like to present was about impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117

00:29:17.575 --> 00:29:20.185 of race and ethnicity on cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117

 $00:29:20.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.894$ associated thrombosis among

NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117

 $00:29:21.894 \rightarrow 00:29:24.166$ underserved patients with cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117

 $00{:}29{:}24.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}26.060$ This was an oral presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.89843117

 $00{:}29{:}26.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}27.572$ presented by Doctor Decosta.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

00:29:30.410 - 00:29:32.990 In this study, a retrospective

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

 $00:29:32.990 \rightarrow 00:29:38.190$ analysis was done and the investigators

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

 $00:29:38.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.616$ identified 9353 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

 $00:29:40.616 \rightarrow 00:29:45.370$ After those, 49.3% were Hispanics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

 $00:29:45.370 \longrightarrow 00:29:48.170$ 27.6% were non Hispanic blacks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

 $00{:}29{:}48.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}49.542$ 50.5% were non Hispanic

NOTE Confidence: 0.78882363875

 $00:29:49.542 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.950$ whites and 7.6% were passed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

00:29:52.990 --> 00:29:56.600 Islanders interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00{:}29{:}56{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00{.}760$ 74.7% were uninsured, and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:00.760 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.950$ The reason for this was the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587
- $00:30:02.950 \rightarrow 00:30:05.161$ study was primarily focused on a

00:30:05.161 - > 00:30:06.866 safety net hospital in Houston,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:06.870 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.076$ which has this demographic of population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:11.080 \rightarrow 00:30:13.335$ The incidence of cancer associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:13.335 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.139$ thrombosis was seven point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:15.140 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.912$ 3% at six months and 9.6% at 12 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

00:30:18.912 --> 00:30:20.604 Of previous studies which

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:20.604 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.130$ have looked at this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:22.130 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.848$ which were primarily focused

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

00:30:24.848 --> 00:30:26.132 on Caucasian population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:26.132 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.609$ the risk at 12 months is much lower,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:29.610 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.336$ about 2.3%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83399587

 $00:30:30.336 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.514$ So something to keep in mind.

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00{:}30{:}35{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}36{.}536$ On the graph on the left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:30:36.540 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.970$ we can see, as expected,

 $00{:}30{:}38{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}42{.}473$ pancreatic upper GI where the OR

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:30:42.473 \rightarrow 00:30:44.471$ patients with pancreatic or upper GI

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00{:}30{:}44{.}471 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}46{.}762$ cancers were the ones with highest

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:30:46.762 \rightarrow 00:30:48.807$ risk of cancer associated thrombosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00{:}30{:}48.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}50.628$ The interesting part was the top.

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:30:50.630 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.622$ Sorry, the bottom right figure where NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00{:}30{:}53.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}57.060$ we can see that non Hispanic black

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:30:57.060 \rightarrow 00:30:59.510$ population and non Hispanic white

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:30:59.510 \rightarrow 00:31:02.095$ population seem to have similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

00:31:02.095 --> 00:31:04.139 cumulative incidence of cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:31:04.139 \dashrightarrow 00:31:06.469$ associated thrombosis at 12 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00{:}31{:}06{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}09{.}990$ While Hispanic population and Asian

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:31:09.990 \dashrightarrow 00:31:12.790$ population seem to have a lower risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00{:}31{:}12.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}15.592$ so this contradicts what we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:31:15.592 \rightarrow 00:31:17.843$ traditionally known about thrombosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333

 $00:31:17.843 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.650$ which is reported to be higher in

- NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333
- $00:31:22.650 \rightarrow 00:31:25.146$ individuals with black ancestry.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333
- $00:31:25.150 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.622$ And Hispanic population have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333
- $00:31:26.622 \rightarrow 00:31:28.462$ been traditionally known to have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333
- 00:31:28.462 --> 00:31:30.349 a lower risk of thrombosis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.823889203333333
- $00:31:30.350 \rightarrow 00:31:33.094$ so that is congruent with that knowledge.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.693077274285714
- $00{:}31{:}35{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}37{.}840$ When the authors did the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.693077274285714
- 00:31:37.840 --> 00:31:38.696 multivariable analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.693077274285714
- 00:31:38.700 --> 00:31:41.790 they again found Hispanic race
- NOTE Confidence: 0.693077274285714
- $00{:}31{:}41.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}45.632$ and Asian race were to have an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.693077274285714
- 00:31:45.632 --> 00:31:47.888 impact on the risk of getting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.693077274285714
- $00{:}31{:}47.888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}49.460$ cancer associated throm bosis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625
- $00{:}31{:}52{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}53{.}848$ The conclusions drawn were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625
- 00:31:53.848 --> 00:31:55.336 higher incidence of cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625
- 00:31:55.340 --> 00:31:57.488 Associated throm
bosis was noted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625
- $00{:}31{:}57{.}488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}00{.}173$ compared to the European registries.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

00:32:00.180 --> 00:32:03.040 Non Hispanic blacks had similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00{:}32{:}03{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}05{.}328$ incidence of cancer associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00{:}32{:}05{.}328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}07{.}790$ thrombosis to non Hispanic whites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

00:32:07.790 --> 00:32:09.415 Hispanic and Asian Pacific Islanders

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00{:}32{:}09{.}415 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11{.}891$ had a lower risk of cancer associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

00:32:11.891 --> 00:32:13.866 throm
bosis compared to non Hispanic

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00:32:13.866 \rightarrow 00:32:16.619$ whites and non Hispanic black population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00:32:16.620 \rightarrow 00:32:19.332$ And treatment with chemotherapy

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00{:}32{:}19{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}21{.}366$ or immunotherapy associated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00{:}32{:}21{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}24{.}408$ It would help you or immunotherapy was

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00{:}32{:}24.408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}27.068$ associated with increased risk of throm bosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89390926625

 $00:32:27.070 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.518$ That concludes my talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.386202125

 $00{:}32{:}32{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}33{.}510$ You said that she.

