Title: Impact of genetic counselling strategy on diagnostic yield and workload for whole genome sequencing-based tumour diagnostics

Running title: strategies for germline analysis in WGS tumour testing

Authors and affiliations: Roelof Koster[1,2], Luuk J. Schipper[1,2], Noor A. A. Giesbertz[1], Daphne van Beek[3], Matías Mendeville[3], Kris G. Samsom[1], Efraim H. Rosenberg[1], Frans B.L. Hogervorst[1], Paul Roepman[3], Mirjam C. Boelens[1], Linda J.W. Bosch[1], Jose G. van den Berg[1], Gerrit A. Meijer[1], Emile E. Voest[1], Edwin Cuppen[3], Marielle W.G. Ruijs[1], Tom van Wezel[1], Lizet van der Kolk[1], Kim Monkhorst[1]

1 The Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. 2 Equal contribution & 3 Hartwig Medical Foundation, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Corresponding Authors:

Roelof Koster, Department of Pathology, Netherlands Cancer Institute, Plesmanlaan 121, Amsterdam, CX, 1066, The Netherlands. r.koster@nki.nl

Kim Monkhorst, Department of Pathology, Netherlands Cancer Institute, Plesmanlaan 121, Amsterdam, CX, 1066, The Netherlands. k.monkhorst@nki.nl. +31 20 5122948

Abstract:

Whole genome sequencing (WGS) enables comprehensive molecular analysis of tumours and identification of hereditary cancer predisposition. According to the guidelines, directly determining pathogenic germline variants (PGVs) requires pre-test genetic counselling, which is cost-ineffective. Referral for genetic counselling based on tumour variants alone could miss relevant PGVs and/or result in unnecessary referrals. Here we sought to determine the optimal strategy with high PGV yield and a low number-needed-to counsel (NTC). Therefore, we compared the PGV yield and NTC of three simulated strategies, using paired tumour-normal WGS data from 937 metastatic patients.

In strategy-1 genetic counselling of all 937 patients prior to the WGS-tumour testing allowed direct PGV analysis using a tumour type-specific gene panel. In strategy-2 and -3, germline testing and referral for post-test genetic counselling is based on tumour variants using adjusted Dutch guidelines (strategy-2) or ESMO-Precision Medicine Working Group recommendations (strategy-3).

In strategy-1, clinically relevant PGVs would be detected in 50 patients (NTC=18.7). In strategy-2, 86 patients would have been referred for genetic counselling and 43 would have clinically relevant PGVs (NTC=2). In strategy-3, 94 patients would have been referred for genetic counselling and 32 would have clinically relevant PGVs (NTC=2.9). Hence, in strategy-2 and -3, 43 and 62 patients, respectively, were unnecessarily referred based on a somatic variant, primarily in BRCA1/2, PALB2, MLH1, and MSH2/6 genes.

Both post-tumour test counselling strategies (2 and 3) had significantly lower NTC compared to pre-tumour test counselling (strategy-1). The adjusted Dutch guidelines had the highest PGV yield per NTC since it was also based on clinical criteria. Both post-tumour test counselling strategies could be improved by using a hybrid approach of directly analysing hereditary predisposition with counselling through mainstreaming for BRCA1/2, PALB2, MLH1, and MSH2/6 genes, along with tumour type-specific strategies for other cancer predisposition genes.

Keywords: Whole Genome Sequencing, cancer genetics, molecular diagnostics, Germline

Introduction

The druggable genome is rapidly expanding and requires continuously adaptation of molecular diagnostic panels for therapy selection based on the latest actionable genomic alterations. Therefore, broad panels like TSO500, PGDx elio, MSK-IMPACT and Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS) are essential developments to analyse the tumours of (metastatic) cancer patients[1-5]. Through the increasing use of these broad molecular diagnostic panels, pathogenic germline variants (PGVs) are now more frequently identified following tumour-based DNA sequencing. Importantly, this includes patients that do not meet current genetic testing criteria[6-17]. Those criteria including age of onset, personal and/or family history and tumour characteristics[18-21]. For better analysis of genomic tumour data these broad tests can use 'normal' DNA (i.e. germline DNA; usually from blood) as a reference. With this comes the possibility of simultaneous detection of pathogenic germline variants (PGVs).

Detection of PGVs becomes increasingly important in targeted therapies. The germline status can be pivotal for therapy selection, such as for *BRCA1/2* mutated ovarian, breast, pancreas and prostate cancer patients[22-25]. Hence, the 2020 ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for prostate cancer recommended the consideration of *BRCA1/2* germline sequencing in all patients with metastatic prostate cancer[26].Furthermore, PGVs signify a hereditary cancer predisposition providing valuable information for timely surveillance and preventative interventions for both the patient and at-risk family members[27-30].Although the importance of detecting PGVs is indisputable, at the same time, it is important to incorporate germline analysis in such a way that patients are adequately informed about possible germline findings and provide consent, before the germline is analysed. Additionally, not all PGVs have clinical consequences that require follow-up or surveillance, and thus not all of them should be reported.

Genomic tumour profiling of (metastatic) cancer patients therefore requires an integrated strategy to refer patients effectively to a clinical geneticist. Unnecessary referrals should be prevented because of possible distress for patients and the associated workload for treating physicians and/or clinical geneticists. Strategies could be based on current guidelines for putative germline variants detected with tumour DNA sequencing, such as developed by the ESMO Precision Medicine Working Group (ESMO-PMWG) and the Dutch Working Group tumour- and germline-diagnostics[3, 4, 31]. These prioritize which tumour-detected putative germline variants to follow up on. Because of the tumour-based

approach relevant PGVs may be missed while somatic tumour variants in cancer predisposition genes may lead to unnecessary referrals. Another strategy is to first refer patients to genetic counsellors which then allows direct reporting of all relevant PGVs upon patients consent parallel with the tumour analysis report. This approach is cost-ineffective and poses a burden on patients. Hence, both strategies, i.e. direct germline analysis and germline analysis based on tumour variants, have their advantages and disadvantages.

