medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

A pivotal study on patients' selection for BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations by different models in Libyan breast cancer women

Eanas Elmaihub[1*], Inas Alhudiri[2], Adam Elzagheid[2], Fakria Elfagi[3] and Elham Hassen[1, 4]

[1]Department of Molecular biology, Higher Institute of Biotechnology of Monastir, Monastir University, Monastir, Tunisia.

[2]Department of Genetic Engineering, Libyan Biotechnology Research Centre, Tripoli, Libya.

[3]Department of Oncology, National Cancer Institute, Sabratha, Libya.

[4]laboratory of Molecular Immuno-Oncology, Faculty of Medicine, Monastir University, Monastir, Tunisia.

*** Corresponding author: Eanas Elmaihub**

E-mail: eanasaltiari@gmail.com elmaihub.enas@sabu.edu.ly

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Introduction: The *BRCA* mutation spectrum of familial breast cancer in Libya remains unknown. Several genetic models developed to predict the probability of *BRCA1/2* mutations have not been applied in Libya, where the NCCN criteria are used for highly penetrating breast cancer susceptibility genes. This study aimed to predict *BRCA1/2* mutation probability in familial breast cancer and eligibility for genetic testing by using BOADICEA and BRCAPRO models and NCCN criteria.

Methods: *BRCA1/2* mutations were retrospectively predicted in 62 unrelated women with familial breast cancer between 2018 and 2021. Logistic regression, ROC analysis, and AUC were used to compare NCCN referral criteria with the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA scores.

Results: Of 62 breast cancer patients, 32 (51.6%) (mean age 43.5±8 years) were predicted by both models as *BRCA* mutation carriers. BRCAPRO predicted *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations in 27.4% and 41.9% of the women, respectively. BOADICEA predicted 8% for *BRCA1* and 29% for *BRCA2*. At least one NCCN criterion was met by 50/62 women (80.6%). Three criteria were statistically significant predictors in BRCAPRO and BOADICEA: breast cancer at ≤ 50 years with one or more close blood relatives with breast cancer, breast cancer patient with a close relative of male breast cancer, and triple-negative breast cancer. For the three respective criteria, sensitivity was 0.78, 0.89 and 0.75, specificity was 0.33, 0.39 and 0.22, AUC was 0.72, 0.75 and 0.76, PPV was 78%, 27.5% and 33.3, and NPV was 67%, 97% and 95.5.

Conclusions: BODICEA and BRCAPRO models are suitable for recommending genetic testing for BRCA gene mutations. The NCCN criteria are too broad.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Keywords: Breast cancer, NCCN criteria, BRCAPRO, BOADICEA, *BRCA1*, *BRCA2*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Breast cancer (BC) has become the most common cancer worldwide. Although the incidence rates in transitioned countries are 88% higher than in transitional countries, the incidence rates in transitioned countries have increased rapidly [1]. North African countries are experiencing some of the most rapid increases, including Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya [1, 2]. In Libya, the incidence is 18.8 new cases per 100,000 women, most of the patients have advanced disease, and are often younger than in Europe, as is common in North Africa [3]. Although the rapid rise in BC incidence rates in North African countries could be attributed to lifestyle and environmental factors, the young age at onset and the high grade suggest the influence of genetic factors, such as mutations in breast cancer susceptibility genes (*BRCA1* and *BRCA2*) [4]. The contribution of *BRCA1/2* mutations to hereditary breast cancer has not yet been thoroughly investigated in North African populations [5,6].

Hereditary genetic factors are responsible for 5–10% of all breast cancers, and *BRCA1/2* gene mutations account for up to 25% of familial cases [7]. The lifetime cancer risk in *BRCA1/2* mutation carriers is roughly 80–85% for female breast cancer (with older breast cancer onset for *BRCA2*), 12–40% for bilateral breast cancer for *BRCA1*, and 6–10% for male breast cancer [8- 13]. These statistics are based on research on European and American populations, and they likely differ in other populations. This risk may be reduced by surgical interventions such as bilateral prophylactic mastectomy, which reduces the risk of BC by more than 90% [14- 17]. Cancer susceptibility gene testing can identify individuals who are most likely to benefit from risk-reduction interventions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Genetic testing of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* is costly and difficult to interpret, particularly in families with a low likelihood of having a mutation. Therefore, it is important to estimate the likelihood that a family carries a *BRCA1/2* gene mutation before a genetic test is done [18].

