Molecular analysis suggests oligoclonality and metastasis of endometriosis lesions across anatomically defined subtypes.

Running title: clonality and metastasis in endometriosis

Teresa H. Praetorius^{1,2}, Anna Leonova^{2,3}, Vivian Lac², Basile Tessier-Cloutier^{2,4}, Janine Senz², Tayyeb M. Nazeran², Martin Köbel⁵, Marcel Grube¹, Bernhard Kraemer¹, Paul J. Yong^{2,3,6}, Stefan Kommoss^{1*}, Michael S. Anglesio^{2,3*}

Affiliations:

- 1) Department of Women's Health, Tübingen University Hospital, 72076 Tübingen, Germany
- 2) British Columbia's Gynecological Cancer Research Program (OVCARE), University of British Columbia, Vancouver General Hospital, and BC Cancer, Vancouver, BC, Canada, V5Z 4E6
- 3) Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, V6H 3Z6
- 4) Department of Anatomical Pathology, Vancouver General Hospital, Vancouver, Canada, V5Z 1M9
- 5) Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, T2N 2T9
- 6) BC Women's Centre for Pelvic Pain & Endometriosis, BC Women's Hospital and Health Centre, Vancouver, Canada, V6H 3N1

*Corresponding Authors (These authors contributed equally to this work):

Dr. Michael S. Anglesio, PhD

m.anglesio@ubc.ca; University of British Columbia, Robert HN Ho Research Centre; 2660 Oak Street, Vancouver, BC, Canada. V6H 3Z6

Prof. Dr. med. Stefan Kommoss

stefan.kommoss@med.uni-tuebingen.de; Department of Women's Health, Tübingen University Hospital, Calwerstraße 7, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

Abstract

Endometriosis symptoms are heterogeneous with controversy on whether it constitutes a single disease or multiple distinct types. Our previous work found recurrent somatic cancer-driver alterations in endometriosis; however, these have not been found ubiquitously. A handful of cases spread across studies also suggest mutations might be shared (clonal) between lesions of the same type. As current classification systems correlate poorly with symptoms or outcomes, somatic genomics may improve the current system. Here, we investigate heterogeneity of somatic cancer-driver mutations within patients and across endometriosis types.

We examined anatomically distinct types of endometriosis (ovarian, deep infiltrating, and superficial endometriosis) in 27 individual patients all of whom had at least two types of endometriosis. Specimens were analyzed using high-sensitivity targeted sequencing with orthogonal validation from droplet digital PCR and mutation-surrogate immunohistochemistry.

Results found 13/27 patients had informative somatic driver mutation in endometriosis, 9/13 had identical mutations across distinct lesions. Endometriomas tended to have a potential for higher mutational load, and this often resulted in functionally redundant driver mutations in same gene within the same lesions.

26 Our data are consistent with clonality across endometriosis
 27 lesions regardless of subtype. Further the finding of redundancy in
 28 mutations with the same gene and lesions is also consistent with
 29 endometriosis representing an oligoclonal disease with
 30 dissemination likely to consist of multiple epithelial clones
 31 travelling together. this suggests the current anatomically defined
 32 classification of endometriosis does not fully recognize the
 33 etiology of the disease. A novel classification should take into
 34 account genomic and other molecular features. These findings
 35 could further contribute to development of a more personalized
 36 endometriosis diagnosis and care.

37

38 Introduction

39 Endometriosis is a chronic estrogen-dependent inflammatory
 40 disease defined by the presence of endometrial epithelial glands
 41 and stroma outside the uterine lumen and a small but significant
 42 risk of malignant transformation (1-3). It is estimated to affect up to
 43 10% of biological females of reproductive age and can result in
 44 severe adverse effects on quality of life and productivity (4, 5).
 45 Clinical symptoms of endometriosis are diverse and include pelvic
 46 pain, dysmenorrhea, dyspareunia, and infertility (2, 6). Three
 47 major anatomically described types of endometriosis are
 48 recognized: superficial peritoneal endometriosis (EM), deep
 49 infiltrating endometriosis (DIE) and ovarian endometriomas
 50 (OMA). In addition, rare types such as mass forming/tumorous or

51 iatrogenic forms also exist. Current classification systems such as
52 the revised American Society for Reproductive Medicine (rASRM)
53 scoring system and the ENZIAN classification for DIE are useful in
54 documenting surgical findings in a standardized manner.
55 However, they poorly correlate with the severity of symptoms and
56 fail to provide a prognostic tool concerning the treatment outcome
57 for pain or infertility (7, 8). Likewise, classification and staging of
58 endometriosis are based on clinical findings and surgical
59 presentation and do not include any information about the
60 molecular potential or microenvironment of these lesions.