In the WGS Implementation in standard Diagnostics for Each cancer patient (WIDE) study[32, 33] we performed paired tumour-normal WGS on 937 metastatic cancer patients. To investigate the optimal strategy to detect hereditary predisposition we compared the PGV yield and the number-needed-to-counsel (NTC) of a simulated pre-tumour test counselling strategy with two simulated post-tumour test counselling strategies using the WIDE data.

Results

Overall germline findings in the WIDE cohort

Paired germline and tumour WGS analysis was performed for 937 patients included in the WIDE cohort. Based on an unbiased, pseudonymized screening of 49 established cancer predisposition genes (CPGs; see Supplemental Table 1), 2309 tumour variants, consisting of 2179 somatic and 130 germline variants were reported by the bioinformatics pipeline on the OncoAct WGS report (Figure 1, Supplemental Table 2,3). After revision 1509 (likely) pathogenic somatic and 109 (likely) pathogenic germline variants (PGVs) remained. The 109 PGVs were in 25 different genes, in 106 unique patients (11.6% of all patients). 25 monoallelic variants in recessively inherited predisposition genes *MUTYH* (n=21) and *NTLH1* (n=4) were excluded as only biallelic or compound heterozygous germline variants are considered having associated hereditary risks. In total, 84 PGVs (including clinically irrelevant PGVs, i.e. in tumour types not matching the per gene associated tumour type) in 23 different genes were present in 82 unique patients (9% of all patients) across 17 different primary tumour locations (Figure 2, Supplemental Table2).

Prior to WGS analysis, 138 patients had already received standard of care genetic (germline) testing as part of clinical guidelines[18], familial cascade testing, or a potential germline finding in a tumour NGS test. Genetic testing was primarily performed in patients with ovarian cancer and breast cancer in 77.4% (24 of 31) and 64.1% (75 of 117) of the patients, respectively. In other common tumour types, like (non-small cell) lung cancer (5 of 274; 1,8%) and colorectal cancer (14 of 167; 8,4%), genetic testing was less often performed (Figure 2, Supplemental Table2).

Taken together, in the total WIDE cohort, 84 PGVs were present in 82 unique patients (9% of all WIDE patients) across 17 different primary tumour locations (Figure 2, Supplemental Table2).

Strategy-1: Pre-tumour test counselling with direct tumour type-specific germline analysis

In strategy 1, all 937 patients need to be counselled about possible germline findings before the WGS-test. PGVs will be reported after simultaneous analysis of the germline based on the tumour type-specific gene panel (Figure1, Supplemental Table 1). This panel closely resembles the standard of care germline testing gene panels used for the specific tumour type(s) as indicated (Supplemental Table 1) [18-21]. 50 PGVs in 50 patients would be reported resulting in a yield of 61% compared to baseline (50 of 82 unique patients – Figure 3, 4, Table 1), an NTC of 18.7 (937 total patient counselled

/ 50 patients with PGV – Figure 3, 4, Table 1), and a prevalence of 5.3% of detected PGVs in the whole WIDE study (50/937 – Table 1, Supplemental Figure 2,3).

Compared to the baseline, 34 PGVs in 32 patients would remain unreported, since these were considered irrelevant per tumour type-specific gene panel (Figure 3, 4, Table 1). The majority of unreported PGVs were in tumour type-unspecific intermediate-risk genes (20 total; 14x *CHEK2* and 6x *ATM*). Furthermore, 14 PGVs were in tumour type-unspecific high-risk genes, including PGVs in *BRIP1*; (n=3) *BARD1 (n=2), TP53 (n=2)* and *NF1* (n=2; *see* Figure 3, 4 , Supplemental Table 2*)*. Interestingly, three of 14 PGVs in the tumour type-unspecific high-risk genes had somatic LOH (1x *BAP1*, 1x *TP53* and 1x *NF1*), indicating that those might have played a role in the tumour development.

Strategy-2: Referral for post-tumour test genetic counselling and testing based on presence of a pathogenic tumour variant per adjusted Dutch guidelines

The second strategy is a tumour-based analysis with subsequent referral for post-tumour test genetic counselling on germline analysis and testing based on pathogenic tumour variants (PTV) present in the WGS report. This strategy was guided by adjusted Dutch national guidelines (Figure 1, Supplemental Table 1)[31]. 106 PTVs were present in 86 unique patients. All 86 patients would be referred to the clinical genetics department for counselling and after consent germline-testing would be performed (Figure 3, 4, Table 1). After germline-testing, 43 PTVs appeared to be clinically relevant PGVs in 43 patients would be detected resulting in a 52% yield compared to baseline (43 of 82 unique patients – Figure 3, 4, Table 1), an NTC of 2 (86 patients counselled / 43 patients with PGV) and a prevalence of detected PGVs of 4.6% in the overall WIDE cohort (43/937 – supplemental Figure 1,2, Table 1). This also means that 63 PTVs in 43 unique patients were most likely of somatic origin and 43 patients were unnecessarily referred for counselling. The majority of somatic mutations were in the homologous recombination repair (HRR; 28 mutations in total; n=21 in *BRCA2* and n=7 in *BRCA1*) and mismatch repair (MMR; 18 mutations in total, including n=10 in *MSH6*) genes (Figure 4).

Strategy-3: Referral for post-tumour test genetic counselling and testing based on presence of a pathogenic tumour variant per ESMO PMWG

The third strategy is a tumour-based analysis with subsequent referral for post-tumour test genetic counselling on germline testing and testing based on pathogenic tumour variants (PTV). This strategy

was guided by the ESMO PMWG recommendation, using both the former and updated (four-tiered) recommendations (Figure 1, Supplemental Table 1)[3, 4]. Here we show data from the intermediate-conservative stringent updated ESMO PMWG recommendation because this is recommended by the ESMO PMWG for European countries (for the other ESMO PMWG tiers see Table 1). 94 patients with 124 PTVs would be referred to the clinical genetics department for counselling and after consent germline-testing would be performed. After germline-testing, 32 PGVs in 32 unique patients would be confirmed in the germline with a 39% yield compared to baseline (32 of 82 patients – Figure 3, 4, Table 1), an NTC of 2.9 (94 patients counselled / 32 patients with PGV) and an overall prevalence of pathogenic germline variants of 3.4% in the overall WIDE cohort (32/937 – supplemental Figure 2,3). Notably, 92 PTVs of the 124 PTVs in 62 unique patients were most likely of somatic origin. The majority of pathogenic variants of somatic origin were in the HRR (28 mutations in total; n=21 in *BRCA2* and n=7 *BRCA1*), MMR (17 mutations in total, including n=10 in *MSH6*), *NF1* (n=9) and *TP53* (n=4) genes (Figure 4).

