Malignant pleural effusions as an alternative to biopsies for the detection of EGFR TKI sensitizing mutations

George D'Souza[1,2*], Chirag Dhar[1,2*^], Vishal Kyalanoor[3], Lokendra Yadav[3], Mugdha Sharmra[1,4], Mohammad Nawaz S[2], Sweta Srivastava[3]

[1]St. John's Research Institute, Bangalore, India

[2]Department of Pulmonary Medicine, St. John's Medical College and Hospital, Bangalore, India

[3]Department of Transfusion Medicine and Immunohaematology, St. John's Medical College and Hospital, Bangalore, India

[4]Department of General Medicine, St. John's Medical College and Hospital, Bangalore, India

* Equal contribution of authors

^ Present affiliation: University of California, San Diego, USA

Corresponding authors: Dr. Sweta Srivastava- sweta.s@stjohns.in (Lead contact), Dr. George D'Souza- george.dsouza@stjohns.in and Dr. Chirag Dhar- cdhar@health.ucsd.edu

Abstract

Lung cancer is the cause of a fourth of all cancer related deaths. About a third of all lung adenocarcinoma tumours harbour mutations on exons 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) gene. Detection of these mutations must be both accurate and timely as patients with certain EGFR mutations have better clinical outcomes when treated with EGFR Tyrosine kinase inhibitors. In our study, we utilized malignant pleural effusions (MPEs) as "liquid biopsies" to detect EGFR mutations when tissue biopsies were unavailable. First, a direct sequencing approach was attempted leading to the detection of a common exon 19 deletion. We then tested the sensitivity of this method by sequencing the mutant DNA sample diluted with wildtype DNA. Signatures of this large deletion were detectable even in a 1 part mutant and 99 part wildtype mixture but with poor base-call confidence. MPEs consist of both wildtype inflammatory cells as well as mutant metastatic cells suggesting that this sequencing-based approach was going to limit our ability to detect single base pair mutations. To mitigate this limitation of sequencing, an EGFR mutant-specific quantitative polymerase chain reaction (PCR) based assay was used on a further n=10 pleural effusion samples (1 non-malignant pleural effusion as an internal negative control). 5/9 (55.55%) samples harboured EGFR mutations with 2/9 (22.22%) being exon 19 deletions and 3/9 (33.33%) had the S768I exon 20 mutation. These data suggest MPEs may be utilized to detect mutations even before a biopsy is made available. The high frequency of S768I mutations seen in our study suggests that cancer cells harbouring these mutations may be superior in their ability to migrate, home or reside in pleural fluid.

Introduction

Lung cancer is a major contributor to death due to cancer. Amongst the various types of lung cancer, the non-small cell lung cancer accounts for approximately 80% of all cases[1]. In India, a significant rise has been seen in the time trends of lung cancer in Delhi, Chennai and Bangalore. Lung cancer is the cause of 6.9 percent of all new cancer cases and 9.3 percent of all cancer related deaths in both men and women in India[2]. Mutations seen on Exons 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) gene are frequently observed in these cases and have been shown to be present in nearly a third of all lung adenocarcinoma cases[3-5]. Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) is a family member of receptor tyrosine kinases and play a central role in cellular signalling which promote cell growth and proliferation. Some mutations in this protein strongly predict the efficacy of EGFR inhibitors used in the treatment of these cases. There are reportedly more than 32 different mutations that have been detected in EGFR gene, and are distributed across the 4 exons namely, 18, 19, 20, and 21[6, 7]. More than 20 different in-frame deletions on exon 19 have been reported accounting for nearly half of the cases of EGFR mutant lung adenocarcinoma. Importantly, tumours harbouring these deletions are found to be sensitive to EGFR TKIs such as erlotinib and gefitinib[8]. This targeted therapy has been found to increase clinical outcomes in these patients[9]. It is imperative that such mutations are diagnosed accurately and early for the benefit of patients.

Response rates of more than 70 percent have been observed in patients on EGFR targeted therapy[10]. Patients with EGFR mutant positive advanced NSCLC treated with Erlotinib, an EGFR Tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) have shown better response rates and Progression-free survival (PFS) as compared to those on first line chemotherapeutic agents[11-14].

