medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Title

A Pilot Basket Study to Evaluate Multi-Analyte Liquid Biopsies for Personalized Treatments in Advanced Refractory Cancers

Authors

Rajnish Nagarkar[a], Timothy Crook[b], Nicholas Plowman[c], Andrew Gaya[d], Darshana Patil[e], Dadasaheb Akolkar[e], Vijay Palwe[a], Prakash Pandit[a], Shruti Kate[a], Shirsendu Roy[a], Navin Srivastava[e], Vineet Datta[e], Chirantan Bose[e], Sanket Patil[e], Sachin Apurwa[e], Ajay Srinivasan[e*], Rajan Datar[e]

Author Affiliations

[a]HCG Manavata Cancer Centre, Nasik, India.

[b]Broomfield Hospital, Chelmsford, UK.

[c]St Bartholomew's Hospital, London, UK.

[d]HCA Healthcare UK, London, UK.

[e]Datar Cancer Genetics, Nasik, India.

Corresponding Author

Dr. Ajay Srinivasan. E-mail: ajays@datarpgx.org, Phone: 0091-7391088107.

Keywords

Encyclopedic Tumor Analysis; Liquid Biopsy; Multi-analyte Liquid Biopsy; Precision Oncology; Combination Regimens.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstarct

Prior attempts at personalizing anticancer treatments based on univariate tumor profiling ('single gene variant') for selection of monotherapy with targeted agents ('single drug') have generally yielded poor response rates. We report findings from the LIQUID IMPACT pilot trial where Multi-analyte Liquid Biopsy (MLB) profiling of circulating tumor analytes in peripheral blood was used to inform selection of personalized combination regimens in advanced refractory cancers. Among the 43 patients evaluable as per study protocol, 34 had targetable pathway activations. Partial Response (PR) was observed in 14 (41.1%) of the 34 patients with signaling pathway activation, including 5 (50%) of 10 cases with mTOR activation, 8 (44.4%) of 18 cases with activation of angiogenesis and 4 (50.0%) of 8 cases with EGFR / ERBB2 activation. PR was not reported among the 9 cases with no detectable pathway activation. Toxicities were manageable and there were no treatment related deaths. The study findings suggest that MLB may be able to inform safe and efficacious combination regimens in patients with advanced refractory cancers.

Introduction

The findings of the RESILIENT trial have shown that multi-analyte profiling of freshly biopsied tumor tissue can inform selection of safe and efficacious treatments in heavily pre-treated advanced refractory cancers [1]. During the trial, several screened patients were unable to undergo an invasive biopsy for various reasons such as proximity of the lesion to vital organs, co-morbidities or other procedural risks [2,3]. We hence developed a Multi-analyte Liquid Biopsy (MLB) which interrogated circulating tumor-derived analytes in peripheral blood; MLB combined the strengths of a multi-analyte tumor tissue profiling with the convenience and safety of a liquid biopsy to inform selection of patient specific

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

combination anticancer regimens based on molecular and functional vulnerabilities of the tumor.

LIQUID IMPACT was a pilot basket trial which evaluated the feasibility of MLB to inform treatment selection in advanced refractory cancers; patients were assigned to treatment baskets based on targetable molecular indication(s) and the performance of each basket evaluated to determine suitability for a future study with an expanded cohort.

Methods

Study Design

LIQUID IMPACT (CTRI/2019/02/017548; registered on 8th February, 2019) was a prospective, single arm, non-randomized pilot study for evaluation of MLB-guided personalized combination treatment regimens in patients with advanced refractory solid organ cancers. The trial was approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) and Ethics Committees of the Study Sponsor (Datar Cancer Genetics, DCG) as well as the trial site (HCG-Manavata Cancer Centre, HCG-MCC). The trial was conducted in accordance with all applicable ethical guidelines and the Declaration of Helsinki.

Patients

The trial recruited patients with refractory solid organ cancers who had either failed at least two prior lines of Standard of Care (SoC) treatments **or** where (further) SoC treatment options were unviable, and where an invasive biopsy to obtain tumor tissue (for *de novo* tumor profiling) was not possible. Eligible patients had radiologically measurable lesions with an Eastern Co-operative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of ≤2 and fitness as ascertained by the treating clinician. Patients who fulfilled the above criteria were counselled regarding the potential benefits and risks of the trial. Thereafter, patients who provided signed, informed consents were enrolled.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Multi-Analyte Tumor Profiling

All study participants provided only peripheral blood samples. The process of multi-analyte tumor profiling and generation of patient specific therapy recommendations (TR) have been described previously [4,5]. The complete details of investigations under multi-analyte tumor profiling are provided in Supplementary Methods.