Difference between the three strategies

In strategy-2 (adjusted Dutch guidelines), compared to strategy-1 (pre-tumour test counselling with tumour type-specific directly germline analysis) PGVs in seven patients were missed, including six PGVs that were somatically lost in the tumour and therefore not reported in the somatic tumour report (see below). (Supplemental table 4). Additionally, one PGV in the high-risk gene *APC* was not referred for a patient with Colorectal cancer at age 49, since *APC* is only considered when the patient and/or family members have polyposis (Supplemental table 5).

In strategy-3 (ESMO-PMWG intermediate-conservative tier), compared to strategy-1, PGVs in 18 patients were missed, again including the same six PGVs that were somatically lost in the tumour. Additionally, 12 patients with PGVs in high-risk genes were not referred, including PGVs in *TP53* (n=3), *RB1 (*n=1) and *APC* (n=1) since the patients did not match ESMO-PMWG's age requirement (matching tumour type and age < 30 year – see Supplemental table 5).

Interestingly, six PGVs were missed with strategy 2 and 3 because the allele harbouring the PGV was somatically lost in the patients tumour (3x *BRCA2*, 1x *BRCA1*, 1x *MLH1* and 1x *CHEK2*). These variants were detected in the germline-based strategy-1 because in this strategy we could report hereditary predisposition directly based on germline analysis (blood). They were not detected with the

other two strategies however, because our WGS pipeline does not report PGVs that are lost in the tumour report. The reasoning behind this is that these variants probably do not play a role in the oncogenesis of this tumour because of the fact that they are lost in it.

Indeed, for 4 of the 5 (*BRCA1/2* and *MLH1*) variants with an associated HRD or MSI signature, we could corroborate this with a lack of the associated signature indicating that the PGV did not play a role in the oncogenesis of the tumour. These 4 patients all exhibited a homologous repair or microsatellite proficient profile (Supplemental table 4). However, 1 of the patients with a lost pathogenic *BRCA2* germline variant did show an HRD profile. This patient however was previously treated with a PARP inhibitor and the loss of the *BRCA2* germline variant in this tumour fits with the scenario where the mutated allele was selected against due to therapeutic pressure[34]. For the 6th patient with a *CHEK2* PGV there are currently no associated tumour signatures. Importantly, in 5 out 6 patients these missed PGVs were clinically relevant per tumour type or family history in the context of hereditary predisposition (Supplemental table 4).

Discussion

In this study, we compared the PGV yield and associated number-needed-to counsel in 988 tumours analysed by WGS for three different strategies. A pre-tumour test counselling strategy directly analysing the germline (strategy-1) and two post-tumour test counselling strategies (based on the adjusted Dutch guidelines [strategy-2][31] and the ESMO PMWG recommendation [strategy-3][3, 4]). Results show the highest yield of 61% for strategy-1 vs. 52% and 39%, for strategy-2 and strategy-3 respectively**.** In comparison to strategy-1, a considerable proportion of PGVs in strategy-2 (6 out of 7) and strategy-3 (6 out of 18) were not detected due to somatic loss of 6 PGVs in the associated tumours.

In the context of molecular tumour analysis it seems valid to not report these variants because 5 out of 6 did not play a role in the tumour oncogenesis of the tested tumour. However in the context of screening strategies that aim to identify all hereditary predisposition by sequencing the tumour e.g. Tumour First [35] this poses a challenge because you can miss a relevant hereditary predisposition. We therefore also looked at the tumour types and available family history in our database of these six patients to see if the 'missed' PGVs were clinically relevant. Indeed in 5 of the six patients the PGVs was relevant for familial cascade testing because either the PGV was not detected in a relevant tumour (e.g. BRCA2 in a breast carcinoma) or the family history showed matching tumour types that warrant further follow up (Supplemental table 4).

It is important to emphasize that regular NGS panels do not filter out these PGVs based on detection in normal tissue surrounding the tumour tissue. So, depending on the tumour cell percentage these NGS panels will or will not detect these PGV's in the surrounding normal tissue. Therefore, when broad NGS panels are used they could include these somatically lost PGVs depending on the tumour cell percentage and the diagnostic yield for the post-tumour strategies would maximally increase to 60% and 46% respectively.

The highest yield of the pre-tumour test counselling approach requires adequate genetic counselling of all patients prior to paired tumour-germline sequencing. As a result, the number-needed-to counsel (NTC=18.7) is high, especially compared to both post-tumour test strategies that have an NTC of 2 (adjusted Dutch guidelines) and 2.9 (ESMO PMWG) respectively (Table 1).

When comparing post-tumour test counselling strategy-2 and strategy-3, the number of patients referred for genetic counselling and the NTC was higher for the intermediate-permissive, intermediate-conservative, conservative and “old” ESMO PWMG recommendations (strategy-3) as compared to adjusted Dutch guidelines (strategy-2; see Tabel1). Simultaneously, less PGVs were detected using the ESMO PWMG recommendations as compared to adjusted Dutch guidelines (Table 1). Both the former and recently updated recommendations from the ESMO PWMG are largely constituted around the per gene germline conversion rate (GCR), i.e., the rate of which a mutation in a gene of interest can be attributed to an underlying pathogenic germline variant. For genes with very common somatic mutations, like *TP53* or *APC*, the per gene GCR is intrinsically low. As a result, follow-up genetic testing is only recommended in specific cases (on-tumour setting, age < 30 year), to prevent large-scale genetic testing in low a priori risk populations. Thus, the per gene GCR is used as surrogate for clinical information and family history. In contrast, the adjusted Dutch guidelines uses clinical/familial criteria to pin-point specific cases to follow-up. The difference in approach is especially noticeable for *TP53.* With the adjusted Dutch guidelines, three patients with a PGV in *TP53* would have been detected, while no patients would have been referred based on a somatic *TP53* variant. On the other hand, using the ESMO PWMG recommendation four patients with a somatic mutation in *TP53* would have been referred and no patients with a PGV in *TP53* were detected (Figure 4).