In several countries, a clinical standard for identifying hereditary breast/ovarian cancer has been developed and data have accumulated [15, 19]. This has resulted in the development of various models [20- 23] that can more precisely estimate *BRCA1/2* mutation carrier probabilities based on both genetic and empirical models that calculate the probability of mutation by using predictor variables derived from cancer family history. The BRCAPRO software [22, 24] and the Breast and Ovarian Analysis of Disease Incidence and Carrier Estimation Algorithm (BOADICEA) are examples of such tools [25, 26]. BOADICEA was founded by women and families from the United Kingdom, as well as a few other countries, and Africans are not represented. Furthermore, BRCAPRO is based on mutation rates and penetrance in women of Ashkenazi Jewish and European ancestry [8, 27].

Libya lacks genetic testing for familial and non-familial mutations in cancer patients, including breast cancer [28], and most of those who require it must travel abroad. Consequently, familial breast and ovarian cancer patients in Libya are assessed based on the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) criteria for highly penetrating breast cancer susceptibility genes. In addition, the *BRCA1/2* gene testing is typically recommended only for patients who are triple-negative and have a family history of breast/ovarian cancer. Despite the utility of the NCCN criteria for referral to genetic assessment, they lack specificity for accurately excluding people with low

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

a priori risk [29]. In light of these issues, the logical step would be to develop local protocols that are efficient, practical, and beneficial to those specific patients.

To the best of our knowledge, *BRCA1/2* mutation prediction models have not been applied to people of North African ethnicity. Hence, we aimed to retrospectively predict *BRCA1/2* mutation probability in Libyan women with BC by using the BOADICEA and BRCAPRO models and to compare how the NCCN high-risk assessment criteria perform in referring BC patients for genetic evaluation in comparison to the two risk assessment models.

Methods

Patients and criteria

The study included 62 unrelated women with BC who were followed up at the outpatient clinic of the National Cancer Institute in Sabratha, Libya from 2018 to 2021. The patients were selected based on a family history of breast, ovarian, or other cancer in one or more first- second or third-degree relatives regardless of the age of onset. Data were collected from the patients in a self-administered questionnaire during their visits to the clinic. The medical records of the patients were reviewed.

Study tools

To calculate the probability of a patient being a *BRCA1/2* mutation carrier, we used the BRCAPRO CancerGene software program (v6, Bayes Mendel R package)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(http://www4.utsouthwestern.edu/breasthealth/cagene) and BOADICEA CanRisk v6 (https://www.canrisk.org/).

BRCAPRO uses statistical ideas that go back to Bayes and Mendel [24]. It analyzes data from patients and all their relatives, including their age at diagnosis, current age, age at death, ethnicity, BC markers, such as the ER (estrogen receptor) scores, PR (progesterone receptor) and HER2 (human epidermal growth factor receptor-2), and other risk factors such as the woman's age at first live birth, and mammographic density. The calculations make use of information on the occurrence of breast, ovarian, and other cancers among first- and second-degree relatives.

BOADICEA uses information such as lifestyle, women's health, number and sex of children, breast screening, mammographic density, hormone receptors, including ER, PR, HER2, reproductive factors, and medical and family history. The medical history of the patients included age at diagnosis of breast or ovarian cancer. The family history included age at diagnosis of breast, ovarian, pancreatic, or prostate cancer in first or second-degree relatives. In our study, the ethnicity of all the patients was marked as "unknown" in BRCAPRO and as "other" in BOADICEA because of insufficient research on the ethnic groups living in North Africa. Based on the probability calculation scores in the two models, ≥ 10% was considered a high-risk subgroup that would benefit from genetic testing [30].

As reported in St. Gallen International Breast Cancer Conference 2011 [31], patients' tumors were classified into four molecular subtypes according to the following definitions: luminal A (ER + and/or PR+, Ki67 low and HER2-), luminal B (ER + and/or PR+, Ki67 high and/or HER2+), HER2-positive (ER-, PR- and HER2+) and triple-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

negative (ER-, PR-, HER2-). Medical records were used to obtain ER, PR, HER2 and Ki67 expression levels. ER and PE were recorded in categories (positive *vs*. negative). Patients with ≥ 20% positive nuclei were identified as having high Ki67 expression, while those with ≤ 20% positive nuclei were identified as having low Ki67 expression. HER2 was considered positive when the score was +3 [32].

The patients were also assessed using the National Comprehensive Cancer Network NCCN criteria (v2.2022) for referral to genetic risk evaluation [33]. NCCN does not provide a percent probability of mutation, whereas the models calculate carrier probability scores for the *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* genes separately.

We compared each of the NCCN referral criteria to the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA scores of our breast cancer patients to determine how each of the NCCN criteria performed.