Treatments

In all patients, the treatment agents were initially administered at lower (≤50%) doses, and sequentially escalated to established safe and efficacious dose. The dose escalation schedule was individualized based on close monitoring of toxicity; in most patients, the dosage could be escalated to 100% by the fourth cycle. Other factors which guided patient-specific dosage and schedule included institutional guidelines and protocols as well as clinical assessment of patients' health. Patient-specific regimens were administered until either disease progression, death or dose limiting toxicity was encountered. Patients with disease progression were excluded from the trial and shifted to other SoC treatment (if available) or physician's choice treatment or considered for best supportive care alone.

Evaluations

Patients underwent an ^{18}F-Fluorodeoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography – Computed Tomography (FDG PET-CT) scan before initiation of treatment to determine baseline status of disease. Response was evaluated on the lines of RECIST 1.1 criteria [6] from follow-up scans following at least two treatment cycles or 60 days of treatment, except in cases where the treating clinician advised evaluation in the interim.

Endpoints

The primary end point of this pilot study was Objective Response Rate (ORR) defined as the percentage of patients who achieved Complete Response (CR) or Partial Response (PR) during the active study phase. Progression Free Survival (PFS) was also evaluated in patients

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and was defined as time from commencement of treatment under ETA to disease progression or death during the active study phase. Quality of Life (QoL) was evaluated based on patient's feedback on symptomatic and functional status at baseline and at study termination or most recently available follow-up.

Patient Monitoring

All patients underwent periodic clinical evaluations to assess fitness for treatment as per study protocol. Adverse events (AEs) were recorded every week either during patient admissions or by telephone follow-up. All AEs were reported as per NCI-CTCAE v5 criteria [7]. Grade 3 and above AEs, if any, were followed up till resolution. Patients were followed up until study termination or patient exclusion (death / loss to follow-up / withdrawal of consent), whichever was earlier to determine Progression Free Survival (PFS).

Statistical Methods and Analysis

The sample size of the study was determined based on the ORR, assuming that the ORR in such refractory advanced stage cancer patients is <10%. Simon's 2-stage design was used to validate the adequacy of cohort size for assessment of ETA based therapy. The null hypothesis that the true response rate is 10% was tested against a one-sided alternative. Initially, at least 20 patients were required to accrue; if there were 2 or fewer responses, the study was to be terminated. Otherwise, at least 20 additional patients were required to accrue for a minimum total of 40 patients. The null hypothesis would be rejected if 6 or more responses were observed in 40 patients. With 40 evaluable patients, this design yields a type I error rate of 5% and power of 90% when the true response rate is 25%. The 95% CI of ORR was constructed using a binomial distribution (Clopper-Pearson estimation method). Patient demographics were analysed with descriptive statistics. Contingency tables described the categorical data with counts and percentages. Continuous data was summarized using median

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and range. CONSORT diagram, Waterfall Plot and Bar Graphs were used to summarize the data. Kaplan-Meier estimator was used to estimate survival function.

Results

Patients

Between Feb 2019 and Oct 2019, 74 patients were screened of whom 65 were recruited (received therapy recommendations). Of these, 51 patients eventually started treatment as per MLB; 23 patients were excluded prior to start of treatment for various reasons including withdrawal of consent (n = 4), death (n = 1), deterioration of ECOG performance status (n = 9), unfit for therapy (n = 5) or unavailability of lesions measurable on a CT / PET-CT scan (n = 3). Out of the 51 patients who started treatment, 8 patients were excluded within the first week (prior to any follow-up evaluation) for various reasons including patient being lost to follow-up (n = 1), death (n = 2), withdrawal of consent (n = 1) and deterioration of ECOG performance status (n = 4). A total of 43 patients were evaluable as per study criteria. The CONSORT diagram (Figure 1) depicts the study structure and patient flow. Patient demographics, baseline status and prior treatments are provided in Supplementary Table 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

Molecular Landscape of the Population

Figure 2 depicts the landscape of molecular features in the Intent to Treat (ITT) population. Single nucleotide variations (SNV) in TP53 were the frequently encountered (28, 54.9%) feature followed by those in PIK3CA (4, 7.8%) and KRAS/NRAS (4, 7.8%). Copy Number Variations (CNV) as gain of copy was observed frequently in CCND, MYC, MET and FGFR. The multigene panel does not provide information on loss of gene copy. Gene expression as determined by abundance of mRNA transcripts (by NGS) or polypeptide product (by IHC) was observed frequently in CCND, ERBB2, mTOR, VEGF and VEGFR.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Among the ITT population, actionable SNVs were detected in 6 patients all of whom were evaluable, actionable CNVs were detected in 5 patients of whom 4 were eventually evaluable, overexpression of actionable gene transcripts was observed in 7 patients all of whom were evaluable and targetable polypeptide gene products were detected by ICC in 22 patients, of whom 19 were evaluable. All but one patient in the ITT and Evaluable cohorts respectively had indication for cytotoxic drugs from in vitro chemoresistance profiling of viable tumor cells; the single patient received combination of targeted agents only. Patient-wise actionable gene alterations that formed the basis for therapy selection are indicated in Supplementary Dataset.