NOTE Confidence: 0.679631074

 $00:32:48.010 \dashrightarrow 00:32:50.560$ I'm just gonna start my groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812904183333333

 $00{:}32{:}53{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}54{.}079$ The right one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333

 $00:33:01.790 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.580$ Hopefully this is the right one.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- 00:33:04.580 --> 00:33:10.082 Alright, I'm so let me just start moving.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00{:}33{:}10.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.350$ OK so hello buddy and Alex Pine and I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00:33:15.350 \rightarrow 00:33:18.264$ wanted to briefly briefly everybody
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00:33:18.264 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.254$ on 3 potentially 4 abstracts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00{:}33{:}21{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}24{.}830$ If we have time and.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00{:}33{:}24.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}27.644$ The first three are sort of have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00:33:27.644 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.943$ this ITP flavor and a couple
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00:33:29.943 \longrightarrow 00:33:31.992$ of them has kovid color,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00:33:31.992 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.639$ so the first one is actually the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- 00:33:35.639 00:33:39.315 first two kind of have the same motif,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.881443083333333
- $00:33:39.315 \rightarrow 00:33:42.780$ and they both studies actually looked into.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454
- $00:33:44.820 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.170$ What happens to patients with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454
- $00{:}33{:}47.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}48.580$ persisting thermoset opinion
- NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454
- $00{:}33{:}48{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}51{.}514$ when they receive COVID that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454
- $00:33:51.514 \rightarrow 00:33:55.816$ vaccines and so the first study?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454

 $00:33:55.820 \rightarrow 00:33:58.800$ Which was out of Cornell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454

 $00:33:58.800 \rightarrow 00:34:00.976$ Essentially they were operating

NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454

 $00:34:00.976 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.696$ on the premise that play,

NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454

 $00:34:03.700 \rightarrow 00:34:06.668$ let's play play quite a bit of

NOTE Confidence: 0.661312154545454

00:34:06.668 --> 00:34:09.050 a role in immune immune system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00:34:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.600$ And also in their cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00{:}34{:}14.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}17.228$ different cohort but in their center

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00:34:17.230 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.614$ thrust opinion happened in 27% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00:34:20.614 \dashrightarrow 00:34:24.040$ patients with just COVID-19, so they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00:34:24.040 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.952$ Actually postulated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00{:}34{:}24{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}29{.}760$ or at least developed the concept further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

00:34:29.760 --> 00:34:31.743 That in COVID-19,

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00:34:31.743 \dashrightarrow 00:34:34.795$ especially severe COVID-19, there's a a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00{:}34{:}34{.}795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}36{.}925$ This is normal glycosylation of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00{:}34{:}36{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}39{.}624$ spike protein antibodies is is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.757131832

 $00:34:39.624 \rightarrow 00:34:41.440$ prothrombotic signal for platelets,

 $00:34:41.440 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.010$ especially through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}34{:}46{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49{.}320$ Direct receptor these complexes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:34:49.320 \rightarrow 00:34:52.650$ IgG and virus operate through the

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:34:52.650 \rightarrow 00:34:59.100$ Cy come receptor and So what they?

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:34:59.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.444$ They also. There was also a

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:02.444 \longrightarrow 00:35:03.588$ clinical sort of observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:03.590 \rightarrow 00:35:07.064$ Then there were some reports of ITP in post

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:07.064 \rightarrow 00:35:10.230$ vaccine settings in a single institution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

00:35:10.230 --> 00:35:11.298 I believe I'm GH.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:11.298 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.236$ There was a 52 patients and there

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:13.236 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.605$ were 12% of ITP dissertations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}15.605 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}18.630$ So they asked the question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}18.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}20.886$ Several questions is in fact what is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:20.886 \dashrightarrow 00:35:23.027$ effect of vaccines on platelet count,

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:23.030 \rightarrow 00:35:26.238$ risk of bleeding events?

 $00:35:26.240 \dashrightarrow 00:35:29.720$ What kind of what kind of effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:29.720 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.460$ is in repeat dosing of vaccines?

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:31.460 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.970$ You know the second vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:32.970 \longrightarrow 00:35:34.178$ booster and so on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}34{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}35{.}795$ and what the risks of

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}35{.}795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}36{.}764$ the actual exacerbation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:36.770 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.996$ What sort of plays a role in

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}39{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}43{.}790$ exacerbating so their cohort was

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}43.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}46.133$ retrospective from patients 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:46.133 \rightarrow 00:35:47.516$ university affiliated patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:47.516 \dashrightarrow 00:35:50.300$ that we actually also participated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}50{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}54{.}040$ So it's 117 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

00:35:54.040 --> 00:35:57.055 With a pretty long history of ITP 12 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00{:}35{:}57.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}59.670$ And of course they were.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:35:59.670 \dashrightarrow 00:36:01.420$ You know at the time where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364

 $00:36:01.420 \rightarrow 00:36:02.949$ study was sort of conducted,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00:36:02.950 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.618$ yeah,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00:36:03.618 \rightarrow 00:36:06.958$ the patients were getting vaccinated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00{:}36{:}06{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}08{.}962$ were older patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00{:}36{:}08{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}12{.}760$ So breakdown of what the rapies
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00:36:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.276$ were administered,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00:36:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.752$ either on the rapy or off the rapy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00:36:16.752 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.400$ or prior prior therapy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608086705636364
- $00{:}36{:}18{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}18{.}890$ So
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}36{:}20{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}24{.}600$ TPO, RA's and we talk smack word
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:36:24.600 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.620$ bulk of the of the treatments,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:36:26.620 \rightarrow 00:36:28.864$ and colectomy was also in 21% of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}36{:}28{.}864 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}31{.}896$ patients and at the time of the study 40
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}36{:}31{.}896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}34{.}514$ patients were off treatment and 16 of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}36{:}34{.}514 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37{.}319$ those were with normal platelet count.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:36:37.320 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.830$ This is a breakdown of.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:36:38.830 \rightarrow 00:36:42.898$ See the exchange that we received.