Statistical analysis

We summarized the clinical characteristics of the study participants as medians for continuous variables and frequencies for categorical variables. Logistic regression was used in conjunction with receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis to determine which NCCN criteria were statistically significant predictors of high-risk patients, and the BRCAPRO and/or BOADICEA were used as the reference standards to evaluate the sensitivity and specificity of the patient's criteria. The area under the curve (AUC), a general indicator of accuracy, was measured using ROC curves, and the calculations were made for both positive predictive values (PPV) and negative predictive values (NPV). A perfect test has an area of 1, whereas an area of 0.5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

means that the test is useless. We examined each of the NCCN referral criteria concerning the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA results of our breast cancer patients to see how each of the NCCN criteria performed. The clinical significance of each NCCN criterion was determined by BRCAPRO and/or BOADICEA scoring. All statistical analyses were performed with IBM SPSS Statistics v20.

Results

The clinical characteristics of the 62 BC women who participated in the study are summarized in Table 1. Forty-eight (77%) of them were ≤ 50 years old at diagnosis, with an average of 44.8 years. Thirty-eight women (61.2%) had a family history of BC in first-degree relatives and 13 (21%) in second-degree relatives.

In total, 62 patients were classified into four molecular subtypes of tumors (Table 2). More than half the patients were luminal B [38/62(61.3%)], followed by luminal A [11/62(17.7%)], triple-negative BC [8/62(13%)], and HER2+ [4/62(6.5%)]. Half of the BC patients aged ≤ 50 years had luminal B subtype (51.6%), whereas 11.3% had luminal A, 9.7% were triple-negative, and 4.8% were HER2 positive. Premenopausal and postmenopausal patients aged ≤ 50 years with the luminal A subtype represented 4.8% and 6.5%, respectively, while luminal B patients represented 38.7% and 12.9%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1 Patient characteristics

Characteristic	**(%) Frequency**
≤ 50 y	48 (77)
Family history of breast cancer in	
1st-degree relatives	38 (61.2)
2nd-degree relatives	13 (21)
3rd-degree relatives	8 (13)
Family history of ovarian cancer in	
1st-degree relatives	1 (1.6)
Family history of prostate or pancreas cancer	4(6.4**)**
Family history of endometrium cancer in	
1st-degree relatives	4(6.4)

Table 2 Distribution of molecular- subtype of breast cancer by age groups and menopausal status.

	Molecular subtype	
	Premenopause	**Postmenopause**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Age	N	Luminal A N (%)	Luminal B N (%)	Her2-Positive N (%)	Triple-Negative N (%)	Luminal A N (%)	Luminal B N (%)	Her2-Positive N (%)	Triple-Negative N (%)
≤ 50 Years	**48**	3(4.8)	24 (38.7)	3(4.8)	2(3.2)	4(6.5)	8(12.9)	0	4(6.5)
≥ 51 Years	**14**	1(1.6)	0	1(1.6)	0	3(4.8)	6(9.7)	0	2(3.2)
Total	**62**	4(6.5)	24(38.7)	4(6.5)	2(3.2)	7(11.3)	14(22.6)	0	6(9.7)

From the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA model scores based on the information provided by the patients, the highest prediction rates were 90.8% for *BRCA2* and 75.7% for *BRCA1*. The patient with the highest *BRCA2* score had a first-degree relative and a second-degree relative with a history of male breast cancer and was classified as a luminal B subtype. On the other hand, the highest score for *BRCA1* was for a patient with double breast and ovarian cancer. The patient was classified as luminal A.

The mean carrier probability for all mutations in BRCAPRO was 8.1% for *BRCA1* and 18.7% for *BRCA2*. For BOADICEA it was 4.8% for *BRCA1* and 12.3% for *BRCA2*. Using a cutoff of ≥ 10%, BOADICEA identified 5/62 (8%) of the patients as having a high risk of *BRCA1* mutations and 18/62 (29%) as high risk for *BRCA2* mutations, whereas BRCAPRO identified 17/62 (27.4%) for *BRCA1* and 26/62 (41.9%) for *BRCA2*. Consequently, 32/62 (51.6%) of the patients were identified as high risk by BOADICEA and/or BRCAPRO and therefore eligible for genetic testing. Four individuals had a high risk in both models of *BRCA1*, 13 had a high risk in BRCAPRO only, and 1 had a high risk in BOADICEA only. For *BRCA2*, 15 patients were positive in both models at the same threshold, 11 were positive in BRCAPRO, and 3 were positive in BOADICEA.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The average ages (mean ± SD) of patients classified as high risk for *BRCA1* mutations by BRCAPRO and BOADICEA were, respectively, 42.5 ± 9.5 years and 43.6 + 14.8 years. For both models together, it was 42.7 ± 9.2 years. The mean age of patients identified as having a low risk of *BRCA1* mutations by these models was 45.1 ± 8.9 years (p = 0.7). On the other hand, the average ages of patients with a high risk of *BRCA2* mutation by BRCAPRO, BOADICEA, both models and low-risk BRCA2 mutations were 42.12 ± 7.8 years, 43.5 ± 9.6, 43.6 ± 8.4 and 45.8 ± 9.2, respectively (p = 0.8).