Diagnostic tests for the detection of these EGFR mutations are now part of the routine management of lung adenocarcinoma[15]. In spite of the invasiveness and morbidity associated with lung biopsies[16], the primary tumour is preferred for detection of mutations[17]. Most often, an amplification-refractory mutation system (ARMS) is used for the detection of these mutations from the biopsy. The utility of pleural effusion (PE) in the detection of EGFR mutations has been well established over the years in the field of lung cancer diagnosis[18, 19]. In this study, we utilized malignant pleural effusions in an attempt to detect EGFR mutations at our tertiary care centre.

Ethics

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Committee of St. John's National Academy of Health as per IERB guidelines (Study No. 1/2016). Appropriate consents for carrying out experimental genetic tests were obtained.

Methods

Pleural fluid processing and DNA isolation

Pleural fluid was tapped from patients with malignant pleural effusions and centrifuged at 3500 rpm for 5 mins at 4°C to collect the cell pellet. The cell pellets were stored in -80°C until further processing. The DNA was extracted from the samples using the QIAamp DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen) as per the manufacturer's instructions. Samples were analyzed for their quality using BioSpec Nano UV-VIS Spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Corp.) and electrophoresed on an agarose gel to ascertain its integrity.

Direct sequencing

Appropriate primers for exons 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the EGFR gene were designed and obtained based on the reference sequence available on NCBI (Table 1). Genomic DNA obtained was subjected to a gradient PCR to optimize the annealing temperature and was visualized on a 1.2% agarose gel (Fig.1). The PCR products were subjected to Direct sequencing.

Table 1

Region of Interest	Forward Primer 5' to 3'	Reverse Primer 5' to 3'
Exon 18	GTCCTTCCAAATGAGCTGGCAAG	ACAAAGAGTAAAGTAGATGATGG
Exon 19	TGTCCCTCACCTTCGGGGTGCAT	ACATTTAGGATGTGGAGATGAGCA
Exon 20	CTCAAGATCGCATTCATGCGTC	GACAGGCACTGATTTGTGCAC
Exon 21	AGTAGTCACTAACGTTCGCCAG	TCCCAGCAAGTACTGTTCCC

Real-time PCR based detection of EGFR mutations

DNA samples were subjected for testing a total of 10 detectable EGFR mutations in a 96-well Real Time PCR format using the TRUPCR® EGFR Kit (3B BlackBio Biotech India Ltd.) as per the manufacturer's instructions. Real-time PCR data analysis and identification of EGFR mutant samples was done. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time this kit is being using to detect mutations from PEs.

Results

Optimization of a polymerase chain reaction protocol to amplify EGFR exon 18, 19, 20 and 21 from malignant pleural effusion (MPE).

Initially, we attempted a PCR amplification coupled with a direct sequencing approach to detect EGFR mutations from malignant pleural effusions. Appropriate primers (sequences listed in table 1) were designed and optimized on sample S0. Successful amplification of exons 18-21 by PCR on S0 are shown in figure 1. The primers for exon 18 and 21 had 55 °C as the annealing temperature while exon 19 and 20 were best amplified at an annealing temperature of 57.8 °C.



Figure 2: 1.2% Agarose gel imaged under ultra-violet light: 100bp ladder, A: GAPDH, B: Exon 20, lanes C-G: Exon 19 at annealing temperatures of 55 C, 57.8 C, 60.5 C, 63.1 C and 65 C lanes H-L: Exon 18 at annealing temperatures of 55 C, 57.8 C, 60.5 C, 63.1 C and 65 C, lanes M-Q: Exon 21 at annealing temperatures of 55 C, 57.8 C, 60.5 C, 63.1 C and 65 C Interestingly, two distinct bands are visible for Exon 19 (lanes C-G)

Detection of a common exon 19 deletion detected from MPE by direct sequencing.