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00{:}36{:}42.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}45.015$ Simon, of course majority and

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00{:}36{:}45.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}47.130$ then definitions how they sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:36:47.210 \longrightarrow 00:36:49.400$ of were assessing the response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00{:}36{:}49{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}51{.}302$ So stable platelet count was plus

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:36:51.302 \rightarrow 00:36:53.460$ minus 20% of the pre vaccine level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:36:53.460 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.090$ and ITP exasperation was defined as either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:37:01.090 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.526$ Much higher than 50% reduction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00{:}37{:}03.526$ --> $00{:}37{:}07.702$ platelet count or 20% reduction if you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:37:07.702 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.198$ If the if the native platelets

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00{:}37{:}10.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}13.159$ below 30,000 or the use of rescue

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:37:13.159 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.604$ treatment and So what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:37:15.604 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.181$ They found that there's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

00:37:18.181 -> 00:37:19.809 three groups of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00{:}37{:}19{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}23{.}209$ So in about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:37:23.210 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.586$ I would say third or close to third

- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:26.586 \rightarrow 00:37:28.852$ quarter places actually increased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}37{:}28.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}31.308$ platelet count increased in.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.928$ Happened in middle part like a 40%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:33.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.266$ Nothing happened and in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:36.266 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.174$ about third so to speak,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:39.174 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.463$ it's actually decreased and this is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:41.463 \dashrightarrow 00:37:42.730$ the first Test of the second dose.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:42.730 \rightarrow 00:37:46.042$ Sort of similar and they pointed out
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:46.042 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.810$ that it may not be the same patience.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:48.810 \longrightarrow 00:37:53.082$ So they broke it down into
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:37:53.082 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.930$ into into several groups.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- 00:37:55.930 --> 00:37:56.478 Specifically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}37{:}56{.}478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}59{.}649$ so they assessed all patients in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00{:}37{:}59{.}649 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}02{.}223$ terms of incidence of post vaccine
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055
- $00:38:02.223 \rightarrow 00:38:04.170$ ITP reservation splenectomy patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.417$ patients with me in patients with very

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:06.417 \rightarrow 00:38:08.470$ heavily pretreated with five more than five,

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:08.470 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.820$ five, and more prior therapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:10.820 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.516$ and so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:11.516 \rightarrow 00:38:12.212$ interestingly enough,

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:12.212 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.750$ if you look at this point to me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:14.750 \longrightarrow 00:38:18.746$ it's they they saw a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.438028055

 $00:38:18.750 \rightarrow 00:38:22.418$ significantly higher incidence of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.534652041

 $00{:}38{:}24.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}28.743$ I've played loads of ITP reservations

NOTE Confidence: 0.534652041

 $00:38:28.743 \dashrightarrow 00:38:31.494$ as well as patients with who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.534652041

 $00:38:31.494 \rightarrow 00:38:33.339$ very, very heavily pretreated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.720235435454545

 $00{:}38{:}35{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}37{.}628$ Now when the when the post vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.720235435454545

 $00:38:37.628 \dashrightarrow 00:38:39.120$ rescue therapy was administered,

NOTE Confidence: 0.720235435454545

 $00:38:39.120 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.276$ it was it was effective was administered

NOTE Confidence: 0.720235435454545

 $00:38:41.276 \rightarrow 00:38:44.615$ about 30% of patients and they they

NOTE Confidence: 0.720235435454545

 $00:38:44.615 \rightarrow 00:38:47.330$ reported no serious bleeding events.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.720235435454545
- $00:38:47.330 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.510$ From a patient with.

- $00{:}38{:}51{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}54{.}404$ Patients with stable or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:38:54.404 \dashrightarrow 00:38:57.188$ increased platelet count after.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00{:}38{:}57{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}58{.}354$ The first vaccine,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00:38:58.354 \rightarrow 00:39:00.682$ so that was those 43 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00{:}39{:}00{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}05{.}186$ and after those number 26 patients have

NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00:39:05.186 \rightarrow 00:39:08.610$ platelet count, decreased below 30.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00:39:08.610 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.890$ So factors that are found not

- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:39{:}10.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}13.045$ predictive of estimation were age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:39:13.045 \rightarrow 00:39:14.905$ gender, vaccine type and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:39:14.910 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.250$ presence of autoimmune disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:39{:}18.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}20.620$ They actually had access to two

NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00:39:20.620 \dashrightarrow 00:39:22.949$ surveys and they sort of tried.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00{:}39{:}22.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26.160$ They tried to validate their findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875

 $00:39:26.160 \rightarrow 00:39:30.584$ and they they looked into these surveys.

- $00:39:30.590 \longrightarrow 00:39:32.334$ These are two surveys.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- 00:39:32.334 --> 00:39:34.750 One is from a base in the United States,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:39:34.750 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.310$ one is from UK especially.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75235606875
- $00:39:36.310 \rightarrow 00:39:37.638$ They track the track.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00{:}39{:}39{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}43{.}678$ Similar data. And so they found
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00{:}39{:}43.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}46.752$ that in indeed in patients who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00:39:46.752 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.280$ had platelet count decreased.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00{:}39{:}50{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}51{.}660$ There were a lot more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00{:}39{:}51{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}54{.}470$ people with splenectomy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00:39:54.470 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.320$ And then when they looked
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- 00:39:57.320 --> 00:39:59.600 into your CTP cohort.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00:39:59.600 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.685$ Also survey based they found
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00{:}40{:}02.685 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}05.770$ sort of breakdown of similar.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00{:}40{:}05{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}07{.}406$ Similar breakdown of decreased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00:40:07.406 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.860$ platelets about the third of patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- 00:40:09.860 --> 00:40:11.284 indeed had ITP assassinations,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572
- $00:40:11.284 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.420$ and they also in the same

 $00{:}40{:}13{.}492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}15{.}340$ survey found this book to me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:15.340 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.209$ Was the shade with a 2 fold

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

00:40:17.209 --> 00:40:18.748 increase of risk of decreasing

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:18.748 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.911$ in platelets by more than 50%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:20.911 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.266$ So they acknowledged the speed

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}23.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}25.820$ limitationes that there's no lack of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:25.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.580$ There's there's no unvaccinated

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:28.580 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.650$ control group 2.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.316$ To compare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}31{.}316 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}32{.}981$ there was a possible selection