Table 3 shows the results for 50/62 (80.6%) patients who met at least one NCCN criterion. Using logistic regression, NCCN criterion (BC patient at age ≤ 50 with one or more BC close blood relatives) was a statistically significant predictor of patients identified as high risk for *BRCA1* and *BRCA2 2* mutations by either BRCAPRO or BOADICEA score (p = .011 and p = .005 respectively) in with sensitivity of 0.78, specificity of 0.33, and area under the ROC curve of 0.72 (Fig 1). PPV was 78% and NPV was 67%. The criterion of BC patient with relative male BC was statistically significant in patients at high risk of *BRCA2* mutations (P = 0.023), with a sensitivity of 0.89, specificity of 0.39, and area under the ROC curve of 0.75 (Fig 2). PPV was 27.5 % and NPV was 97%. Triple-negative BC patients diagnosed at age ≤ 60 were also statistical significant at high risk patients of *BRCA1* mutations (P = 0.008), with a sensitivity of 0.75, specificity of 0.22 and area under the ROC curve of 0.76 (Fig 3). PPV was 33.3% and NPV 95.5%.

Table 3 BRCAPRO and BODICEA models against NCCN criteria for *BRCA1/2* genes mutation risk prediction.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

NCCN Criteria A woman with BC diagnosis meeting any of :the following	No. of patients	BRCAPRO patients score ≥ 10		BODICEA patients score ≥ 10		High score by BRCAPRO or BOADICEA		P value for the high score by BRCAPRO or BOADICEA	
		BRCA1 N = 17	BRCA2 N = 26	BRCA1 N = 5	BRCA2 N = 18	BRCA1 N = 18	BRCA2 N = 29	BRCA1	BRCA2
BC at age ≤ 50 and ≥ 1 close blood relative with B or O C at age ≤ 50	35	14	22	4	14	15	23	**.011 ***	**.005 ***
At age 45≤	10	1	1	0	0	1	1	. 178	.031
Double primary BC/ OC	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	.487	.999
Male BC relative	9	4	9	0	6	4	9	.279	**.023 ***
≥ 1 relative with prostate or pancreatic cancer	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	.999	.385
Triple-negative (ER, PR, Her2-) BC diagnosed ≤60 years old	8	5	3	1	3	6	4	**.008 ***	.845

Twelve patients did not meet any of the NCCN criteria.

Breast B, Ovary O, Cancer C, * Significant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Fig 1. ROC curve for NCCN criterion of BC at age ≤ 50 years and one or more close blood relatives with breast or ovarian cancer at age ≤ 50 years as a predictor for genetic test eligibility.



Fig. ROC curve for NCCN criterion: BC patients with relatives of male BC as a predictor of genetic test eligibility.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Fig. 3 ROC curve for NCCN criterion: Triple-negative (ER, PR, Her2-) BC diagnosed ≤60 years old as a predictor of genetic test eligibility.

Discussion

Despite recent efforts by Libyan health authorities to develop nationwide breast cancer screening programs [34], the unavailability of genetic diagnostics for people with familial breast and ovarian cancer remains a concern. Situation of *BRCA* mutations in Libyan women has not been practiced, and this is the first study to use the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA scoring (≥ 10%) to predict *BRCA1/2* gene mutations in women with BC who have a strong family history of BC and to evaluate the efficacy of NCCN criteria.

Based on the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA scoring systems, our calculated frequency of patients at high risk of being carriers of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations were 29% and 46.8% for the respective scoring systems. If these high-risk patients were to test positive for *BRCA1/2* mutations, this estimate would be consistent with studies showing that *BRCA2* mutations are more common than *BRCA1* mutations in the Arab

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

region [35], though this pattern is not observed in the majority of other populations [36]. We also found that the occurrence of both breast and ovarian cancer in one patient was related to a high risk of a *BRCA1* mutation, as reported in Sweden [37]. This had the highest probability of *BRCA1* mutation in the BODICEA model.

We employed BRCAPRO and BOADICEA because they are the most reliable in predicting mutant carrier probability when compared to other scoring models [38]. BRCAPRO predicted that 27.4% of the patients had *BRCA1* mutations and 41.9% had *BRCA2* mutations, which are slightly greater than the percentages predicted by BOADICEA (8% for *BRCA1* and 29% for *BRCA2*). The BRCAPRO model is similar to BOADICEA in that *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* are modeled independently. The differences between them can be explained in part by their use of different mutation rates and allele frequencies. In particular, in BRCAPRO, the mutations are assumed to be more common in *BRCA1* than in *BRCA2*, but BOADICEA finds that *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations have similar population frequencies, though *BRCA2* was more common [22]. The benefit of using two predictive models instead of one was that we were able to identify more high-risk patients who needed genetic testing, and based on score results from either or both scoring systems, we recorded 13 more *BRCA1* and 11 more *BRCA2* high-risk patients compared to using either system alone.