Study Baskets and Treatments

Among the ITT population (n = 51), 38 patients had a molecular indication for a targeted therapy agent, of whom 34 were evaluable. Among the 37 patients who were assigned combinations of cytotoxic and targeted agents, 33 were evaluable and the patient who received combination of targeted agents and no cytotoxic agents was also evaluable. Among 12 patients (ITT) who were assigned an mTOR inhibitor, 10 were eventually evaluable. Among 20 patients (ITT) who were assigned an angiogenesis inhibitor, 18 were evaluable. Finally, among 9 patients (ITT) who received an EGFR inhibitor based on EGFR / ERBB2 activation or KRAS wild type, 8 were evaluable. Among the above patients, 1 evaluable patient received an mTOR inhibitor as well as an Angiogenesis inhibitor. Similarly. 3 patients received Angiogenesis inhibitor as well as EGFR inhibitor of whom 2 were evaluable; both patients were evaluated in both baskets. Endocrine therapy was administered to 2 patients in addition to cytotoxic and targeted agents. Among 13 patients where actionable molecular indications were undetectable and who received combinations of cytotoxic agents, 9 were evaluable. Details of cancer types per treatment basket are provided in Supplementary Table

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

4. Patient-wise details of prior treatments, MLB-indications and treatments are provided in Supplementary Dataset.

Response to Treatment

No Complete Response (CR) were observed. Partial Response was observed in 14 patients which yields an ORR of 32.6 % in the evaluable population (n = 43) and 27.5% in the ITT population (n = 51). Waterfall Charts depict the best response (Figure 3) of all 43 patients. Patients in the evaluable subset were followed up for a median duration of 3.8 months (range: 1.1 months – 13.2 months). All 14 PRs were observed among the 34 patients (41.2%) with indication for any pathway, which included 5 (50%) of 10 patients who received an mTOR inhibitor, 8 (44.4%) of 18 patients who received an Angiogenesis Inhibitor and 4 (50%) of 8 patients who received an EGFR inhibitor. Though not an endpoint of the study, Stable Disease (SD) for more than 60 days was observed in 18 other patients. yielding a Disease Control Rate (DCR) of 74.4% in the evaluable population.

Median Progression Free Survival (mPFS) in the evaluable subset was 3.8 months (95%CI: 2.95 - 4.55 months). mPFS was 4.2 months among 34 patients with any pathway indication, 3.8 months among 10 patients with mTOR activation, 4.8 months among 18 patients with Angiogenesis activation, 6.2 months among 8 patients with EGFR activation. mOS among the 9 patients without any molecular indication was 2.8 months. It is pertinent to add that 7 patients were surviving at the time of manuscript submission and hence true Median Overall Survival (mOS) is presently indeterminate. However, considering OS data censored at the most recent follow-up (Oct 2020), the mOS in the evaluable subset was 7.3 months (95%CI: 6.0 – 8.6 months). Similarly, mOS was 8.6 months among 34 patients with any pathway indication, 10.7 months among 10 patients with mTOR activation, 8.4 months among 18 patients with Angiogenesis activation, 7.9 months among 8 patients with EGFR activation. mOS among the 9 patients without any molecular indication was 4.7 months. The Kaplan

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Meier plots of PFS and OS are depicted in Figure 4. Details of overall response and per study basket are provided in Supplementary Table 5.

Adverse Events

All the 51 patients in the Intent to Treat (ITT) population were evaluated for Therapy Related Adverse Events (TR-AE). TR-AEs of any grade were reported in 46 (90.2%) of the overall population whereas Grade III and IV AEs were observed in 28 (54.9%) and 9 (17.6%) of the population. Grade III TR-AEs were reported in 38.5% of 13 patients on cytotoxic regimen and 60.5% of 38 patients where the regimen included a targeted agent. Grade IV TR-AEs were reported in 15.4% of 13 patients on cytotoxic regimen and 18.4% of 38 patients where the regimen included a targeted agent. Grade III TR-AEs which were considered as SAEs were observed in 35.3% of the overall population. All AEs were transient, acute (non-chronic), managed by standard procedures and followed up until resolution; Most Grade IV AEs and Grade III SAEs were resolved between 48-72 hours. There were no treatment related deaths. Overall and basket-wise profiles of AEs are provided in Supplementary Table 6 and 7.