The amplicon sequences were compared with the reference EGFR sequence available on the National Center for Biotechnology Information (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) database and exons 18, 20 and 21 were found to be identical. However, exon 19 was found to have an 18 bp deletion (Fig. 3). On comparing with the wildtype EGFR cDNA sequence, this sequence was found

to have a deletion (c.2240_2258del18, p.L747_P753delinsS). Searches on cBioPortal and COSMIC yielded multiple other studies that have reported the same mutation.

```
Query  11        CCAGATCACTGGGCAGCATGTGGCACCATCTCACAATTGACAGTTAACGTCTTCCTTCTC  70
                 ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| |||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174650  CCAGATCACTGGGCAGCATGTGGCACCATCTCACAATTGCCAGTTAACGTCTTCCTTCTC
55174709

Query  71        TCTCTGTCATAGGGACTCTGGATCCCAGAAGGTGAGAAAGTTAAAATTCCCGTCGCTATC  130
                 ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174710  TCTCTGTCATAGGGACTCTGGATCCCAGAAGGTGAGAAAGTTAAAATTCCCGTCGCTATC
55174769

Query  131       AAGGAATTA------------------AAAGCCAACAAGGAAATCCTCGATGTGAGTTTC  172
                 |||||||||                  |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174770  AAGGAATTAAGAGAAGCAACATCTCCGAAAGCCAACAAGGAAATCCTCGATGTGAGTTTC
55174829

Query  173       TGCTTTGATGTGTGGTC-TGCATGGCTCTGAACCTCAGGCCCACCTTTTCTCATGTCTGG  231
                 ||||||| |||||||   | |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174830  TGCTTTGCTGTGTGGGGGTCCATGGCTCTGAACCTCAGGCCCACCTTTTCTCATGTCTGG
55174889
```

Figure 3: Exon 19 sequence of S0 when aligned with the wildtype sequence indicated that this was the c.2240_2258del18, p.L747_P753delinsS mutation.

The analysis of the sequence using FinchTV has been shown in figure 4. We observed that this patient's sequences for exon 18, 20 and 21 were of good quality with no underlying peaks. However, exon 19 sequence had variations in the sequence.



Figure 4: Chromatogram of exon 19 sequence detecting a deletion in sample S0.

Common exon 19 deletion detectable even in diluted DNA samples but base calling is error prone.

The PCR product for exon 19 was then diluted in DNA obtained from a control subject to evaluate the efficiency of Direct sequencing. These varying dilutions (1 in 10, 1 in 25, 1 in 50 and 1 in 100) were then subjected to PCR and subsequent Direct sequencing. We observed that though the mutated sequence could be detected even at a 1 in 100 dilution (Fig 5) there were significant limitations of this sequencing-based approach.

```
Query  19        ATCACTGCTGCAGCATGTGTGCACGCATCTCACAATTGCCAGTTAACGTCTTCCTTCTCT  78
                 |||||||  |||||||||| |||| |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174654  ATCACTG-GGCAGCATGTG-GCAC-CATCTCACAATTGCCAGTTAACGTCTTCCTTCTCT  55174710

Query  79        CTCTGTCATAGGGACTCTGGATCCCAGAAGGTGAGAAAGTTAAAATTCCCGTCGCTATCA  138
                 ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174711  CTCTGTCATAGGGACTCTGGATCCCAGAAGGTGAGAAAGTTAAAATTCCCGTCGCTATCA  55174770

Query  139       AGGAATC--GA-AAG-AA-------G-------ACAAGGAAATCCTCGATGTGAGTTTCT  180
                 ||||||   || ||| ||       |       |||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174771  AGGAATTAAGAGAAGCAACATCTCCGAAAGCCAACAAGGAAATCCTCGATGTGAGTTTCT  55174830

Query  181       GCTTTGATGTGAGTTTCTGCTTTGCTCTGAACCTCAGGCCCACCTTTTCTCATGTCTGGC  240
                 |||||| |||| |     | | | |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Sbjct  55174831  GCTTTGCTGTGTGGGGGTCCATGGCTCTGAACCTCAGGCCCACCTTTTCTCATGTCTGGC  55174890

Query  241       AGCTTTCTCATG--CTAGACCCTGCTCATCTCTCAC  274
                 ||||  ||| ||  |||||||||||||||||| |||
Sbjct  55174891  AGCTG-CTC-TGCTCTAGACCCTGCTCATCTC-CAC  55174923
```

Figure 5: Sequencing of diluted S0 sample (1-part S0 DNA and 99 parts wildtype control DNA) showed that while signatures of the deletion were still coming through, there was significant error in base calls.

Malignant pleural effusions often contain wildtype stromal and hematopoietic cells along with the metastatic lung cancer cells. In light of the above results, detection of single base part mutations by direct sequencing of this heterogenous mix was obviously going to be a challenge. To overcome this limitation of direct sequencing, we decided to use a mutant-specific PCR amplification assay instead.