Patients with BC at the age of ≤ 50 and having first or second- degree relatives with BC at the age of ≤ 50 met the highest risk NCCN criteria. The average age of these patients was 44.8 years, which is consistent with a previous study in Libya that showed a higher frequency of BC among those ≤ 50 years old [3, 39- 41]. Luminal B subtype (61.3%) was more prevalent than luminal A (17.7%). This is in agreement

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

with studies in Tunisia [42], Morocco [43], Saudi Arabia [44] and Italy [45] but differs from studies in other North African countries, including Egypt, Tunisia and Algeria [46- 49]. The difference could be explained by the heterogeneity of BC in different cohorts drawn from different countries. The incorporation of HER2-positive patients in luminal B groups and the use of different Ki-67 cut-off values to stratify luminal breast cancer groups around the globe could lead to different results [42]. Furthermore, the 13% triple-negative breast tumors in our study is similar to the percentages found in Tunisia and Morocco [42–43], and the 6.5% for the Her2-positive subtype is in agreement with studies from Algeria, Europe and the USA [50].

Several studies refer to a link between specific molecular subtypes and *BRCA1/2* mutation status. *BRCA1/2* mutation carriers are more likely to have triple-negative BC. This association is strongest in *BRCA1*-related BC, and most *BRCA2* BCs belong to the luminal B subtype [51]. Interestingly, the results of our study show that 75% of the triple-negative BC patients had scores ≥ 10 of carrier *BRCA1* mutation, and 55.3% of the luminal B subtype had *BRCA2* scores ≥ 10. These findings need confirmation by future full gene sequence analyses for *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* in the same patients.

The overall mutation prevalence in patients identified as high risk by BRCAPRO and BOADICEA was lower than would be expected based on the NCCN criteria. The NCCN criteria that correlated best with the scoring systems for identifying high-risk patients were as follows: (i) BC patients at age ≤ 50 years and having one or more close blood relatives with BC at age ≤ 50 years, (ii) BC patients having male relatives with BC, and (iii) patients with triple-negative BC (ER, PR, Her2) diagnosed at age ≤ 60 years. For these, sensitivity was high (78%, 89% and 75%, respectively) and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

specificity was low (33%, 39% and 22%, respectively). This could result in a large number of patients with a low likelihood of having a *BRCA* mutation being referred for a genetic test. Though the *P value* of BC patients with *BRCA2* at age ≤ 45 years was .032 it had a poor area under the ROC curve (0.4), indicating that the criterion may not differentiate between high- and low-risk BRCA mutation carriers, especially because it depends on patient age alone. The other criteria (double primary BC and one or more relatives with prostate or pancreatic cancer,) were not significant, possibly due to the small sample size.

Our study has some limitations. We hypothesized that a BRCAPRO or BOADICEA cutoff of ≥ 10% would be enough to predict the presence of a *BRCA* mutation in patients who require a genetic test with acceptable false-negative rates. We also could not compensate for the fact that none of our patients had a genetic test. However, this study aims to make a pretest prediction of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* carrier mutations. We also had only one patient with double primary BC, one with double primary BOC, four BC patients with relatives who had prostate or pancreatic cancer, and eight triple-negative (ER, PR, Her2) BC patients at the age ≤ 60. As a result, increasing the number of patients who meet the rarer criteria will improve the statistical analysis of that criterion.

Conclusion

The NCCN criteria for making decisions on genetic testing have shortcomings because some of them are too general. Based on our results, we believe that using *BRCA* risk calculator models such as BRCAPRO and BODICEA will be advantageous for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

identifying high-risk patients. This pivotal study's results will be validated by performing BRCA1/2 testing based on the BRCAPRO and BOADICEA models.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the National Cancer Institute (NCI), Sabratha, Libya. Verbal informed consent was obtained from each patient before recruitment in the study, which was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the National Cancer Institute (NCI), Sabratha, Libya. This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of the Helsinki Declaration.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in supplementary information files.

Competing interests

None declared.

Funding

None.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Eanas Elmaihub, Inas Alhudiri

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Data curation: Eanas Elmaihub, Fakria Elfagi

Formal analysis: Eanas Elmaihub

Investigation: Eanas Elmaihub, Fakria Elfagi

Methodology: Eanas Elmaihub, Inas Alhudiri

Supervision: Elham Hassen, Adam Elzagheid

Writing – original draft: Eanas Elmaihub

Writing – review & editing: Elham Hassen, Inas Alhudiri

Acknowledgment

We appreciate the help received from the Sabratha Research Unit of the National Cancer Institute and the Oncology Department.