In the Netherlands Cancer Institute, a comprehensive cancer centre, we have implemented WGS in routine clinical care since January 2021 and have explored multiple strategies to learn which strategy fits best in our routine clinical care. WGS results are discussed in a weekly dedicated molecular tumour board, consisting of at least a Pathologist, Clinical Scientist in Molecular Pathology, Clinical Geneticist, Clinical Laboratory Geneticist and an Oncologist. Referral for genetic counselling is communicated by direct contact of the clinical geneticist with the treating physician and by an additional remark in the routine pathology report (Figure 5). We now use a post-tumour test counselling approach using the adopted adjusted Dutch guidelines for referring patients to the clinical geneticist, since it has the best PGV yield per NTC, especially because clinical information and family history is readily available in our hospital during evaluation of the WGS data.

Our current multidisciplinary approach using the adjusted Dutch guidelines has multiple advantages. First, compared to strategy 1, where the direct reporting is integrated in the reporting pipeline per

tumour type, we can instantly switch gears e.g. when the WGS data points to a not expected tumour type or in the context of a cancer of unknown primary (CUP) patient[36].

Further, with the availability of additional clinical information (e.g. history of other primary tumour and/or tumour in other family members) the clinically relevance of specific genes for germline follow-up and therapeutic decisions might change.

For instance, a male with an abdominal metastasized CUP, a pathogenic (germline) mutation in *CHEK2* became clinically relevant per adjusted Dutch guideline for germline follow-up, since his sister was diagnosed with breast cancer. In addition to the referral to the clinical genetics department, he became eligible for experimental PARPi treatment based on the complete loss of *CHEK2* on his tumour report. Likewise, for a male patient with lung cancer, detection of a pathogenic (germline) mutation in *ATM* with increased risk for breast cancer in females did not have any clinical relevance for germline follow-up, as this patient did not have any living female relatives. However, based on the complete loss of *ATM* in the WGS tumour report, this patient became eligible for experimental PARPi treatment. Thus, the diagnostic yield of the adjusted Dutch guidelines could further increase when familial data is taken into account.

We noticed, in our simulated WIDE study data, that the majority of pathogenic somatic and germline variants were within six cancer predisposition genes (*BRCA1*, *BRCA2*, *PALB2*, *MLH1*, *MSH2* and *MSH6*) that are considered relevant to refer for any tumour type using both ESMO PWMG recommendation and adjusted Dutch guidelines. Regarding the future workload for clinical geneticist and the already long waiting lists for patients and possibly associated psychological burden e.g. waiting for test results, we analysed how we could further reduce unnecessary referrals. A hybrid form of directly analysing the germline for the above six genes in combination with one of the tumour-based strategies for the remaining cancer predisposition genes (Figure 5B) would result in a higher PGV yield and less unnecessary referrals for a somatic variants. For instance, this hybrid approach combined with the adjusted Dutch guidelines, would have led to a yield of 59% (compared to 52% for only adjusted Dutch guidelines) and 27 patients with a somatic variant would not be unnecessary referred for germline testing (Table 1; Figure 5). Using this hybrid approach patients need to be specifically pre-tumour test informed by mainstreaming for only these six genes that can be performed by the treating physician or other trained staff supported with standardized educational material.

Interestingly, mainstreaming genetic counselling for prostate, breast and ovarian cancer patients is currently studied by many groups and seems feasible and resource efficient [37-45].

In summary, with this study we benchmarked a pre-tumour test counselling and two post-tumour test counselling strategies to incorporate germline analysis into tumour diagnostic sequencing. All three strategies had a comparable detection rate of clinically relevant pathogenic germline variants, but with different number-needed-to counsel. With clinical information and family history available, the adjusted Dutch guidelines has the best PGV yield per NTC. A combination of pre-tumour test mainstreaming and post-tumour test counselling may maximize the clinically relevant PGV yield of true germline variants and minimize unnecessary referrals. Further studies are necessary regarding ethical aspects, cost efficiency and patient and professional experiences.

Methods

Study population

Patients were included as part of the WGS Implementation in standard Diagnostics for Each cancer patient (WIDE) study[32, 33]. A description of the study protocol and technical details of the WGS analysis can be found elsewhere[32, 33]. In short, metastatic solid cancer patients, unselected for tumour type, age of onset and/or family history, received WGS analysis in parallel with standard-of-care diagnostics to study the feasibility, validity, and clinical value of WGS-based tumour diagnostics in routine pathology practice. The WIDE study was performed in concordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, Dutch law, and Good Clinical Practice after approval by the Medical Ethical Committee of the Netherlands Cancer Institute (NKI) (NL68609.031.18). All included patients provided written consent for study participation.