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

00:40:32.981 --> 00:40:34.588 bias because they were following

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:34.588 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.492$ a lot closer to the people who

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}36{.}492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{.}198$ are had refractory GP already.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}40{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}41{.}710$ They were they didn't account

00:40:41.710 --> 00:40:43.220 for titration for concurrent sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}43.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}44.908$ of interventions in terms of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:44.908 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.340$ they affect the platelet count,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:40:46.340 \rightarrow 00:40:48.194$ including the titrations of the of NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

00:40:48.194 --> 00:40:49.831 the medications of the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

00:40:49.831 --> 00:40:51.877 that the patients were already on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

00:40:51.880 --> 00:40:54.112 and the technology that the possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}54.112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}56.030$ overlap between cohort might effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}56.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}57.890$ might affect the platelet count,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}40{:}57.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}00.248$ but overall they felt that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

00:41:00.248 --> 00:41:02.799 major point was that there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00:41:02.799 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.273$ no bleeding in refractory TCP

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}41{:}05{.}273 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07{.}292$ in refractory thrombocytopenia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76842572

 $00{:}41{:}07{.}292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}09{.}870$ Following vaccination and the major.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417165027

00:41:12.180 --> 00:41:13.686 .0 there was like if it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417165027

 $00:41:13.686 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.690$ if it's a splenectomy.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7417165027
- $00:41:14.690 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.695$ Patients follow closer.

00:41:15.695 --> 00:41:17.035 If it's a patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417165027

 $00:41:17.040 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.548$ were the difficult control

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417165027

00:41:18.548 --> 00:41:20.056 ITP or heavily pretreated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417165027

 $00:41:20.060 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.029$ Follow them closer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}41{:}23{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}28{.}412$ And so that was main main idea and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:41:28.412 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.879$ in a sort of in the in the post

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:41:30.880 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.736$ in a additional question sort of session

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}41{:}33.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}35.052$ following the abstract presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}41{:}35{.}052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}37{.}756$ Somebody was asking, how would you counsel

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}41{:}37.756$ --> $00{:}41{:}40.330$ consultations and who actually did not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

00:41:40.330 --> 00:41:42.616 perhaps did not who I had

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}41{:}42.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}43.840$ from Selena after the first.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

00:41:43.840 --> 00:41:45.340 Actually would you, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:41:45.340 \rightarrow 00:41:48.308$ give the second vaccine, and so the

 $00:41:48.308 \rightarrow 00:41:52.250$ presenter actually said that she usually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}41{:}52{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}54{.}250$ She would actually recommend

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:41:54.250 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.069$ but with close observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

00:41:56.069 --> 00:41:58.302 Alright, so moving on to the second

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:41:58.302 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.690$ one so the second study was similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}00.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}02.979$ In fact, they just followed one another.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:42:02.980 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.220$ This one is from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}05{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07{.}260$ Dutch study the benefit of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}07{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}09{.}120$ study was a prospective cohort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}09{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}11{.}316$ but the question was fairly similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}11{.}316 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}13{.}752$ to what happens in patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}13.752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}15.992$ ITP with pre-existing ITP when

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

00:42:15.992 --> 00:42:17.950 they receive COVID-19 vaccine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}17{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21{.}046$ This study had a control arm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}42{:}21.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}24.384$ It had about a similar twice

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:42:24.384 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.316$ as much patients,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00:42:26.316 \longrightarrow 00:42:29.179$ 218 in about the same number of 200.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00:42:29.180 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.086$ Healthy controls.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- 00:42:30.086 --> 00:42:33.257 Breakdown of vaccine was a little different,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00{:}42{:}33{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}35{.}759$ most of them received Moderna that was.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- 00:42:35.760 --> 00:42:37.413 Holland come in.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00{:}42{:}37{.}413 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}39{.}617$ All healthy controls received.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- 00:42:39.620 --> 00:42:42.380 Moderna 15 patients required
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00:42:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.760$ rescue treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00{:}42{:}43.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}47.913$ Now this is a breakdown of the treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00{:}42{:}47{.}913 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}52{.}554$ that patients were received or were on.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00:42:52.560 \rightarrow 00:42:55.395$ So quite a number were on steroids
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00{:}42{:}55{.}395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}58{.}542$ in at a time and then also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00:42:58.542 \rightarrow 00:43:02.034$ about 10% were Hispanic to me,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00{:}43{:}02{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}04{.}284$ definition of ITP dissertation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965
- $00:43:04.284 \rightarrow 00:43:06.528$ was fairly the same.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:43:06.530 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.120$ In fact, exactly the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

00:43:09.120 --> 00:43:12.276 And sorry and So what they?

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:43:12.280 \longrightarrow 00:43:15.292$ What they found here on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00:43:15.292 \rightarrow 00:43:19.110$ graph below is that the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

00:43:19.110 --> 00:43:21.935 Both pleasant count in both

NOTE Confidence: 0.794892965

 $00{:}43{:}21{.}935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}24{.}195$ normal controls and in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

00:43:26.600 --> 00:43:28.356 Patient stated patients actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

 $00:43:28.356 \longrightarrow 00:43:30.551$ decreased and they I believe

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

00:43:30.551 --> 00:43:33.052 they said it's decreased by 6.3%

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

 $00:43:33.052 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.894$ in both in both in both groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

 $00:43:35.894 \rightarrow 00:43:37.322$ so they didn't really feel there

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

 $00:43:37.322 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.797$ was a difference in reduction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

 $00:43:38.800 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.218$ but they both platelets

NOTE Confidence: 0.768123773857143

 $00:43:41.218 \longrightarrow 00:43:43.708$ in both groups went down.