References

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021,71:209–249.
2. Corbex M, Bouzbid S, Boffetta P. Features of breast cancer in developing countries, examples from North Africa. Eur J Cancer. 2014,50:1808–8.
3. Boder JM, Elmabrouk Abdalla FB, Elfageih MA, Abusaa A, Buhmeida A, et al. Breast cancer patients in Libya: Comparison with European and central African patients. Oncol Lett. 2011 Mar;2(2):323-330. https://doi.org/10.3892/ol.2011.245.
4. Laraqui A, Uhrhammer N, Rhaffouli HE, Sekhsokh Y, Lahlou-Amine I, , et al. BRCA genetic screening in Middle Eastern and North African: mutational

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

spectrum and founder BRCA1 mutation (c.798_799delTT) in North African. Dis Markers. 2015;2015:194293. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/194293.

5. Mahfoudh W, Bouaouina N, Ahmed SB, Gabbouj S, Shan J, et al. Hereditary breast cancer in Middle Eastern and North African (MENA) populations: identification of novel, recurrent and founder BRCA1 mutations in the Tunisian population. Mol Biol Rep. 2012 Feb;39(2):1037-46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11033-011-0829-8.
6. ElBiad O, Laraqui A, El Boukhrissi F, Mounjid C, Lamsisi M, et al. Prevalence of specific and recurrent/founder pathogenic variants in BRCA genes in breast and ovarian cancer in North Africa. BMC Cancer. 2022 Feb 25;22(1):208. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-022-09181-4.
7. Larsen MJ, Thomassen M, Gerdes AM, Kruse TA. Hereditary breast cancer: clinical, pathological and molecular characteristics. Breast Cancer (Auckl). 2014 Oct 15;8:145-55. https://doi.org/10.4137/BCBCR.S18715
8. Antoniou A, Pharoah PD, Narod S, Risch HA, Eyfjord JE, et al. Average risks of breast and ovarian cancer associated with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations detected in case series unselected for family history: a combined analysis of 22 studies. The American Journal of Human Genetics. 2003 May 1;72(5):1117-30. https://doi.org/10.1086/375033.
9. Liede A, Karlan BY, Narod SA. Cancer risks for male carriers of germline mutations in BRCA1 or BRCA2: a review of the literature. J Clin Oncol. 2004 Feb 15;22(4):735-42. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2004.05.055.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

10. Giordano SH. A review of the diagnosis and management of male breast cancer. Oncologist. 2005 Aug;10(7):471-9. https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.10-7-471
11. Satagopan JM, Offit K, Foulkes W, Robson ME, Wacholder S, et al. The lifetime risks of breast cancer in Ashkenazi Jewish carriers of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2001 May;10(5):467-73. PMID: 11352856.
12. Ford D, Easton DF, Stratton M, Narod S, Goldgar D, et al. Genetic heterogeneity and penetrance analysis of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes in breast cancer families. The Breast Cancer Linkage Consortium. Am J Hum Genet. 1998 Mar;62(3):676-89. https://doi.org/10.1086/301749
13. Begg CB, Haile RW, Borg Å, et al. Variation of Breast Cancer Risk Among *BRCA1/2* Carriers. *JAMA.* 2008;299(2):194–201. doi:10.1001/jama.2007.55-a
14. Rebbeck TR, Friebel T, Lynch HT, Neuhausen SL, van 't Veer L, et al. Bilateral prophylactic mastectomy reduces breast cancer risk in BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers: the PROSE Study Group. J Clin Oncol. 2004 Mar; 22(6):1055–1062. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2007.55-a
15. Armstrong J, Toscano M, Kotchko N, Friedman S, Schwartz MD, et al. Utilization and outcomes of BRCA genetic testing and counseling in a national commercially insured population: the ABOUT study. JAMA oncology. 2015 Dec 1;1(9):1251-60. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2015.3048.
16. Li Y, Arellano AR, Bare LA, Bender RA, Strom CM, et al. test could cost-effectively help extend life expectancy for women at risk of hereditary breast

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

cancer. Value in Health. 2017 Apr 1;20(4):547-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2017.01.006.