WGS, bioinformatics and reporting

WGS was performed at the Hartwig Medical Foundation (Amsterdam, The Netherlands). Tumour DNA was analysed with a sequencing depth of >90-110x on Illumina NovaSeq6000 platforms (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) according to previously described procedures [32, 33, 46]. DNA isolated from blood was sequenced at a minimal depth of >30x and was used as a reference, allowing to discriminate somatic mutations from germline DNA background variants in bioinformatic analyses. A standardized, fully open source bioinformatics pipeline that is continuously evaluated and improved when necessary, was used to analyse sequencing data [47] (code available through **github.com/hartwigmedical**. The SAGE caller (https://github.com/hartwigmedical/hmftools/blob/master/sage/), for single nucleotide variants, multi-nucleotide variants and small insertions/deletions and the GRIPPS caller (https://github.com/hartwigmedical/hmftools/tree/master/gripss) for structural variants and genomic breakpoint junctions were adjusted for improved germline variant detection. The WGS report (Hartwig Medical OncoAct, Amsterdam, The Netherlands) reported all somatic variants with a (high) driver likelihood [46], including mutations, copy number alterations, fusions in 460 genes and mutational signatures (such as tumour mutational load, homologues recombination deficiency (HRD) and microsatellite instability (MSI)) for each patient. In general variants that are present in the germline and tumour are excluded from the OncoAct WGS report, except for variants in 57 genes that have diagnostic and/or therapeutic relevance (see Supplemental Table 1, Supplemental Figure 1). Notably,

only variants in these genes that are present in both germline and tumour are included on the OncoAct WGS report as variants present in the tumour, although their germline status is not explicated annotated, while variants that are present solely in the germline are excluded from the OncoAct WGS report because these the WGS diagnostic test is focused on clinical actionability and not intended to be a germline diagnostics tool.

Germline – panel of 49 genes & retrospective analysis

Based on available literature, recommendations and guidelines, 49 of the 57 genes (see Supplemental Table 1, Supplemental Figure 1) are established cancer predisposition genes (CPGs) [3, 4, 18-21, 31, 48-51]. CPGs are genes that can harbour germline variants that confer high or moderate risk to certain cancer types. Based on an unbiased, pseudonymized germline screening of these 49 cancer-associated genes, in paired tumour-normal WGS data of 937 patients, all germline variants reported by the bioinformatical pipeline were manually reviewed by at least one Clinical Laboratory Geneticist to determine pathogenicity of reported variants. All (likely) pathogenic variants were considered as baseline and used to determine the prevalence of PGVs in the overall cohort. For patients with a known pathogenic germline variant prior to WGS analysis, clinical data were available.

Germline analysis using three different simulated strategies.

In strategy-1, germline DNA is simultaneously analysed with the WGS-tumour analysis and clinically relevant PGVs are reported based on a tumour type-specific gene panel (Supplemental Table 1). This tumour type-specific gene panel is based on the standard of care genetic (germline) testing gene panels used for the specific tumour type(s) as indicated[18-21]. This strategy requires that all 937 patients are counselled about the possibility of germline findings as a part of the WGS test results.

In strategy-2 and strategy-3, all WGS detected tumour variants in the selected 49 genes were reviewed by at least one Clinical Laboratory Geneticist to determine pathogenicity, after they matched the adjusted Dutch guidelines[31] and/or the recommendations of the ESMO Precision Medicine Working Group (ESMO PMWG)[3, 4] for tumour sequencing (Supplemental Table 1). In our hospital we also wanted to detect MMR/Lynch carriers, therefore we adjusted the Dutch guidelines for the MMR/Lynch genes and reported tumour variants in these genes for any tumour type (in the original Dutch guidelines patients are referred when a variant in MMR/Lynch genes is detected for any tumour type and MSI/dMMR is present in patients <70 years).

Next, according to the recommendations outlined in the related guideline, it is essential to refer patients for genetic counselling regarding germline analysis. After consent of the patient, germline testing can be performed to analyse if the reported pathogenic tumour variant (PTV) in the WGS report is present in the germline or not. Here, we report how many of these patients had a (likely) PGV or a somatic variant as the basis for their referral for genetic counselling.

We calculated the NTC for the different strategies defined as the number of patients that were counselled by a clinical geneticist divide by the number of PGVs detected.

Author contributions statement

RK, NG, TW, LK and KM were responsible for the conceptualization of the study design. EC, EV, GM and KM were involved in funding acquisition. RK, LS, NG, DB, MM, KS, ER, FH, PR, MB, LB, JB, MR, TW, LK and KM for data collection and/or were responsible for part of the data analysis. RK, LS, NG and KM were responsible for drafting of the article. The underlying data reported in the article has been accessed and verified by multiple authors (RK, LS, and KM). All authors have read, revised, and approved the article.

Data availability statement

The researchers are willing to share with external qualified researchers access to patient-level data and supporting clinical documents. These requests are reviewed and approved by an independent review committee on the basis of scientific merit. All data provided are anonymized to respect the privacy of patients who have participated in the study, in line with applicable laws and regulations. Data can be requested via https://www.hartwigmedicalfoundation.nl/applying-for-data/ or k.monkhorst@nki.nl.

Funding

The Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Care innovation (ZonMW, Project No. 446002004) and Hartwig Medical Foundation.

Disclosure

KM reports research grants from AstraZeneca and speakers' fees from MSD, Roche, AstraZeneca. and Benecke. KM received consultancy fees from Pfizer, BMS, Roche, MSD, Abbvie, AstraZeneca, Diaceutics, Lilly, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim and nonfinancial support from Roche, Takeda, Pfizer, PGDx and DELFi.

EC reports consultancy fees and support for attending meetings and traveling from Illumina. EV is member of the supervisory board of Hartwig Medical Foundation.

GM is cofounder and a board member (CSO) of CRCbioscreen BV, he has a research collaboration with CZ Health Insurances (cash matching to ZonMW grant) and he has research collaborations with Exact Sciences, Sysmex, Sentinel Ch. SpA, Personal Genome Diagnostics (PGDX), DELFi; these companies provide materials, equipment, and/or sample/genomic analyses. GM is an Advisory Board member of ‘Missie Tumor Onbekend.’

RK, LS, NG, DB, MM, KS, ER, FH, PR, MB, LB, JB, MR, TW, and LK report no conflicts of interest.

Figures Legends

Figure 1. Overview of our WGS pipeline with three strategies of integrated germline analysis.

In general variants that are present in the germline and tumour are excluded from the WGS report, except for variants in 49 established cancer predisposition genes. Variants in these genes that are present in both germline and tumour are included on the tumour report as tumour variants. These are analysed according to the three different strategies as indicated. #Tumour type-specific gene panel – see supplemental table 1. *ESMO PMWG germline recommendations – see reference [3, 4] and supplemental table 1. ^Adjusted Dutch guideline – see reference [31] and supplemental table 1.