Quality of Life (QoL)

Quality of Life was measured based on the Eastern Co-operative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance Status as well as a brief questionnaire which evaluated the patients symptomatic status, ability to perform activities of daily living (ADL) and the ability to perform additional / more strenuous activities. Patients' feedback was obtained at baseline and every month until study completion or exclusion. Within the evaluable cohort, 86% of patients indicated stable to decreased symptomatic status while 54% of patients indicated stable to improved functional status.

Discussion

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

There have been prior attempts at personalizing treatments based on molecular profiling of the tumor [8–16]. However, most of these have relied on single biomarkers for selection of single drug regimens, thus prone to the same limitations into label-agnostic use as is encountered in the labelled indication. Hence, most prior precision oncology trials have shown only modest benefits, with label agnostic molecularly guided monotherapy selection.

While multi-gene variant profiling can identify resistance as well as additional targetable variants, concurrent gene expression profiling can provide information on therapeutically targetable signalling pathways. The previous RESILIENT trial as well as the present LIQUID IMPACT study evaluated tumor gene expression profiles for therapeutic direction [1]. More recently, the WINTHER trial reported evaluation of gene expression profiling for therapy selection [9]. However, while the RESILIENT and LIQUID IMPACT trials used DNA and RNA data complementarily, the WINTHER trial used RNA data where DNA data was not available. Based on this design, the WINTHER trial reported 13% ORR in the DNA arm and 8% ORR in the RNA arm. While the trial failed to demonstrate benefits from univariate RNA analysis to guide treatments, it presented a rationale for use of RNA data in multivariate evaluations.

The present study also evaluated ICC profiling of CTCs to detect therapeutically targetable markers, akin to immunohistochemistry (IHC) on tumor tissue or cytology specimens. In a recent large (>30,000 samples) cohort study, we have described the potential of ICC profiling of CTCs to provide diagnostically relevant information without requirement of tumor tissue [5]. In the present paper we describe the potential application of ICC towards theranostic guidance.

While molecular indications form the basis for selection of targeted and endocrine agents, there are fewer biomarkers for selection of cytotoxic anticancer agents which remain the mainstay of treatments in several cancers. We have previously evaluated and described the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

accuracy and utility of C-TACs from peripheral blood for in vitro chemoresistance profiling [17]. In vitro chemoresistance profiling of viable tumor cells (from a tumor biopsy) has previously demonstrated limited potential [18,19], but has been unviable due to the inability to obtain viable tumor cells for de novo analysis. In these regards, the analysis of circulating tumor cells (CTCs) and Circulating Tumor Associated Cells (C-TACs) has shown some promise [17,20–24]. In the present study, in a subset of 9 patients where actionable molecular variants could not be detected, in vitro chemoresistance profiling of C-TACs was used to guide treatment selection. While no Objective Responses were observed, Stable Disease of >60 days was reported in 5 patients indicating an onco-static effect of the treatment in most patients.

It is pertinent to note that only 6 of 51 patients in the ITT cohort had actionable SNVs. Under conventional circumstances, the remaining 45 patients (~88%) would have been excluded from treatments, and similar exclusion rates has been reported in other trials [8,11,15]. MLB revealed actionable indications in individuals without conventional targetable gene variants. MLB encompasses clonal variations arising from tumor heterogeneity and also captures the profile of the 'leading edge' tumour bud cells, which may well be the most aggressive elements for metastatic spread and invasiveness [25].

Studies have shown that combination regimens yield improved benefits over monotherapy [26,27]. Illustratively, the combination of Everolimus and Lenvantinib has higher efficacy over Everolimus monotherapy in metastatic RCC [28]. The combination of Alpelisib and Fulvestrant has yielded higher response rates (~26%) in ER+/HER2- metastatic breast cancers than Alpelisib monotherapy [29,30]. It has been shown that monotherapy for blockade of VEGF / VEGFR signalling often yield transient responses followed by eventual resistance [31,32], owing to which combination strategies to achieve tandem blockade of multiple signalling pathways have been proposed as a viable strategy [33–36].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Various prior meta-analyses have shown that it is possible to safely administer *de novo* drug combinations in patients without increasing the risk of adverse events (AEs) [37–39]. While patient-specific of AEs may not be predictable, it is possible to anticipate AEs based on available literature as well as the history of AEs in each patient. Where the cancer had progressed following failure of multiple prior systemic lines of therapy, such patients tend to be physiologically fatigued due to cumulative toxicity. This toxicity is reflected as the patient drop-out between screening and start of therapy, as well as prior to the first follow-up scan. Thus, this heavily pretreated cohort was at an inherently higher risk of AEs due to cumulative toxicities from prior treatments. Hence, all patients were administered initial doses at ≤50% and with controlled dose escalation. Thus, while Grade III and IV AEs were observed, they were limited, transient and manageable. Significantly, there were no treatment related mortalities.