Mutant-specific quantitative PCR based detection of EGFR mutations from MPE suggests a high frequency of S768I exon 20 mutation.

An established EGFR mutation real-time PCR kit was used to identify EGFR mutations in malignant pleural effusions. The kit is optimized to detect mutations in a background of wild type DNA with starting material as less as 3-5 ng of purified genomic DNA. The resultant qPCR was analyzed for reaction controls, DNA assessment done based on an EGFR Reference gene and the samples thus passed were analyzed for mutation as described in the manual according to the defined ΔCt parameters. Our results showed that 5/9 (55.55%) of pleural effusions probed had EGFR mutations. Of these, 2/9 (22.22%) were the exon 19 deletion E746_S750del18 and 3/9 (33.33%) were the exon 20 S768I mutations. Table 2 describes these findings and Figure 6 presents these findings in the form of a doughnut chart. The amplification plots and ΔCt values are provided in supplementary figures 1-7 and supplementary tables 1 and 2.

Table 2

Sample. No.	Sex	Mutation detected	Exon where mutation is present
S1	M	WT	-
S2	M	E746_S750DEL	Exon 19
S3	M	WT	-
S4	F	E746_S750DEL	Exon 19
S5	F	WT	-
S6	M	WT	-
S7	M	S768I	Exon 20
S8	M	WT	-
S9	M	S768I	Exon 20
S10	M	S768I	Exon 20

M= Male, F= Female, WT= wildtype EGFR, S5 was a non-malignant pleural fluid sample that served as an internal assay negative control



Figure 6: Doughnut chart representing the various mutations detected in this study. Percentages are embedded in the slices and number of cases observed are indicated in parenthesis beneath the genotype.

Discussion

The prevalence of somatic mutations in the EGFR gene is high (~ 33%) in lung adenocarcinomas [21, 22]. The detection of any EGFR mutation and the resultant treatment with EGFR TKIs (Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors) aids in sensitizing the tumours and thereby enhance the prognosis of patients. EGFR mutation testing on tissue biopsies is the gold standard for diagnosis; however, it has its own drawbacks, mainly resulting in uncontrolled bleeding and morbidity [23]. Utility of pleural effusion fluid for mutation testing along with a plethora of other secondary specimens (pericardial effusion, fine needle aspirates, CSF, cfDNA, etc) is reported in the quest of development of alternate strategies for reliable testing [24]. We attempted to detect EGFR mutations from the pleural effusion collected from patients as a part of routine treatment/diagnostic processes. As it involves no exclusive sampling procedures, we proposed to develop a minimally invasive and inexpensive method for EGFR mutation diagnostics.

In our study we first used PCR coupled to direct sequencing to detect mutation in pleural effusion derived malignant cells. We were able to detect a common mutation using this method. One of the biggest drawbacks of Direct sequencing versus allele specific detection lies in its limit of detection. Pleural fluid consists of a heterogeneous pool of stromal and inflammatory cells apart from the metastatic cells. Since the non-tumor cells harbour wildtype genomic sequence, the signal to noise ratio in electropherogram is lower for mutated sequence. The mutation sequence identification may be compromised in the event of suboptimal malignant cells numbers. We showed that at dilution of 1:100 of a mutated DNA with wildtype genomic DNA signatures of the mutation continue but the wildtype sequence bases provide conflicting results in certain positions of the gene. These inadequate results are more likely to be seen in single base pair mutations. We then utilized an EGFR mutation detection kit. Commercially available diagnostic kits are designed for testing EGFR mutation on FFPE sections. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of EGFR mutation testing by Taqman technology platform using pleural effusions in India. Jong Sik Lee and colleagues have used PNA clamping technology to detect EGFR mutations in the supernatant derived from the pleural effusion where in the objective was to detect mutations using cell free DNA [25]. Jie Lin et al have shown that EGFR mutations can be detected in the supernatant, cell pellets of the pleural effusion using High Resolution Melting (HRM) analysis and Sanger sequencing [26].