17. Meijers-Heijboer H, van Geel B, van Putten WL, Henzen-Logmans SC, Seynaeve C, et al. Breast cancer after prophylactic bilateral mastectomy in women with a BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation. New England Journal of Medicine. 2001 Jul 19;345(3):159-64. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200107193450301.
18. American Society of Clinical Oncology. American Society of Clinical Oncology policy statement update: genetic testing for cancer susceptibility. J Clin Oncol. 2003 Jun 15;21(12):2397-2406. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2003.03.189.
19. Balmana J, Diez O, Rubio IT, Cardoso F. BRCA in breast cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines. Annals of Oncology. 2011 Sep 1;22:vi31-4. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdr373.
20. Frank TS, Deffenbaugh AM, Reid JE, Hulick M, Ward BE, et al. Clinical characteristics of individuals with germline mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2: analysis of 10,000 individuals. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2002 Mar 15;20(6):1480-90. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2002.20.6.1480
21. Couch FJ, Deshano ML, Blackwood MA, Calzone K, Stopfer J, et al. BRCA1 mutations in women attending clinics that evaluate the risk of breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine. 1997 May 15;336(20):1409-15. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199705153362002
22. Berry DA, Iversen Jr ES, Gudbjartsson DF, Hiller EH, Garber JE, et al. BRCAPRO validation, sensitivity of genetic testing of BRCA1/BRCA2, and prevalence of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

other breast cancer susceptibility genes. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2002 Jun 1;20(11):2701-12. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2002.05.121

23. Evans DG, Eccles DM, Rahman N, Young K, Bulman M, Amir E, et al. A new scoring system for the chances of identifying a BRCA1/2 mutation outperforms existing models including BRCAPRO. Journal of medical genetics. 2004 Jun 1;41(6):474-80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jmg.2003.017996.
24. Berry DA, Parmigiani G, Sanchez J, Schildkraut J, Winer E. Probability of carrying a mutation of breast-ovarian cancer gene BRCA1 based on family history. Journal of the National Cancer Institute. 1997 Feb 5;89(3):227-37. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/89.3.227.
25. Antoniou AC, Cunningham AP, Peto J, Evans DG, Lalloo F, et al. The BOADICEA model of genetic susceptibility to breast and ovarian cancers: updates and extensions. British journal of cancer. 2008 Apr;98(8):1457-66. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6604305.
26. Antoniou AC, Pharoah PD, McMullan G, Day NE, Stratton MR, et al. A comprehensive model for familial breast cancer incorporating BRCA1, BRCA2 and other genes. British journal of cancer. 2002 Jan;86(1):76-83. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6600008.
27. Nanda R, Schumm LP, Cummings S, Fackenthal JD, Sveen L, et al. Genetic testing in an ethnically diverse cohort of high-risk women: a comparative analysis of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations in American families of European and African ancestry. Jama. 2005 Oct 19;294(15):1925-33. doi:10.1001/jama.294.15.1925.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

28. Abbad A, Baba H, Dehbi H, Elmessaoudi-Idrissi M, Elyazghi Z, et al. Genetics of breast cancer in African populations: a literature review. Glob Health Epidemiol Genom. 2018 May 11;3:e8. https://doi.org/10.1017/gheg.2018.8

29. Lim GH, Borje E, Allen Jr JC. Evaluating the performance of National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) breast and ovarian genetic/familial high risk assessment referral criteria for breast cancer women in an Asian surgical breast clinic. Gland Surgery. 2017 Feb;6(1):35. https://doi.org/10.21037%2Fgs.2016.11.05

30. Varesco L, Viassolo V, Viel A, Gismondi V, Radice P, et al. Performance of BOADICEA and BRCAPRO genetic models and of empirical criteria based on cancer family history for predicting BRCA mutation carrier probabilities: a retrospective study in a sample of Italian cancer genetics clinics. Breast. 2013 Dec;22(6):1130-5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2013.07.053

31. Goldhirsch A, Wood WC, Coates AS, Gelber RD, Thurlimann B, et al. Strategies for subtypes--dealing with the diversity of breast cancer: highlights of the St. Gallen International Expert Consensus on the Primary Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2011. Ann Oncol. 2011, 22 (8): 1736-1747. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdr304

32. Ehinger A, Malmström P, Bendahl PO, Elston CW, Falck AK, et al. South and South-East Swedish Breast Cancer Groups. Histological grade provides significant prognostic information in addition to breast cancer subtypes defined according to St Gallen 2013. Acta Oncol. 2017 Jan;56(1):68-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0284186X.2016.1237778