NOTE Confidence: 0.72874327777778

 $00{:}43{:}45{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}49{.}214$ In fact, this is the better image of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00:43:53.500 \rightarrow 00:43:55.230$ And so they further look

 $00:43:55.230 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.960$ into risk factors as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00{:}43{:}56{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}59{.}564$ And here they found interesting piece

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00:43:59.564 \rightarrow 00:44:02.610$ which is a contradicts the previous study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00{:}44{:}02.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}05.130$ They found that split me actually was

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00:44:05.130 \longrightarrow 00:44:07.230$ associated with increase of platelets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00{:}44{:}07{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}10{.}240$ quite substantial cruise of platelets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00{:}44{:}10{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}14{.}585$ And a current treatment was associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00{:}44{:}14{.}585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}17{.}915$ with a decrease of platelets and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00{:}44{:}17{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}21{.}376$ Age was associated with small decrease

NOTE Confidence: 0.851011732

 $00:44:21.380 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.148$ in platelets following vaccinations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}44{:}25{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}28{.}365$ So this is again sort of a tally that

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:44:28.370 --> 00:44:31.138 3030 patients developing masturbations

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:44:31.138 --> 00:44:33.906 15 required rescue treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:44:33.910 \rightarrow 00:44:36.190$ The bleeding they did report bleeding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}44{:}36{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}39{.}502$ and interestingly enough and and in

 $00:44:39.502 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.112$ a post in a in a in a question

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:44:43.112 \rightarrow 00:44:45.629$ period they were asked about this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}44{:}45{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}48{.}174$ so all the five bleeding episodes

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:44:48.174 \rightarrow 00:44:50.362$ happened in patients with platelet

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:44:50.362 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.499$ count of higher than 100,000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}44{:}52{.}499 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}56{.}251$ And in fact one patient who had a

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:44:56.251 --> 00:44:58.020 fatal fatal gas
trointestinal bleeding

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:44:58.020 \rightarrow 00:45:00.150$ also had platelet count of 100.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}45{:}00{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}04{.}820$ So their answer was that it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:04.820 \rightarrow 00:45:06.476$ It was not related to vaccination at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:06.480 \rightarrow 00:45:07.185$ it was comorbidities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:45:07.185 --> 00:45:08.830 and in fact in the patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:45:08.881 --> 00:45:10.260 had a GI bleed fatal jab bleed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:10.260 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.916$ it was a severe liver disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:14.920 \rightarrow 00:45:17.256$ Few patients require transfusions

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:17.256 \longrightarrow 00:45:19.008$ over plated or.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:19.010 \rightarrow 00:45:21.677$ It helps so the conclusions here is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- 00:45:21.680 --> 00:45:23.430 it's actually kind of similar.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}23{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}25{.}890$ The effect of code in vaccination
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:25.890 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.456$ is similar in health in healthy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:28.456 \rightarrow 00:45:30.308$ controls and ITP patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}30{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}31{.}782$ Dissertations were only a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:31.782 \rightarrow 00:45:33.622$ few very few ITP patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:33.630 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.085$ There was a good response
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}36.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37.558$ to rescue treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}37{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}40{.}332$ And essentially vaccination is safe and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:40.332 \rightarrow 00:45:43.039$ monitoring is advised and is actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:45:43.040 \rightarrow 00:45:46.820$ was recommended by ASH guidelines.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}46{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}49{.}092$ Come and this is sort of the additional
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}49.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}50.560$ questions that they were asked.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}45{:}50{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}52{.}205$ Somebody asked whether they check
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:52.205 \rightarrow 00:45:53.850$ for platelet antibodies and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:45:53.905 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.897$ said they did not evaluate for

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:45:55.897 --> 00:45:56.893 platelet antibodies directly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}45{:}56{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}00{.}675$ but but there's no association with

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:46:00.675 \rightarrow 00:46:05.580$ high levels in health healthy controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}46{:}05{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}05{.}911$ So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:46:05.911 --> 00:46:08.890 so I want to just finish up with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:46:08.971 \rightarrow 00:46:13.940$ third study, which is which is also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:46:13.940 --> 00:46:15.116 ITP related studying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:46:15.116 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.900$ In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}46{:}15{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}20{.}152$ this is an interesting trial about use

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:46:20.152 --> 00:46:24.744 of BTK inhibitor will support NIP in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:46:24.750 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.630$ A refractory relapsed ITP's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}46{:}26{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}30{.}588$ The premise of the of the trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:46:30.590 \rightarrow 00:46:33.164$ was was I think it was five for face,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:46:33.170 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.471$ face,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:46:33.471 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.073$ one face,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- 00:46:34.073 --> 00:46:36.600 two sort of update on on the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:46:36.600 \rightarrow 00:46:38.350$ phase one phase two trial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:46:38.350 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.822$ The the premise was that pertain
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:46:40.822 \rightarrow 00:46:43.967$ inhibitors modulate quite a bit of a quite
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}46{:}43.967 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}46.109$ a number of different effector cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:46:46.110 \longrightarrow 00:46:48.938$ B cells and macrophages.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:46:48.940 \rightarrow 00:46:52.192$ Then also signaling signaling of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}46{:}52.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}54.945$ basilar receptor and inhibitors decrease
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}46{:}54{.}945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}58{.}594$ our reactive antibodies in so there's a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}46{:}58{.}594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00{.}779$ There's an interest in evaluating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:47:00.779 \rightarrow 00:47:03.880$ this group of class of medications.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00:47:03.880 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.758$ Class of drugs in it P.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}47{:}05{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}07{.}080$ And specifically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
- $00{:}47{:}07.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}11.700$ While I'm really Brittany was chosen because.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333
$00:47:11.700 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.428$ Is believed to be very selective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:47:13.430 --> 00:47:15.785 so out of different kinases

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:15.785 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.669$ it's it's pretty selective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:17.670 \rightarrow 00:47:23.320$ It inhibits quite quite nicely, but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:23.320 \longrightarrow 00:47:27.060$ But not others, rather occupy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00{:}47{:}27.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}29.160$ Target potentially, but not others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:47:29.160 --> 00:47:32.190 It's quite reversible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:32.190 \rightarrow 00:47:34.626$ And why not in Britain for instance?