When implemented on a small pilot scale study (n=9), we were successful in detecting EGFR mutations in 5/9 (55%) subjects. The mutations that were detected in these samples were either S768I or E746_S750del. Importantly, a study by Leventakos and group have shown that

S7681 mutation in exon 20 of EGFR is rare and is usually found in combination with sensitizing mutations and they have concluded that the predictive and prognostic role of this mutation is yet to be fully explored [27]. However, in another study it has been shown that S768I conferred reduced sensitivity to gefitinib *in vitro* as compared to other mutations [28, 29]. In our study we have found that 33.3% of the samples exhibited this mutation in isolation, with an absence of any other mutation. Some of the reasons for this large difference are discussed here. Most studies utilize the primary tissue and may miss this mutation if it appears later in the pathogenesis of the disease. Another reason could be that the mutation detection panels used in these studies did not include this mutation. One may also simply come to the conclusion that our cohort has a larger number of patients with this mutation, but we think otherwise. We hypothesize that S768I is a secondary mutation that develops later in the course of the disease and cells harbouring this mutation are able to migrate to, home in or reside within the pleural cavity more easily that cells without this mutation. One could further this speculation that cells having this mutation have a greater metastatic potential (figure 6) though further studies will be needed to prove these hypotheses.



Figure 6: Hypothesized role of the S768I mutation in the pathogenesis of metastasis in lung cancer (Elements of images sourced from http://smart.servier.com/).

The need to develop minimally invasive diagnostic tests in the management of cancers is gaining momentum, thus upon further evaluation and validation, EGFR mutation testing in lung adenocarcinoma patients could be potentially done using pleural effusion by exploiting Taqman based RQ-PCR in a dynamic fashion paving way for a reliable, robust, minimally invasive clinical diagnostic platform. However, this study is limited in its impact as it evaluates only 11 patients and further study needs to be undertaken to evaluate and validate this method in a larger cohort. Additionally, the detection of circulating tumour DNA should also be explored as an alternative to repeated biopsies is one of the techniques being studied [30]. This detection is being done using highly sensitive techniques such as droplet digital polymerase chain reaction. Resources must be directed towards the development of such minimally/non-invasive techniques, especially if these are inexpensive as well.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by a grant from the Advanced Research Wing of the Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore. We also thank Prof. Sudhir Krishna, Ms. Pranatharthi Annapurna and the sequencing division of NCBS, Bangalore for their support. Some of these data were presented at the National Lung Cancer Conference 2016 in Bhubaneshwar and at the American Society for Cellular Biology-European Molecular Biology Organization joint conference 2018 at San Diego[31-33]. A special mention to Dr. Paul Kalanithi for his battle against EGFR mutant lung cancer. His memoir When Breath becomes Air is humbling and yet, inspiring.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author contributions

G.D.S and C.D contributed equally this work which was conceived, planned, supervised and interpreted by G.D.S, C.D and S.S. Funding acquisition was by G.D.S. Experimental assays were performed and interpreted by C.D., V.K., L.Y. and M.S. Clinical sample acquisition was by C.D., M.N.S. and G.D.S. Manuscript was written and edited by C.D. and V.K. S.S. edited the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.

References

1. Zhang X, Zhao Y, Wang M, Yap WS, Chang AY. Detection and comparison of epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in cells and fluid of malignant pleural effusion in non-small cell lung cancer. Lung Cancer. 2008 May; 60(2): 175-82.
2. Malik PS, Raina V. Lung cancer: prevalent trends & emerging concepts. Indian J Med Res. 2015, 141: 5-7.
3. Doval D, Prabhash K, Patil S, Chaturvedi H, Goswami C, Vaid A, Desai S, Dutt S, Veldore V, Jambhekar N, Mehta A, Hazarika D, Azam S, Gawande S, Gupta S. Clinical and epidemiological study of EGFR mutations and EML4-ALK fusion genes among Indian patients with adenocarcinoma of the lung. Onco Targets Ther. 2015; 8: 117-23.
4. Ding L, Getz G, Wheeler DA, Mardis ER, McLellan MD, Cibulskis K, Sougnez C, Greulich H, Muzny DM, Morgan MB, Fulton L, Fulton RS, Zhang Q, Wendl MC, Lawrence MS, Larson DE, Chen K, Dooling DJ, Sabo A, Hawes AC, Shen H, Jhangiani SN, Lewis LR, Hall O, Zhu Y, Mathew T, Ren Y, Yao J, Scherer SE, Clerc K, Metcalf GA, Ng B, Milosavljevic A, Gonzalez-Garay ML, Osborne JR, Meyer R, Shi X, Tang Y, Koboldt DC, Lin L, Abbott R, Miner TL, Pohl C, Fewell G, Haipek C, Schmidt H, Dunford-Shore BH, Kraja A, Crosby SD, Sawyer CS, Vickery T, Sander S, Robinson J, Winckler W, Baldwin J, Chirieac LR, Dutt A, Fennell T, Hanna M, Johnson BE, Onofrio RC, Thomas RK, Tonon G, Weir BA, Zhao X, Ziaugra L, Zody MC, Giordano T, Orringer MB, Roth JA, Spitz MR, Wistuba, II, Ozenberger B, Good PJ, Chang AC, Beer DG, Watson MA, Ladanyi M, Broderick S, Yoshizawa A, Travis WD, Pao W, Province MA, Weinstock GM, Varmus HE, Gabriel SB, Lander ES, Gibbs RA, Meyerson M, Wilson RK. Somatic mutations affect key pathways in lung adenocarcinoma.