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

33. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines) Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast and Ovarian. National Comprehensive Cancer Network; version 2.2022 Available online: https://www.melbournebreastcancersurgery.com.au/wp-content/themes/ypo-theme/pdf/nccn-clinical-practice-genetic.pdf, accessed March 9, 2022.
34. ElJilani MM, Shebani AA, Bishr AM, Jalil HM, Dalyoum TM, et al. Assessment of breast cancer risk in Libyan women using the Gail model. Libyan Journal of Medical Sciences. 2020 Jul 1;4(3):115. DOI: 10.4103/LJMS.LJMS_26_20.
35. Abdulrashid K, AlHussaini N, Ahmed W, Thalib L. Prevalence of BRCA mutations among hereditary breast and/or ovarian cancer patients in Arab countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC cancer. 2019 Dec;19(1):1-2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-019-5463-1
36. Riahi A, Ghourabi ME, Fourati A, Chaabouni-Bouhamed H. Family history predictors of BRCA1/BRCA2 mutation status among Tunisian breast/ovarian cancer families. Breast Cancer. 2017 Mar;24(2):238-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12282-016-0693-4
37. Einbeigi Z, Bergman A, Meis-Kindblom JM, Flodin A, Bjursell C, et al. Occurrence of both breast and ovarian cancer in a woman is a marker for the BRCA gene mutations: a population-based study from western Sweden. Familial cancer. 2007 Mar;6(1):35-41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10689-006-9101-0.
38. Hung FH, Wang YA, Jian JW, Peng HP, Hsieh LL, et al. Evaluating BRCA mutation risk predictive models in a Chinese cohort in Taiwan. Sci Rep. 2019 Jul 15;9(1):10229. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-46707-6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

39. Ermiah E, Abdalla F, Buhmeida A, Larbesh E, Pyrhönen S, et al. Diagnosis delay in Libyan female breast cancer. BMC Res Notes. 2012 Aug 21;5:452. https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-5-452

40. Gusbi E, Elgriw N, Zalmat S, Alemam H, Khalil S, et al. Breast cancer in western part of Libya: Pattern and management (2003-2018). Libyan J Med Sci 2020;4:65-71. https://www.ljmsonline.com/text.asp?2020/4/2/65/284691

41. Ssentongo P, Lewcun JA, Candela X, Ssentongo AE, Kwon EG, et al. Regional, racial, gender, and tumor biology disparities in breast cancer survival rates in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2019 Nov 21;14(11):e0225039. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225039

42. Mighri N, Mejri N, Boujemaa M, Berrazega Y, Rachdi H, et al. Association between epidemiological and clinico-pathological features of breast cancer with prognosis, family history, Ki-67 proliferation index and survival in Tunisian breast cancer patients. PLoS One. 2022 Sep 12;17(9):e0269732. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269732

43. El Fatemi, H., Chahbouni, S., Jayi, S., Moumna, K., Melhouf, et al. Luminal B tumors are the most frequent molecular subtype in breast cancer of North African women: an immunohistochemical profile study from Morocco. *Diagn Pathol* **7**, 170 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1186/1746-1596-7-170.

44. Al Tamimi DM, Shawarby MA, Ahmed A, Hassan AK, AlOdaini AA. Protein expression profile and prevalence pattern of the molecular classes of breast cancer-a Saudi population based study. *BMC cancer*. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-10-223

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

45. Caldarella A, Buzzoni C, Crocetti E, Bianchi S, Vezzosi V, et al. Invasive breast cancer: a significant correlation between histological types and molecular subgroups. *Journal of cancer research and clinical oncology*. 2013;139(4):617–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00432-012-1365-1

46. Bodour Salhia, Elia Anis Ishak, Salwa Gaber, Bree Berghuis, Khateeb H. et al. DuQuette, James Resau, Coya Tapia, John Carpten; Abstract A103: Breast cancer molecular subtype analysis in Egypt reveals high prevalence of Luminal A: Implications for improving prognosis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 1 October 2010; 19 (10_Supplement): A103. https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.DISP-10-A103.

47. Fourati A, Boussen H, El May MV, Goucha A, Dabbabi B, et al. Descriptive analysis of molecular subtypes in Tunisian breast cancer. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2014;10(2):e69–e74. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajco.12034

48. Cherbal F, Gaceb H, Mehemmai C, Saiah I, Bakour R, et al. Distribution of molecular breast cancer subtypes among Algerian women and correlation with clinical and tumor characteristics: a population-based study. Breast Dis. 2015;35(2):95-102. doi: 10.3233/BD-150398. PMID: 25736840.

49. Hercules SM, Alnajar M, Chen C, et al Triple-negative breast cancer prevalence in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysisBMJ Open 2022;12:e055735. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-055735

50. Cherbal F, Gaceb H, Mehemmai C, Saiah I, Bakour R, et al. Distribution of molecular breast cancer subtypes among Algerian women and correlation with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284677; this version posted July 25, 2023. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

clinical and tumor characteristics: a population-based study. Breast Dis. 2015;35(2):95-102. https://doi.org/10.3233/BD-150398

51. Incorvaia L, Fanale D, Bono M, Calò V, Fiorino A, et al. *BRCA1/2* pathogenic variants in triple-negative *versus* luminal-like breast cancers: genotype-phenotype correlation in a cohort of 531 patients. Ther Adv Med Oncol. 2020 Dec 16;12:1758835920975326. https://doi.org/10.1177/1758835920975326