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

00:47:34.630 --> 00:47:35.110 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:35.110 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.030$ so there's association of

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:37.030 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.950$ play legation with liberty,

NOTE Confidence: 0.723092663333333

 $00:47:38.950 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.440$ but not as shown here when.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763151872857143

00:47:44.840 --> 00:47:47.936 Was tested against collagen

NOTE Confidence: 0.763151872857143

 $00:47:47.936 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.130$ so much much. He come.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:47:53.710 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.612$ Specially associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:47:55.612 \rightarrow 00:47:58.148$ aggregation more than rules.

 $00{:}47{:}58{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}01{.}072$ So the trial instant criteria was

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}01{.}072 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}03{.}442$ fairly straightforward, its response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}03{.}442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}05{.}864$ It's essentially adults response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:05.864 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.870$ They have to have at least had to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:08.949 \rightarrow 00:48:11.805$ at least response to one prior treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}11{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}14{.}060$ and there's no other available

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:14.060 \longrightarrow 00:48:16.310$ to them or not approved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}16{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}19{.}126$ And there should be at least two platelet

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:19.126 \longrightarrow 00:48:22.238$ count less than 30 thirty thousand

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}22{.}238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25{.}502$ brother on 2 occasions and concurrent

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:25.502 \rightarrow 00:48:28.470$ therapists were allowed, including.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

00:48:28.470 --> 00:48:29.766 Storage entity arrays.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}29.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33.660$ There was a dose escalation as a phase one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}33{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}35{.}501$ but in kind of a phase two

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}35{.}501 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38{.}208$ phase of it part of it they use

00:48:38.208 --> 00:48:39.684 actually 400 milligrams VID,

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:39.690 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.010$ which I'll show soon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

00:48:42.010 --> 00:48:44.910 Primary in point was essentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:44.910 \longrightarrow 00:48:47.480$ Account of greater than 50,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}47{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}50{.}050$ on two occasion at least,

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}48{:}50{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}53{.}842$ and an increase of 2020 thousand of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:53.842 \rightarrow 00:48:56.990$ baseline without use of rescue medication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:56.990 \rightarrow 00:48:59.503$ And they actually had a long term

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:48:59.503 \rightarrow 00:49:01.970$ extension also for 400 milligrams PID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:49:01.970 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.000$ And so here's what happened.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}49{:}04.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}07.426$ So this is kind of a overall study diagram,

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:49:07.426 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.249$ so this is the 400 the ID group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:49:11.249 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.964$ So this is 45 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}49{:}12.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}16.954$ And so here's the results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00{:}49{:}16{.}954 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}20{.}750$ So out of this 4518 that is 40% reached

NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857

 $00:49:20.750 \longrightarrow 00:49:22.630$ the primary endpoint so greater

- NOTE Confidence: 0.592017207142857
- $00:49:22.706 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.855$ than 50 in with 20 greater than.

 $00:49:27.840 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.248 50\%$ fifty thousand increase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:49:31.250 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.502$ Sorry, greater than 50,000 platelet count

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:49:34.502 \rightarrow 00:49:36.586$ increased 20,000 from the baseline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00{:}49{:}36{.}586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}39{.}234$ so that's 18 patients reached that end

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00{:}49{:}39{.}234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}42{.}410$ point and it was very rapid improvement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:49:42.410 \longrightarrow 00:49:44.546$ so this is it's probably hard to see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

00:49:44.550 --> 00:49:47.700 But this is days and so within,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:49:47.700 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.206$ you know this is actually 20.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

00:49:49.210 --> 00:49:52.208 I think it's 25 or 29 days,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

00:49:52.208 --> 00:49:53.936 so it's a really rapid improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00{:}49{:}53{.}936$ --> $00{:}49{:}55{.}350$ and it's actually sustained.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:49:55.350 \rightarrow 00:49:58.190$ And of course these are not responders and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00{:}49{:}58{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}01{.}260$ you can see here that this is sort of a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:50:01.260 \longrightarrow 00:50:03.290$ Better.

 $00:50:03.290 \rightarrow 00:50:05.354$ Way to assess sort of duration of response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00{:}50{:}05{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07{.}810$ So this is greater than 30 number

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:50:07.810 \longrightarrow 00:50:09.707$ of number of weeks achieved

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177619

 $00:50:09.707 \longrightarrow 00:50:13.400$ in 20 and then 15 and 14.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77861778

 $00{:}50{:}15{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18{.}599$ So then, who ops.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:20.760 \longrightarrow 00:50:22.860$ And so they made a point

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:22.860 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.800$ that it's indeed very rapid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

00:50:24.800 --> 00:50:28.412 very rapid increase in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:28.412 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.268$ median time to greater than 30,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:31.270 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.660$ level was achieved in 8.5 days

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00{:}50{:}34.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}37.310$ greater than 30,000 + 20,000 above

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:50:39.210$ the baseline in basically 12

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:39.210 \longrightarrow 00:50:41.496$ days in greater than 50,000 play

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:41.496 \rightarrow 00:50:43.680$ account in just about the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:43.680 \rightarrow 00:50:45.857$ 12.5 days and median time for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091

 $00:50:45.857 \rightarrow 00:50:47.659$ primary response was about a month,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091
- $00{:}50{:}47.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}50.670$ so it's very very rapid.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091
- $00:50:50.670 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.736$ And then they also showed the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091
- $00:50:53.740 \rightarrow 00:50:57.534$ What happened in this long long extension?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091
- $00:50:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.252$ Arms, so to speak,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091
- $00{:}50{:}59{.}252 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}01{.}820$ and they said that it's basically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.885930590909091
- $00:51:01.820 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.688$ it was quite robust.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- $00:51:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:51:09.752$ Especially it's a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- $00{:}51{:}09{.}752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}12{.}656$ It's a maintain the maintained the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- $00{:}51{:}12.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}16.656$ response a lright and then adverse effects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- 00:51:16.660 --> 00:51:19.331 Basically it's all grade one grade,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- 00:51:19.331 --> 00:51:22.097 one grade, two diarrhea and nausea,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- $00:51:22.100 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.920$ fatigue. And again this is all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- 00:51:24.920 --> 00:51:27.379 about 400 milligrams twice a day,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- $00{:}51{:}27{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}31{.}046$ so conclusions. Mr.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.822417785555555
- $00:51:31.046 \rightarrow 00:51:32.018$ Bracnet provides.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