Nature. 2008; 455: 1069-75.

5. Pao W, Miller V, Zakowski M, Doherty J, Politi K, Sarkaria I, Singh B, Heelan R, Rusch V, Fulton L, Mardis E, Kupfer D, Wilson R, Kris M, Varmus H. EGF receptor gene mutations are common in lung cancers from "never smokers" and are associated with sensitivity of tumors to gefitinib and erlotinib. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2004; 101: 13306-11.

6. Sharma SV, Bell DW, Settleman J, Haber DA. Epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in lung cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2007; 7: 169-181.

7. Catalogue of Somatic Mutations in Cancer (COSMIC), 2011, v.51. http://www.sanger.ac.uk/genetics/CGP/cosmic.

8. Cheng L, Alexander RE, Maclennan GT, Cummings OW, Montironi R, Lopez-Beltran A, Cramer HM, Davidson DD, Zhang S. Molecular pathology of lung cancer: key to personalized medicine. Mod Pathol. 2012; 25: 347-69.

9. Rocha-Lima CM, Raez LE. Erlotinib (tarceva) for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer and pancreatic cancer. P T. 2009; 34: 554-64.

10. Mok TS, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Yang CH, Chu DT, Saijo N, Sunpaweravong P, Han B, Margono B, Ichinose Y, Nishiwaki Y, Ohe Y, Yang JJ, Chewaskulyong B, Jiang H, Duffield EL, Watkins CL, Armour AA, Fukuoka M. Gefitinib or carboplatin-paclitaxel in pulmonary adenocarcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2009; 361: 947-57.

11. Zhou C, Wu YL, Chen G, Feng J, Liu XQ, Wang C, Zhang S, Wang J, Zhou S, Ren S, Lu S, Zhang L, Hu C, Luo Y, Chen L, Ye M, Huang J, Zhi X, Zhang Y, Xiu Q, Ma J, You C. Erlotinib versus chemotherapy as first-line treatment for patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (OPTIMAL, CTONG-0802): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 study. Lancet Oncol. 2011, 12: 735-42.

12. Rosell R, Carcereny E, Gervais R, Vergnenegre A, Massuti B, Felip E, Palmero R, Garcia-Gomez R, Pallares C, Sanchez JM, Porta R, Cobo M, Garrido P, Longo F, Moran T, Insa A, De Marinis F, Corre R, Bover I, Illiano A, Dansin E, de Castro J, Milella M, Reguart N, Altavilla G, Jimenez U, Provencio M, Moreno MA, Terrasa J, Munoz-Langa J, Valdivia J, Isla D, Domine M, Molinier O, Mazieres J, Baize N, Garcia-Campelo R, Robinet G, Rodriguez-Abreu D, Lopez-Vivanco G, Gebbia V, Ferrera-Delgado L, Bombaron P, Bernabe R, Bearz A, Artal A, Cortesi E, Rolfo C, Sanchez-Ronco M, Drozdowskyj A, Queralt C, de Aguirre I, Ramirez JL, Sanchez JJ, Molina MA, Taron M, Paz-Ares L. Erlotinib versus standard chemotherapy as first-line treatment for European patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (EURTAC): a multicentre, open-label, randomised phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2012 13: 239-46.
13. Sequist LV, Martins RG, Spigel D, Grunberg SM, Spira A, Janne PA, Joshi VA, McCollum D, Evans TL, Muzikansky A, Kuhlmann GL, Han M, Goldberg JS, Settleman J, Iafrate AJ, Engelman JA, Haber DA, Johnson BE, Lynch TJ. First-line gefitinib in patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer harboring somatic EGFR mutations. J Clin Oncol. 2008; 26: 2442-9.
14. Shigematsu H, Lin L, Takahashi T, Nomura M, Suzuki M, Wistuba, II, Fong KM, Lee H, Toyooka S, Shimizu N, Fujisawa T, Feng Z, Roth JA, Herz J, Minna JD, Gazdar AF. Clinical and biological features associated with epidermal growth factor receptor gene mutations in lung cancers. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2005; 97: 339-46.
15. Peters S, Adjei AA, Gridelli C, Reck M, Kerr K, Felip E. Metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol. 2012 23 Suppl 7: vii56-64.