Conclusions

The LIQUID IMPACT trial was intended as a pilot / early feasibility study to evaluate MLB to inform selection of safe and efficacious patient-specific combination regimens in advanced refractory cancers. Owing to the pilot nature of the trial, the size of each basket as well as the entire cohort was limited and the study design excluded a traditional control arm; this design was based on the aims and design of the NCI-MATCH and ASCO TAPUR basket trials where the pilot phase did not include a control arm [9,15,40]. Since the present study was a limited cohort pilot trial, the study findings are not intended for in-depth statistical evaluations or rationale-based extrapolations. The study findings are nevertheless encouraging and justify a future larger multi-arm trial with various molecular subtype baskets for treatment of broadly refractory cancers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abbreviations

ADL: Activities of Daily Living; AR: Androgen Receptor; BAM: Binary Alignment/Map; BED: Browser Extensible Display; CD45: Cluster of Differentiation 45; Cell-Free DNA BCT: Cell-Free DNA Blood Collection Tube; C-ETACs: Circulating Ensembles of Tumor Associated Cells; CNV: Copy Number Variations; COSMIC: Catalogue Of Somatic Mutations In Cancer; CPM: Counts Per Million; CR: Complete Response; C-TACs: Circulating Tumor Associated Cells; CTCs: Circulating Tumor Cells; DAPI: 4',6-Diamidino-2-phenylindole dihydrochloride; DCR: Disease Control Rate; ECOG: Eastern Co-operative Oncology Group; EDTA: Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; EGFR: Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor; EpCAM: Epithelial Cell Adhesion Molecule; ER: Estrogen Receptor; ERBB2: Erb-B2 Receptor Tyrosine Kinase 2; ETA: Encyclopedic Tumor Analysis; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; FDG PET-CT: 18F-Fluorodeoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography–Computed Tomography; HCS: High-Content Screening; HER2: Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2; HPE: Histopathological Evaluation; ICC: Immunocytochemistry; IGV: Integrative Genomics Viewer; IHC: Immunohistochemistry; IRB: Institutional Review Boards ; ITT: Intent To Treat; IVD: In-Vito Diagnostics; LVEF: Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction; MLB: Multi-analyte Liquid Biopsy; MRI: Magnetic Resonance Imaging; mTOR: mechanistic Target Of Rapamycin; MTB: Multidisciplinary Tumor Board; NCI-CTCAE: National Cancer Institute-Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events; NCI-MATCH: National Cancer Institute-Molecular Analysis for Therapy Choice; NGS: Next Genome Sequencing; ORR: Objective Response Rate; OS: Overall Survival; panCK: pan-Cytokeratin; PBMCs: Peripheral Blood Mononuclear Cells; PET-CT: Positron Emission Tomography–Computed Tomography; PFS: Progression Free Survival; PIK3CA: Phosphatidylinositol-4, 5-Bisphosphate 3-Kinase Catalytic Subunit Alpha; PR: Partial Response; QC: Quality Control; QoL: Quality of Life; RCC: Renal Cell Carcinoma;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

RECIST: Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors; SD: Stable Disease; SNV: Single Nucleotide Variations; SoC: Standard of Care; TAPUR: Targeted Agent and Profiling Utilization Registry; TMAP: Torrent Mapping Alignment Program; TR-AE Therapy Related Adverse Events; UCSC: University of California Santa Cruz; VEGF: Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor; VEGFR: Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Receptor

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful towards all study participants and their caregivers. The contributions of HCG Manavata Cancer Centre as well as the staff of the Study Sponsor (DCG) towards managing various clinical, operational and laboratory aspects of the study are also acknowledged with gratitude.

Funding

No external funding was obtained for this study. The entire study was funded by the Study Sponsor (DCG).

Ethics approval and Consent to Participate

All trials were approved by institutional review boards and ethics committees of the study sponsor (Datar Cancer Genetics, DCG) as well as clinical trial sites (HCG Manavata Cancer Centre, HCG-MCC). There is no approval number. The approval letters are available at:

http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/rmaindet.php?trialid=31265&EncHid=12285.74411&modid=1&compid=19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

All trials were conducted in accordance with all applicable ethical guidelines and the Declaration of Helsinki. All study participants were previously counselled regarding study objectives, potential benefits and potential risks and provided signed written informed consent for participation in the trial.