00:51:34.220 --> 00:51:38.990 Inhibition of phagocytosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00{:}51{:}38{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}41{.}822$ And 40% of patients on 400

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00{:}51{:}41.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43.710$ milligram VID achieved endpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

00:51:43.801 --> 00:51:46.406 primary endpoint at 18 patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00{:}51{:}46{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}50{.}430$ Response was rapid and was well

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:51:50.430 \rightarrow 00:51:53.432$ tolerated and response was maintained.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:51:53.432 \longrightarrow 00:51:54.720$ So there's open going

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:51:54.720 \longrightarrow 00:51:56.330$ face the Luna three trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00{:}51{:}56{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}00{.}950$ which further will address this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:52:00.950 \rightarrow 00:52:05.572$ This this modality in additional questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:52:05.572 \rightarrow 00:52:07.636$ I think there was nothing really

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

00:52:07.636 --> 00:52:08.630 particularly interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:52:08.630 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.130$ but they said there's no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

00:52:10.130 --> 00:52:13.970 nobody, nobody was on any.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

00:52:13.970 --> 00:52:15.740 Antibiotic prophylaxis and

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00:52:15.740 \longrightarrow 00:52:18.100$ there was no infections.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703
- 00:52:18.100 --> 00:52:20.278 So I think in interest of time I finish,

 $00:52:20.280 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.418$ I stop here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73578703

 $00{:}52{:}23{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}25{.}080$ If we have some questions, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932399030769231

 $00:52:25.090 \rightarrow 00:52:27.466$ thank you all very much for those very

NOTE Confidence: 0.932399030769231

 $00:52:27.466 \rightarrow 00:52:29.499$ informative and very clear presentations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

00:52:31.650 --> 00:52:33.000 If people do have questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00:52:33.000 \rightarrow 00:52:35.440$ if they could put them in the chat

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00:52:35.440 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.409$ that there are a couple there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00{:}52{:}37{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}39{.}408$ Maybe we can start with those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00:52:39.410 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.742$ So I'm Kelsey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00{:}52{:}40.742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}43.406$ You mentioned in your abstract with

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00{:}52{:}43{.}406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}46{.}429$ factor 11 deficiency that some patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00{:}52{:}46{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}50{.}330$ bled despite getting fresh frozen plasma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00{:}52{:}50{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}52{.}124$ What what might be some alternatives

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00:52:52.124 \rightarrow 00:52:53.320$ to treat those individuals?

 $00:52:53.320 \rightarrow 00:52:55.088$ Or do you have any any thoughts about

NOTE Confidence: 0.903285578

 $00:52:55.088 \rightarrow 00:52:56.797$ why those people still had bleeding?

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:52:58.370 \longrightarrow 00:52:59.423$ Yeah, it's interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:52:59.423 \longrightarrow 00:53:02.659$ I mean the half life of factor 11 is long.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00{:}53{:}02.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04.095$ I think about two days or so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00{:}53{:}04{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}05{.}612$ and so it's it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

00:53:05.612 --> 00:53:07.334 It's intriguing, but I think something

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00{:}53{:}07{.}334 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}08{.}539$ we've all experienced in practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:53:08.540 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.020$ I think that may happen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:53:10.020 \dashrightarrow 00:53:12.440$ perhaps just the quantity effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00{:}53{:}12{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}14{.}860$ or Lebanon is not concentrated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

00:53:14.860 --> 00:53:16.570 You know, you never maybe know

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:53:16.570 \rightarrow 00:53:18.259$ exactly what you're getting in the FP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:53:18.260 \rightarrow 00:53:19.752$ and maybe one element.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:53:19.752 \rightarrow 00:53:21.660$ And I, you know there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615

 $00:53:21.660 \rightarrow 00:53:22.820$ cases reported of inhibitors,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:22.820 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.105$ so perhaps some of those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- 00:53:24.105 00:53:25.133 patients that didn't respond,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:25.140 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.690$ maybe inhibitors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:27.690 \dashrightarrow 00:53:32.926$ I think that I think Novoseven could be used,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:32.930 \rightarrow 00:53:34.372$ but I think with caution and maybe
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:34.372 \longrightarrow 00:53:36.122$ at a lower dose or maybe particularly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00{:}53{:}36{.}122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}37{.}742$ in someone who had an inhibitor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:37.750 \rightarrow 00:53:39.294$ I think there would be a role there,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00{:}53{:}39{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}41{.}974$ and then may be sort of leaning more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:41.974 \rightarrow 00:53:44.102$ heavily on anti fibrinolytics might
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:44.102 \rightarrow 00:53:47.956$ be useful, but I mean I think it's.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:47.960 \rightarrow 00:53:50.452$ A challenge we've all seen and experienced
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00:53:50.452 \rightarrow 00:53:52.589$ that sometimes is hard to pinpoint.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904679545384615
- $00{:}53{:}52{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}53{.}390$ It's a great question,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166
- $00{:}53{:}53{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}54{.}988$ great, thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166

00:53:54.988 --> 00:53:56.880 Thank you and and Sudan shoe. You. NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:53:56.880 \rightarrow 00:53:58.752$ You mentioned that there was an NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:53:58.752 \rightarrow 00:54:00.484$ increase in the clinical clinically NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:54:00.484 \rightarrow 00:54:02.620$ relevant non major bleeding and NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:54:02.620 \rightarrow 00:54:04.820$ individuals who are getting doax NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:54:04.820 \rightarrow 00:54:06.580$ for cancer associated thrombosis. NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:54:06.580 \longrightarrow 00:54:08.500$ So when when you prescribe either NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00{:}54{:}08{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}10{.}218$ a low molecular weight heparin NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 00:54:10.218 --> 00:54:12.822 orado act to a patient with cancer NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 $00:54:12.822 \rightarrow 00:54:14.404$ associated thrombosis, how do you? NOTE Confidence: 0.798709166 00:54:14.404 --> 00:54:15.238 How do you? NOTE Confidence: 0.769428 00:54:17.290 --> 00:54:19.210 Decide on the benefits, risks there, NOTE Confidence: 0.769428 $00:54:19.210 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.390$ and what what agents do. NOTE Confidence: 0.769428 $00:54:20.390 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.587$ You tend to choose and are there. NOTE Confidence: 0.769428 $00:54:21.590 \rightarrow 00:54:23.090$ Are there things about the NOTE Confidence: 0.769428 $00:54:23.090 \rightarrow 00:54:24.432$ patient that may point you