16. Wiener RS, Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Welch HG. Population-based risk for complications after transthoracic needle lung biopsy of a pulmonary nodule: an analysis of discharge records. Ann Intern Med. 2011 155: 137-44.

17. Pirker R, Herth FJ, Kerr KM, Filipits M, Taron M, Gandara D, Hirsch FR, Grunenwald D, Popper H, Smit E, Dietel M, Marchetti A, Manegold C, Schirmacher P, Thomas M, Rosell R, Cappuzzo F, Stahel R. Consensus for EGFR mutation testing in non-small cell lung cancer: results from a European workshop. J Thorac Oncol. 2010; 5: 1706-13.

18. Dan Liu ,Yachao Lu , Zhenli Hu , Ning Wu, Xiaomeng Nie, Yang Xia, Yiping Han, Qiang Li, Guanshan Zhu, Chong Bai Malignant Pleural Effusion Supernatants Are Substitutes for Metastatic Pleural Tumor Tissues in EGFR Mutation Test in Patients with Advanced Lung Adenocarcinoma. Plos ONE February 2014; 9 (2): e89946.

19. H Kimura, Y Fujiwara, T Sone, H Kunitoh, T Tamura, K Kasahara, K Nishio. *EGFR* mutation status in tumour-derived DNA from pleural effusion fluid is a practical basis for predicting the response to gefitinib. Molecular Diagnostics. 2006.

20. TRUPCR® EGFR PCR Kit, https://www.3bblackbio.com/trupcr-oncology-egfr.html

21. Yue-Lun Zhang, Jin-Qiu Yuan, Kai-Feng Wang, Xiao-Hong Fu, Xiao-Ran Han, Diane Threapleton, Zu-Yao Yang, Chen Mao, Jin-Ling Tang. The prevalence of *EGFR* mutation in patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Oncotarget. 2016; 7 (48): 78985–78993.

22. Han B, Tjulandin S, Hagiwara K, Normanno N, Wulandari L, Laktionov K, Hudoyo A, He Y, Zhang YP, Wang MZ, Liu CY, Ratcliffe M, McCormack R, Reck M. EGFR mutation prevalence in Asia-Pacific and Russian patients with advanced NSCLC of adenocarcinoma and non-adenocarcinoma histology: The IGNITE study. Lung Cancer. 2017; 113: 37-44.

23. Lim, Minji, Kim, Chi-Ju, Sunkara, Vijaya, Kim, Mi-Hyun, Cho, Yoon-Kyoung. Liquid Biopsy in Lung Cancer: Clinical Applications of Circulating Biomarkers (CTCs and ctDNA). Micromachines. 2018; 9, 100.

24. Gillian Ellison, Guanshan Zhu, Alexandros Moulis, Simon Dearden, Georgina Speake, Rose McCormack. EGFR mutation testing in lung cancer: a review of available methods and their use for analysis of tumour tissue and cytology samples. J Clin Pathol 2013; 66: 79–89.

25. Lee, J.S., Hur, J.Y., Kim, I.A. *et al.* Liquid biopsy using the supernatant of a pleural effusion for EGFR genotyping in pulmonary adenocarcinoma patients: a comparison between cell-free DNA and extracellular vesicle-derived DNA. BMC Cancer. 2018; 18**,** 1236.