Competing Interests

RN, TC, NP, AG, PP, SK, SR, VP have no competing interests; DP, DA, NS, VD, CB, SA, SP and AS are employees of the Study Sponsor; RD is the founder of the Study Sponsor.

Consent for Publication

All study participants consented for publication of deidentified biological data. The present manuscript does not contain any personal or identifiable information or data of any participant. All Authors have consented to publication of this manuscript and the data.

Data Availability

The datasets and supplementary material generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Author Contributions

RN: Study Design, Clinical Management, Manuscript Review;

TC: Study Design, Data Review, Manuscript Review;

NP: Study Design, Data Review, Manuscript Review;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

AG: Study Design, Data Review, Manuscript Review;

DP: Study Design, Data Review, Data Analysis, Manuscript Review;

DA: Study Design, Molecular Analysis, Data Review, Manuscript Review;

VP: Clinical Management, Manuscript Review;

PP: Clinical Management, Manuscript Review;

SK: Clinical Management, Manuscript Review;

SR: Clinical Management, Manuscript Review;

NS: Molecular Analysis, Data Analysis, Manuscript Review;

VD: Study Design, Data Review, Manuscript Review;

CB: Data Review, Data Analysis, Manuscript Review;

SP: Sample Analysis, Data Review;

SA: Bioinformatics and Data Analysis, Data Review;

AS: Study Design, Data Analysis, Manuscript Writing;

RD: Resources, Study Design, Manuscript Review.

References

[1] Nagarkar R, Patil D, Crook T, et al. Encyclopedic tumor analysis for guiding treatment of advanced, broadly refractory cancers: results from the RESILIENT trial. Oncotarget. 2019;10:5605–5621.

[2] Sennerstam RB, Franzén BSH, Wiksell HOT, et al. Core-needle biopsy of breast cancer is associated with a higher rate of distant metastases 5 to 15 years after diagnosis than FNA biopsy. Cancer Cytopathol. 2017;125:748–756.

[3] Hiley CT, Le Quesne J, Santis G, et al. Challenges in molecular testing in non-small-cell lung cancer patients with advanced disease. Lancet (London, England). 2016;388:1002–1011.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[4] Akolkar D, Patil D, Crook T, et al. Circulating ensembles of tumor-associated cells: A redoubtable new systemic hallmark of cancer. Int J cancer. 2020;146:3485–3494.

[5] Gaya A, Crook T, Plowman N, et al. Evaluation of circulating tumor cell clusters for pan-cancer noninvasive diagnostic triaging. Cancer Cytopathol. 2021;129:226–238.

[6] Eisenhauer EA, Therasse P, Bogaerts J, et al. New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). Eur J Cancer. 2009;45:228–247.

[7] NCI, NIH D. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events v5.0. 2017;

[8] Flaherty KT, Gray RJ, Chen AP, et al. Molecular Landscape and Actionable Alterations in a Genomically Guided Cancer Clinical Trial: National Cancer Institute Molecular Analysis for Therapy Choice (NCI-MATCH). J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2020;38:3883–3894.

[9] Rodon J, Soria J-C, Berger R, et al. Genomic and transcriptomic profiling expands precision cancer medicine: the WINTHER trial. Nat Med. 2019;25:751–758.

[10] Le Tourneau C, Delord J-P, Gonçalves A, et al. Molecularly targeted therapy based on tumour molecular profiling versus conventional therapy for advanced cancer (SHIVA): a multicentre, open-label, proof-of-concept, randomised, controlled phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2015;16:1324–1334.

[11] Hainsworth JD, Meric-Bernstam F, Swanton C, et al. Targeted Therapy for Advanced Solid Tumors on the Basis of Molecular Profiles: Results From MyPathway, an Open-Label, Phase IIa Multiple Basket Study. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2018;36:536–542.

[12] Von Hoff DD, Stephenson JJJ, Rosen P, et al. Pilot study using molecular profiling of patients' tumors to find potential targets and select treatments for their refractory cancers. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2010;28:4877–4883.

[13] Massard C, Michiels S, Ferté C, et al. High-Throughput Genomics and Clinical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Outcome in Hard-to-Treat Advanced Cancers: Results of the MOSCATO 01 Trial. Cancer Discov. 2017;7:586–595.

[14] Tsimberidou A-M, Iskander NG, Hong DS, et al. Personalized medicine in a phase I clinical trials program: the MD Anderson Cancer Center initiative. Clin cancer Res an Off J Am Assoc Cancer Res. 2012;18:6373–6383.