- NOTE Confidence: 0.769428
- $00:54:24.432 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.780$ in One Direction or another?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:27.840 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.594$ So the clinically relevant non major
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- 00:54:30.594 --> 00:54:33.130 bleeding was really of concern,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:33.130 \longrightarrow 00:54:34.894$ which was higher in doax and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00{:}54{:}34{.}894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}36{.}740$ that has been pretty consistent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:36.740 \longrightarrow 00:54:38.820$ throughout all the six trials.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:38.820 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.078$ So it wasn't just one study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:42.080 \rightarrow 00:54:44.271$ And the way it impacts my practice
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00{:}54{:}44{.}271 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}46{.}981$ is if if I do look at the patient's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:46.981 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.544$ underlying bleeding risk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:48.544 \rightarrow 00:54:51.386$ If there isn't an individual where I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:51.386 \rightarrow 00:54:53.300$ would be more concerned about bleeding,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00:54:53.300 \rightarrow 00:54:56.250$ perhaps someone who had immediate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00{:}54{:}56{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}57{.}598$ postoperative thrombotic event,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636
- $00{:}54{:}57{.}598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}59{.}872$ or perhaps with some body who's going
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

 $00{:}54{:}59{.}872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}02{.}813$ for a surgery or has a known history

NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

 $00:55:02.813 \rightarrow 00:55:04.740$ of underlying bleeding or faults.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

00:55:04.740 --> 00:55:08.856 I might be more inclined to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

 $00:55:08.860 \rightarrow 00:55:11.060$ those individuals rather than doax,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

00:55:11.060 - 00:55:12.747 so that would be my approach and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

 $00:55:12.750 \dashrightarrow 00:55:14.868$ How I would use that information?

NOTE Confidence: 0.733083880363636

 $00{:}55{:}14.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}15.120$ Thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

00:55:15.130 --> 00:55:17.090 you very much, don't you?

NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

 $00{:}55{:}17.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}19.682$ And Alex, are there any situations

NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

 $00:55:19.682 \rightarrow 00:55:22.310$ in patients with ITP, and in in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

 $00:55:22.310 \rightarrow 00:55:26.032$ in which you might hold off on giving NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

00:55:26.032 --> 00:55:27.740 COVID vaccine COVID-19 vaccine?

NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

00:55:27.740 --> 00:55:30.410 So individuals who are recently flared NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

00:55:30.410 --> 00:55:33.773 or have very low platelet counts and

NOTE Confidence: 0.71389297

00:55:33.773 --> 00:55:35.920 requiring intense therapy, for instance?

NOTE Confidence: 0.813180108

 $00:55:38.200 \dashrightarrow 00:55:39.892$ You know, so this is interesting

- NOTE Confidence: 0.813180108
- $00:55:39.892 \rightarrow 00:55:41.998$ because the data they really didn't

00:55:41.998 --> 00:55:43.378 actually include specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813180108

 $00:55:43.380 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.370$ like they didn't address the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.813180108

 $00:55:47.370 \rightarrow 00:55:50.338$ of whether patients who were in right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813180108

 $00{:}55{:}50{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}52{.}926$ right, or right now on inactive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:55:55.370 \longrightarrow 00:55:56.606$ ITP destinations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:55:56.606 \rightarrow 00:56:00.254$ prior to prior to vaccination. They were.

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:56:00.254 \rightarrow 00:56:02.193$ They only had patients who were on

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

00:56:02.193 --> 00:56:04.276 sort of chronic chronic therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00{:}56{:}04.276 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09.342$ so I I don't think we have data per

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:56:09.342 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.490$ say in that regard, but personally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

00:56:12.490 --> 00:56:17.308 I think if there's a flare actually flare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

00:56:17.310 --> 00:56:19.990 I probably would hold off,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

00:56:19.990 --> 00:56:23.390 just not to disturb.

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

00:56:23.390 --> 00:56:25.060 You know it. You know,

00:56:25.060 --> 00:56:28.168 in in in response further,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00{:}56{:}28.168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}30.728$ I think it would might what might be

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:56:30.728 \rightarrow 00:56:33.003$ really interesting is in this situation

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00{:}56{:}33.003 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}35.687$ to address further whether they're truly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:56:35.690 \dashrightarrow 00:56:38.770$ Uh and antibody platelet antibody,

NOTE Confidence: 0.610153234285714

 $00:56:38.770 \rightarrow 00:56:40.954$ which none of them really looked into.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759774240235294

 $00{:}56{:}43.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}44.699$ Great, but but I think I would

NOTE Confidence: 0.759774240235294

 $00:56:44.699 \rightarrow 00:56:46.460$ probably hold off until there's some

NOTE Confidence: 0.759774240235294

 $00{:}56{:}46{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}47{.}836$ stabilization of platelet count.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00{:}56{:}49{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}52{.}600$ Seems very prudent. Yep, OK, alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00:56:52.600 \rightarrow 00:56:54.770$ Well it's it's just about 1:00 o'clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00:56:54.770 \dashrightarrow 00:56:58.358$ so I want to thank our speakers for again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00{:}56{:}58{.}358 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}59{.}594$ Excellent presentation that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00{:}56{:}59{.}594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}01{.}713$ were informative and I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00:57:01.713 \rightarrow 00:57:03.361$ highlighted some really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

00:57:03.361 -> 00:57:05.009 areas in classical hematology.

 $00{:}57{:}05{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}07{.}610$ And thank you all for for joining us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

00:57:07.610 --> 00:57:08.834 Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7916155125

 $00{:}57{:}08{.}834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}11{.}000$ Have a great day every one. I.