26. Jie Lin, Ye Gu, Rui Du, Min Deng, Yaodan Lu, Yanqing Ding. Detection of *EGFR* mutation in supernatant, cell pellets of pleural effusion and tumor tissues from non-small cell lung cancer patients by high resolution melting analysis and sequencing. Int J Clin Exp Pathol. 2014; 7(12): 8813–8822.

27. Leventakos K, Kipp BR, Rumilla KM, Winters JL, Yi ES, Mansfield AS. S768I Mutation in EGFR in Patients with Lung Cancer. J Thorac Oncol. 2016; 11(10): 1798-801.

28. Kancha RK, von Bubnoff N, Peschel C, Duyster J. Functional analysis of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutations and potential implications for EGFR targeted therapy. Clin Cancer Res. 2009; 15(2): 460-7.

29. Chen YR, Fu YN, Lin CH, Yang ST, Hu SF, Chen YT, Tsai SF, Huang SF. Distinctive activation patterns in constitutively active and gefitinib-sensitive EGFR mutants. Oncogene. 2006; 25: 1205–1215.

30. Suraj, S., Dhar, C., Srivastava, S. Circulating nucleic acids: An analysis of their occurrence in malignancies (Review). Biomedical Reports 2017; 6.1: 8-14.

31. Dhar C, Sharma M, Nawaz M, D'Souza G, Srivastava S. Sanger sequencing of metastatic pleural effusion: An inexpensive, minimally invasive tool for the detection of EGFR mutations in lung adenocarcinoma- Presented at the National Lung Cancer Conference, Bhubaneshwar 2016 (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313108485_Sanger_sequencing_of_metastatic_pleural_effusion_An_inexpensive_minimally_invasive_tool_for_the_detection_of_EGFR_mutations_in_lung_adenocarcinoma-_Presented_at_the_National_Lung_Cancer_Conference_201)
32. Dhar C, Sharma M, Nawaz M, D'Souza G, Srivastava S. Detection of EGFR TKI sensitizing mutations from metastatic pleural fluid secondary to lung adenocarcinoma: a perspective from Southern India. F1000Research. 2018 Dec 17;7.
33. 16. American Society for Cell Biology. 2018 ASCB Annual Meeting abstracts. Molecular biology of the cell. 2018 Dec 15;29(26):3063.



Supplemental figure 1 shows the amplification curves for different mutations tested in Sample S2

423



Supplemental figure 2 shows the amplification curves for different mutations tested in Sample S4

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432



Supplemental figure 3 shows the amplification curves for different mutations tested in Sample S7

433

434

435

436

437

438

439



Supplemental figure 5 shows the amplification curves for different mutations tested in Sample S9

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454



Supplemental figure 6 shows the amplification curves for different mutations tested in Sample S10

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466



Supplemental figure 7 shows the representative amplification curves for different mutations tested and classified as a Wild Type sample or below LOD

467

468

469

Sample No.	ΔCt								
	G719X	**T790M**	**S768I**	**EX20INS**	**C797S**	**L858R**	**L861Q**	**E746_S750DEL**	**EX19DEL**
S1	11.261	12.919	12.393	15.518	13.704	21.527	19.990	14.589	8.697
S2	11.595	12.284	12.148	13.915	12.470	20.835	ND	**6.327**	9.159
S3	10.997	12.154	11.452	13.572	13.223	19.834	19.788	14.197	8.416
S4	10.981	12.106	12.276	15.961	12.879	18.905	ND	**5.597**	8.640
S5	12.438	11.107	11.385	14.670	19.424	ND	ND	ND	8.957
S6	11.314	12.079	11.776	17.363	12.901	ND	ND	14.173	8.642

Supplemental table 1 shows the ΔCt values of Samples S1- S6

Sample No.	ΔCt								
	G719X	**T790M**	**S768I**	**EX20INS**	**C797S**	**L858R**	**L861Q**	**E746_S750DEL**	**EX19DEL**
S7	12.212	20.890	**4.077**	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
S8	15.164	ND	13.393	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
S9	13.942	ND	**8.558**	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
S10	12.041	ND	**6.280**	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

Supplemental table 2 shows the ΔCt values of Samples S7-S11

475