Figure 2. Prevalence of pathogenic germline variants per primary tumour location.

Overview of percentage of patients with standard-of-care genetic testing prior to the WGS (bars) and prevalence of pathogenic germline variants (dots) detected with the WGS per primary tumour location/type. Locations with fewer than 30 patients are grouped in "other". Bars are highlighted based on the number of patients.

Figure 3. Referral to clinical geneticist following the three different strategies.

Figure 4. Pathogenic variants (un)detected for the three different strategies on gene level.

* 3x *BRCA2*, 1x *BRCA1*, 1x *MLH1* and 1x *CHEK2* are somatically lost in the tumour and would have been reported if they were present on the tumour report per Adjusted Dutch guidelines and ESMO PMWG recommendation. # ESMO PMWG recommendation has no recommendation for *MEN1*.

Figure 5. Overview of our dedicated molecular tumour board and proposed changes.

WGS results are discussed in a weekly dedicated molecular tumour board, consisting of at least a pathologist, clinical scientist in molecular pathology, clinical geneticist, clinical laboratory geneticist and an oncologist. Referral for genetic counselling is communicated by direct contact of the clinical geneticist with the treating physician and by an additional remark in the routine pathology report. **A**, current practice in which we use a post-tumour test counselling approach using the adopted Dutch guidelines for referring patients to the clinical geneticist. **B**, proposed hybrid form with pre-test mainstreaming for *BRCA1/2, PALB2, MLH1* and *MSH2/6* genes combined with post-test counseling for other remaining cancer predisposition genes.

Tables

Table 1. Pathogenic variants detected, number-to-counsel and PGV yield.

	Pathogenic Germline variants (n)	Pathogenic Somatic variants (n)	Total (n) pathogenic variants	Patients with PGV (n)	Patients with somatic variants (n)	Patients counselled (n)	Prevalence (%)	NTC	Yield (%)	Yield/NTC
Baseline	84	0	84	82		937	9.0	11.4	100	8.8
Strategy-1 – direct germline analysis with Tumour specific gene panel	50	0	50	50		937	5.3	18.7	61	3.3
Strategy-2 Adjusted Dutch guidelines	43	63	106	43	43	86	4.6	2.0	52	26.2
Strategy-3 ESMO 2022 Intermediate-conservative	32	92	124	32	62	94	3.4	2.9	39	13.3
ESMO 2018/19	32	101	133	32	69	101	3.4	3.2	39	12.4
ESMO 2022 permissive	62	202	264	61	134	195	6.6	3.2	74	23.3
ESMO 2022 Intermediate-permissive	37	115	151	37	79	116	3.9	3.1	45	14.4
ESMO 2022 Conservative	20	70	90	20	46	66	2.1	3.3	24	7.4
Hybrid form germline analysis of 6 core genes +										
Adjusted Dutch guideline for other genes	48	18	66	48	16	64	5.1	1.3	59	43.9
ESMO 2022 Intermediate-permissive for other genes	37	42	79	37	32	69	3.9	1.9	45	24.2

NTC (number-needed-to-counsel; Patients counselled (n)/patients with PGVs (n).

References

1. Wei B, Kang J, Kibukawa M et al. Evaluation of the TruSight Oncology 500 Assay for Routine Clinical Testing of Tumor Mutational Burden and Clinical Utility for Predicting Response to Pembrolizumab. J Mol Diagn 2022; 24: 600-608.
2. Deak KL, Jackson JB, Valkenburg KC et al. Next-Generation Sequencing Concordance Analysis of Comprehensive Solid Tumor Profiling between a Centralized Specialty Laboratory and the Decentralized Personal Genome Diagnostics elio Tissue Complete Kitted Solution. J Mol Diagn 2021; 23: 1324-1333.
3. Mandelker D, Donoghue M, Talukdar S et al. Germline-focussed analysis of tumour-only sequencing: recommendations from the ESMO Precision Medicine Working Group. Ann Oncol 2019; 30: 1221-1231.
4. Kuzbari Z, Bandlamudi C, Loveday C et al. Germline-focused analysis of tumour-detected variants in 49,264 cancer patients: ESMO Precision Medicine Working Group recommendations. Ann Oncol 2022.
5. Zehir A, Benayed R, Shah RH et al. Mutational landscape of metastatic cancer revealed from prospective clinical sequencing of 10,000 patients. Nat Med 2017; 23: 703-713.
6. AlDubayan SH, Giannakis M, Moore ND et al. Inherited DNA-Repair Defects in Colorectal Cancer. Am J Hum Genet 2018; 102: 401-414.
7. Carlo MI, Mukherjee S, Mandelker D et al. Prevalence of Germline Mutations in Cancer Susceptibility Genes in Patients With Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma. JAMA Oncol 2018; 4: 1228-1235.
8. Huang KL, Mashl RJ, Wu Y et al. Pathogenic Germline Variants in 10,389 Adult Cancers. Cell 2018; 173: 355-370 e314.
9. Lu C, Xie M, Wendl MC et al. Patterns and functional implications of rare germline variants across 12 cancer types. Nat Commun 2015; 6: 10086.
10. Stadler ZK, Maio A, Chakravarty D et al. Therapeutic Implications of Germline Testing in Patients With Advanced Cancers. J Clin Oncol 2021; 39: 2698-2709.
11. Meric-Bernstam F, Brusco L, Daniels M et al. Incidental germline variants in 1000 advanced cancers on a prospective somatic genomic profiling protocol. Ann Oncol 2016; 27: 795-800.
12. Parsons DW, Roy A, Yang Y et al. Diagnostic Yield of Clinical Tumor and Germline Whole-Exome Sequencing for Children With Solid Tumors. JAMA Oncol 2016; 2: 616-624.
13. Schrader KA, Cheng DT, Joseph V et al. Germline Variants in Targeted Tumor Sequencing Using Matched Normal DNA. JAMA Oncol 2016; 2: 104-111.
14. Seifert BA, O'Daniel JM, Amin K et al. Germline Analysis from Tumor-Germline Sequencing Dyads to Identify Clinically Actionable Secondary Findings. Clin Cancer Res 2016; 22: 4087-4094.
15. Zhang J, Walsh MF, Wu G et al. Germline Mutations in Predisposition Genes in Pediatric Cancer. N Engl J Med 2015; 373: 2336-2346.
16. Jones S, Anagnostou V, Lytle K et al. Personalized genomic analyses for cancer mutation discovery and interpretation. Sci Transl Med 2015; 7: 283ra253.
17. Mandelker D, Zhang L, Kemel Y et al. Mutation Detection in Patients With Advanced Cancer by Universal Sequencing of Cancer-Related Genes in Tumor and Normal DNA vs Guideline-Based Germline Testing. JAMA 2017; 318: 825-835.
18. STOET, VKGN, WKO. Erfelijke tumoren: Richtlijnen voor diagnostiek en preventie. . 2017s https://www.vkgn.org/files/3515/Blauwe%20boekje%202017%20richtlijnen%20oncogenetica.pdf.
19. Daly MB, Pilarski R, Berry M et al. NCCN Guidelines Insights: Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast and Ovarian, Version 2.2017. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2017; 15: 9-20.
20. Gupta S, Provenzale D, Regenbogen SE et al. NCCN Guidelines Insights: Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Colorectal, Version 3.2017. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2017; 15: 1465-1475.
21. Stjepanovic N, Moreira L, Carneiro F et al. Hereditary gastrointestinal cancers: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-updagger. Ann Oncol 2019; 30: 1558-1571.
22. Castro E, Romero-Laorden N, Del Pozo A et al. PROREPAIR-B: A Prospective Cohort Study of the Impact of Germline DNA Repair Mutations on the Outcomes of Patients With Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. J Clin Oncol 2019; 37: 490-503.
23. Tutt ANJ, Garber JE, Kaufman B et al. Adjuvant Olaparib for Patients with BRCA1- or BRCA2-Mutated Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med 2021; 384: 2394-2405.
24. Litton JK, Rugo HS, Ettl J et al. Talazoparib in Patients with Advanced Breast Cancer and a Germline BRCA Mutation. N Engl J Med 2018; 379: 753-763.