[15] Harris L, Chen A, O\textquoterightDwyer P, et al. Abstract B080: Update on the NCI-Molecular Analysis for Therapy Choice (NCI-MATCH/EAY131) precision medicine trial. Mol Cancer Ther [Internet]. 2018;17:B080--B080. Available from: https://mct.aacrjournals.org/content/17/1_Supplement/B080.

[16] Sicklick JK, Kato S, Okamura R, et al. Molecular profiling of cancer patients enables personalized combination therapy: the I-PREDICT study. Nat Med. 2019;25:744–750.

[17] Crook T, Gaya A, Page R, et al. Clinical utility of circulating tumor-associated cells to predict and monitor chemo-response in solid tumors. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol. 2021;87:197–205.

[18] Schrag D, Garewal HS, Burstein HJ, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology Technology Assessment: chemotherapy sensitivity and resistance assays. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2004;22:3631–3638.

[19] Burstein HJ, Mangu PB, Somerfield MR, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline update on the use of chemotherapy sensitivity and resistance assays. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2011;29:3328–3330.

[20] Ignatiadis M, Lee M, Jeffrey SS. Circulating Tumor Cells and Circulating Tumor DNA: Challenges and Opportunities on the Path to Clinical Utility. Clin cancer Res an Off J Am Assoc Cancer Res. 2015;21:4786–4800.

[21] Rawal S, Yang Y-P, Cote R, et al. Identification and Quantitation of Circulating Tumor Cells. Annu Rev Anal Chem (Palo Alto Calif). 2017;10:321–343.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[22] Hayes DF, Cristofanilli M, Budd GT, et al. Circulating tumor cells at each follow-up time point during therapy of metastatic breast cancer patients predict progression-free and overall survival. Clin cancer Res an Off J Am Assoc Cancer Res. 2006;12:4218–4224.

[23] Balakrishnan A, Koppaka D, Anand A, et al. Circulating Tumor Cell cluster phenotype allows monitoring response to treatment and predicts survival. Sci Rep. 2019;9:7933.

[24] Khoo BL, Lee SC, Kumar P, et al. Short-term expansion of breast circulating cancer cells predicts response to anti-cancer therapy. Oncotarget. 2015;6:15578–15593.

[25] Maffeis V, Nicolè L, Cappellesso R. RAS, Cellular Plasticity, and Tumor Budding in Colorectal Cancer. Front Oncol. 2019;9:1255.

[26] Palmer AC, Sorger PK. Combination Cancer Therapy Can Confer Benefit via Patient-to-Patient Variability without Drug Additivity or Synergy. Cell. 2017;171:1678-1691.e13.

[27] Bayat Mokhtari R, Homayouni TS, Baluch N, et al. Combination therapy in combating cancer. Oncotarget. 2017;8:38022–38043.

[28] Leonetti A, Leonardi F, Bersanelli M, et al. Clinical use of lenvatinib in combination with everolimus for the treatment of advanced renal cell carcinoma. Ther Clin Risk Manag. 2017;13:799–806.

[29] Juric D, Rodon J, Tabernero J, et al. Phosphatidylinositol 3-Kinase α-Selective Inhibition With Alpelisib (BYL719) in PIK3CA-Altered Solid Tumors: Results From the First-in-Human Study. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2018;36:1291–1299.

[30] André F, Ciruelos E, Rubovszky G, et al. Alpelisib for PIK3CA-Mutated, Hormone Receptor-Positive Advanced Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2019;380:1929–1940.

[31] Zhao Y, Adjei AA. Targeting Angiogenesis in Cancer Therapy: Moving Beyond

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor. Oncologist. 2015;20:660–673.

[32] Haibe Y, Kreidieh M, El Hajj H, et al. Resistance Mechanisms to Anti-angiogenic Therapies in Cancer. Front Oncol. 2020;10:221.

[33] Deng H, Kan A, Lyu N, et al. Dual Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Receptor and Fibroblast Growth Factor Receptor Inhibition Elicits Antitumor Immunity and Enhances Programmed Cell Death-1 Checkpoint Blockade in Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Liver cancer. 2020;9:338–357.

[34] Qin S, Li A, Yi M, et al. Recent advances on anti-angiogenesis receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitors in cancer therapy. J Hematol Oncol. 2019;12:27.

[35] Gotink KJ, Verheul HMW. Anti-angiogenic tyrosine kinase inhibitors: what is their mechanism of action? Angiogenesis. 2010;13:1–14.

[36] Yi M, Jiao D, Qin S, et al. Synergistic effect of immune checkpoint blockade and anti-angiogenesis in cancer treatment. Mol Cancer. 2019;18:60.