25. Robson M, Im SA, Senkus E et al. Olaparib for Metastatic Breast Cancer in Patients with a Germline BRCA Mutation. N Engl J Med 2017; 377: 523-533.
26. Parker C, Castro E, Fizazi K et al. Prostate cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 2020; 31: 1119-1134.
27. Mandelker D, Ceyhan-Birsoy O. Evolving Significance of Tumor-Normal Sequencing in Cancer Care. Trends Cancer 2020; 6: 31-39.
28. Jonsson P, Bandlamudi C, Cheng ML et al. Tumour lineage shapes BRCA-mediated phenotypes. Nature 2019; 571: 576-579.
29. Le DT, Durham JN, Smith KN et al. Mismatch repair deficiency predicts response of solid tumors to PD-1 blockade. Science 2017; 357: 409-413.
30. Moore K, Colombo N, Scambia G et al. Maintenance Olaparib in Patients with Newly Diagnosed Advanced Ovarian Cancer. N Engl J Med 2018; 379: 2495-2505.
31. NVVP, VKGL, VKGN. Adviezen projectgroep tumor- en erfelijkheidsdiagnostiek. 2021s https://www.vkgn.org/files/8666/20211006%20Adviezen%20projectgroep%20tumor-%20en%20erfelijkheidsdiagnostiek%20definitief.pdf.
32. Samsom KG, Bosch LJW, Schipper LJ et al. Study protocol: Whole genome sequencing Implementation in standard Diagnostics for Every cancer patient (WIDE). BMC Med Genomics 2020; 13: 169.
33. Samsom KG, Schipper LJ, Roepman P et al. Feasibility of whole-genome sequencing-based tumor diagnostics in routine pathology practice. J Pathol 2022; 258: 179-188.
34. Waks AG, Cohen O, Kochupurakkal B et al. Reversion and non-reversion mechanisms of resistance to PARP inhibitor or platinum chemotherapy in BRCA1/2-mutant metastatic breast cancer. Ann Oncol 2020; 31: 590-598.
35. Witjes VM, Braspenning JCC, Hoogerbrugge N et al. Healthcare professionals' perspectives on implementation of universal tumor DNA testing in ovarian cancer patients: multidisciplinary focus groups. Fam Cancer 2023; 22: 1-11.
36. Schipper LJ, Samsom KG, Snaebjornsson P et al. Complete genomic characterization in patients with cancer of unknown primary origin in routine diagnostics. ESMO Open 2022; 7: 100611.
37. Hamilton JG, Symecko H, Spielman K et al. Uptake and acceptability of a mainstreaming model of hereditary cancer multigene panel testing among patients with ovarian, pancreatic, and prostate cancer. Genet Med 2021; 23: 2105-2113.
38. Scheinberg T, Goodwin A, Ip E et al. Evaluation of a Mainstream Model of Genetic Testing for Men With Prostate Cancer. JCO Oncol Pract 2021; 17: e204-e216.
39. Vlaming M, Bleiker EMA, van Oort IM et al. Mainstream germline genetic testing in men with metastatic prostate cancer: design and protocol for a multicenter observational study. BMC Cancer 2022; 22: 1365.
40. Srinivasa S, Bowman M, Titterton L et al. Mainstream genetic testing for high-grade ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers: A tertiary referral centre experience. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol 2023.
41. Bokkers K, Bleiker EMA, Hoogendam JP et al. Mainstream genetic testing for women with ovarian cancer provides a solid basis for patients to make a well-informed decision about genetic testing. Hered Cancer Clin Pract 2022; 20: 33.
42. Bokkers K, Frederix GWJ, Velthuizen ME et al. Mainstream germline genetic testing for patients with epithelial ovarian cancer leads to higher testing rates and a reduction in genetics-related healthcare costs from a healthcare payer perspective. Gynecol Oncol 2022; 167: 115-122.
43. Fallowfield L, Solis-Trapala I, Starkings R et al. Talking about Risk, UncertaintieS of Testing IN Genetics (TRUSTING): development and evaluation of an educational programme for healthcare professionals about BRCA1 & BRCA2 testing. Br J Cancer 2022; 127: 1116-1122.
44. Bokkers K, Vlaming M, Engelhardt EG et al. The Feasibility of Implementing Mainstream Germline Genetic Testing in Routine Cancer Care-A Systematic Review. Cancers (Basel) 2022; 14.
45. Vergote I, Gonzalez-Martin A, Ray-Coquard I et al. European experts consensus: BRCA/homologous recombination deficiency testing in first-line ovarian cancer. Ann Oncol 2022; 33: 276-287.
46. Priestley P, Baber J, Lolkema MP et al. Pan-cancer whole-genome analyses of metastatic solid tumours. Nature 2019; 575: 210-216.
47. Roepman P, de Bruijn E, van Lieshout S et al. Clinical Validation of Whole Genome Sequencing for Cancer Diagnostics. J Mol Diagn 2021; 23: 816-833.
48. Miller DT, Lee K, Abul-Husn NS et al. ACMG SF v3.1 list for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing: A policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). Genet Med 2022; 24: 1407-1414.

49. Pujol P, Vande Perre P, Faivre L et al. Guidelines for reporting secondary findings of genome sequencing in cancer genes: the SFMPP recommendations. Eur J Hum Genet 2018; 26: 1732-1742.
50. Capellini A, Williams M, Onel K, Huang KL. The Functional Hallmarks of Cancer Predisposition Genes. Cancer Manag Res 2021; 13: 4351-4357.
51. Rahman N. Realizing the promise of cancer predisposition genes. Nature 2014; 505: 302-308.

Figure 1


Biopsy (fresh/frozen)
DNA isolation
WGS > 90x
Tumour normal comparison
Somatic events
Blood sample
DNA isolation
WGS > 30x
Germline variant calling
Germline events (49 cancer predisposition genes)
Germline events also detected in tumour (49 genes)
Tumor report:
No direct information about heredity
Microsatellite stability score
HR-Deficiency score
Tumor mutational load & burden
Tumor purity & ploidy
Molecular tissue of origin prediction (ACUP)
Predicted driver/passenger likelihood
Potential targets for treatment
Strategy-1: Pre-tumour test counseling with tumour type-specific# germline analysis
Pre-tumour test counseling
Germline events (49 cancer predispostion genes)
Tumour type specific panel#
If Pathogenic Germline Variant detected
Germline report
Referral to Clinical genetics
Strategy-2: Tumour-based analysis: Dutch guidelines^ with post-tumour test counselling
Pre-tumour test information
Tumour events (49 cancer predisposition genes)
Dutch Guidelines based analysis^
If Pathogenic Tumour Variant detected
Strategy-3: Tumour-based analysis: ESMO recommendation* with post-tumour test counselling
Pre-tumour test information
Tumour events (49 cancer predisposition genes)
ESMO based analysis*
If Pathogenic Tumour Variant detected
Post-tumour test counselling
Germline analysis
If Pathogenic Germline Variant detected
Germline report
Referral to Clinical genetics

Figure 2


Total cohort
Other
Urothelial tract
Skin
Prostate
Ovary
Lung
Colorectum
Breast
Bone/Soft tissue
CUP
100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
10%
Patients tested (%)
PGV prevalence
Number of patients
Total cohort
Per cohort
937
30
50
100
150
200
250
300

Figure 3


Pathogenic Germline Variant
Somatic variant basis of referral for germline testing
pre-test counselling
Post-tumour test counselling
Unique patients (n) referred to Clinical Geneticist
937
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
937
50
86
43
43
94
32
62
Strategy-1: Pre-tumour test genetic counselling with tumour type-specific gene panel germline analysis
Strategy-2: Tumour-based analysis: Dutch guidelines recommendation with post-tumour test genetic counselling
Strategy-3: Tumour-based analysis: ESMO (intermediate-conservative) with post-tumour test genetic counselling

Figure 4


Strategy-1: Pre-tumour test genetic counselling with tumour type-specific gene panel germline analysis
Not detected PGV
Detected PGV
Strategy-2: Tumour-based analysis: Dutch guidelines with post-tumour test genetic counselling
Not detected PGV
Referral for tumour variant of germline origin
Referral for tumour variant of somatic origin
Strategy-3) Tumour-based analysis: ESMO recommendation (intermediate-conservative) with post-tumour test genetic counseling
Not detected PGV
Referral for tumour variant of germline origin
Referral for tumour variant of somatic origin
Pathogenic variants (n)
0
5
10
15
20
25
CHEK2
BRCA1
BRCA2
ATM
TP53
SDHA
PMS2
PTCH1
CDKN2A
BRIP1
MSH2
PALB2
NF1
MLH1
APC
BAP1
RB1
FLCN
MEN1
MSH6
SDHD
SDHB
BARD1
other
MUTYH
NTHL1
TSC2

Figure 5


WGS request
WGS tumour and blood
No filter for 49 genes
Pathologist, Clinical Scientist in Molecular Pathology
WGS board
Clinical Geneticist, Clinical Laboratory Geneticist
Clinical reason for referral? - Electronic Health Record
ESMO / Dutch guidelines (49 genes)
Germline analysis using WGS data
PA report to treating physician
+
In report referral to clinical genetics
+
Clinical Geneticist contacts treating physician
Genetic counselling of patient


WGS request
Mainstreaming genetic counseling (6 core genes)
WGS tumour and blood
No filter for 49 genes
Pathologist, Clinical Scientist in Molecular Pathology
WGS board
Clinical Geneticist, Clinical Laboratory Geneticist
Clinical reason for referral? - Electronic Health Record
ESMO / Dutch guidelines (43 other genes)
Germline analysis using WGS data
PA report to treating physician
+
In report referral to clinical genetics
+
Clinical Geneticist contacts treating physician
Genetic counselling of patient