[37] Liu S, Nikanjam M, Kurzrock R. Dosing de novo combinations of two targeted drugs: Towards a customized precision medicine approach to advanced cancers. Oncotarget. 2016;7:11310–11320.

[38] Nikanjam M, Liu S, Kurzrock R. Dosing targeted and cytotoxic two-drug combinations: Lessons learned from analysis of 24,326 patients reported 2010 through 2013. Int J cancer. 2016;139:2135–2141.

[39] Nikanjam M, Liu S, Yang J, et al. Dosing Three-Drug Combinations That Include Targeted Anti-Cancer Agents: Analysis of 37,763 Patients. Oncologist. 2017;22:576–584.

[40] ASCO TAPUR [Internet]. [cited 2021 Oct 21]. Available from: https://www.tapur.org/.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure Legends

Figure 1. CONSORT Diagram. Among the 74 patients who were screened, 51 eventually started treatment (ITT population) and 43 were finally evaluable based on study criteria. Patients provided blood samples at baseline which was used for multi-analyte cancer profiling

Figure 2. Landscape of Genomic Alterations in the Intent to Treat (ITT) Population. Each vertical column indicates a single patient (patient number in the bottom X-axis). Vertically stacked grey boxes in each column indicate individual genes (gene names on right Y-axis). Black dots within each box indicates a point mutation (single nucleotide variation), red dots indicate in vitro sensitivity (chemoresistance profiling, CRP), blue shaded boxes indicate gain of gene copy (CNV gain). Patients are grouped by observed targetable molecular indications (or lack of the same). Colour coded boxes in the topmost row indicate cancer types.

Figure 3. Summary of Outcomes. Treatment Response was evaluated as per RECIST 1.1. Percent change in dimensions of target lesions (Sum of Largest Diameters, SLD) between baseline and at best response are represented. Each bar represents the response in a unique patient. Patients are arranged in descending order of change (%) in SLD. Bars are colour coded as per the molecular indication: Black: no detectable signalling pathway; Orange: mTOR; Green: Angiogenesis; Purple: EGFR; Blue: CDK4. In 3 patients, 2 signalling pathways were detected which are represented by a pattern of 2-colours, each corresponding to the respective pathway.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.23.21268152; this version posted December 29, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 4. Kaplan Meier Plot of Progression Free Survival (PFS) and Overall Survival (OS). A. PFS in the overall population as well as those patients with (M: all) and without (N) a targetable molecular indication. B. OS in the overall population as well as those patients with (M: all) and without (N) a targetable molecular indication. C. PFS in patients with any targetable indication (M: all) as well as in those with activation of EGFR (M: EGFR), Angiogenesis (M:AGI) or mTOR (M: mTOR) signalling. D. OS in patients with any targetable indication (M: all) as well as in those with activation of EGFR (M: EGFR), Angiogenesis (M:AGI) or mTOR (M: mTOR) signalling. Patients at risk at each milestone are indicated in the inset table. Censoring events are indicated by a vertical cross bar.


Screened
74
Excluded: 9
Demise: 1
Non-measurable lesions: 3
Unfit for therapy: 5
Enrolled
65
20 ml blood
MLB
Treatment
Recommendation
Excluded: 14
ECOG Deterioration: 9
Withdrew consent: 4
Lost to follow-up: 1
Intent to Treat
51
Excluded: 8
ECOG Deterioration: 4
Lost to follow-up: 1
Withdrew consent: 1
Demise: 2
Evaluable
43


mTOR
Angiogenesis
EGFR
no Actionable Indication
Cancer
TP53
NRAS
KRAS
CCND1/2/3
MYC
CTNNB
FBXW7
SMAD4
MET
STK11
APC
CDK4
CDKN1/2/3
ESR1
AR
ERBB2
EGFR
PIK3CA
mTOR
VEGFA/B
VEGFR1/2
PDGFRA/B
FGFR1/2/3/4
FLT3
42 5 3 21 29 19 1 36 46 50 28 12 41 32 39 2 38 51 13 30 34 45 4 43 48 37 7 9 10 11 35 8 20 14 15 17 27 44 22 26 40 47 23 16 33 18 31 25 24 6 49
Legends
Stomach
Ovary
Head and Neck
Oesophagus
Colorectal
Liver
Occult
Lung
Testes
Sarcoma
Breast
Skin
Pancreas
Prostate
Endometrium
Point Mutation
Gain of Copy
Overexpression
Functional Sensitivity


20%
10%
0%
-10%
-20%
-30%
-40%
-50%
-60%
-70%
-80%
% change in SLD (per RECIST 1.1)


Percent survival
OS (Months)


Percent survival
OS (Months)


Percent survival
PFS (Months)


Percent survival
PFS (Months)