61 Recent studies have now shown that multiple forms of
62 endometriosis harbor somatic cancer-driver alterations including
63 recurrent activating changes in *KRAS*, *PIK3CA*, *ARID1A* and
64 others (9-11). While it appears the underlying malignant potential
65 for the vast majority of lesions, despite the presence of recurrent
66 driver mutations, remains low (6), their ultimate function in the
67 pathobiology of endometriosis remains unclear. These findings
68 are particularly important to monitoring disease since somatic
69 alteration could be therapeutically targeted or tracked to examine
70 etiology and potential disease dissemination. The concept that
71 endometriosis disseminates is not novel. Endometriosis frequently
72 presents with multiple anatomical sites affected by lesions(12, 13);
73 recent findings confirm a high rate of coexistence between
74 OMA, EM, and DIE where only 2.3% of study had isolated
75 OMA (12). Along with current etiology largely attributing an

76 origin to endometrial tissues, all endometriosis lesions may well
77 have disseminated from a eutopic point of origin. This highlights
78 the importance of studying the mechanisms of clonal
79 dissemination and metastasis of endometriosis (11, 13, 14).
80 Nonetheless, there is little objective evidence in support of
81 widespread clonal dissemination of endometriosis tissues.

82 Clinical presentation of endometriosis is heterogeneous and it is
83 controversial whether endometriosis constitutes one disease entity
84 or whether independent types with different underlying
85 pathogenesis exist (15). As noted above somatic alteration could
86 be used to examine the spread and distribution of distinct
87 endometriosis clones within a given individual. Here we explored
88 the potential clonal relationship of endometriosis from 27 patients
89 with multiple anatomically separated lesions, and each having at
90 least two distinct types of endometriosis. Our initial objective was
91 assessment of clonality at the level of endometriosis anatomically
92 described types, asking questions such as: are mutations
93 frequently shared between lesions and/or between lesion types. If
94 they are not, this would suggest each anatomically defined type
95 represents a unique disease. If they are this would indicate
96 plasticity between types and/or that our understanding of
97 endometriosis types is currently insufficient.

98

99 Materials and Methods

100 Experimental subject details

101 Formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded (FFPE) archival tissues
 102 from 27 patients from the Tübingen University Hospital, Germany
 103 were included. Inclusion criteria included histopathological
 104 diagnosis of endometriosis, presentation of two or more types of
 105 endometriosis (deep infiltrating, and/or superficial, and/or ovarian
 106 endometrioma) in distinct anatomical locations, and lesions
 107 estimated to be of sufficient size for macrodissection. Patients with
 108 a history of, or co-existing, gynecological cancer were excluded.
 109 Experiments were done at the University of British Columbia and
 110 the University of Calgary. The project was conducted in
 111 compliance with the Canadian Tri-Council Policy Statement on
 112 Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2, 2018),
 113 effort to obtain written informed consent was exercised for all
 114 patients. Specimen from non-contactable patients (lost
 115 contact/deceased) treated more than 5 years before the start of
 116 the study were included under institutionally approved waiver of
 117 consent (Tübingen University Hospital Research Ethics Board). All
 118 institutions approved use of materials and associated clinical data
 119 through local research ethics boards.

120 Sample processing and DNA extraction

121 FFPE specimens were sectioned onto glass slides, stained with
 122 dilute hematoxylin and eosin, and manually enriched for
 123 endometriosis glands and stroma by manual microdissection as
 124 described previously (10, 16). DNA was extracted using the

125 ARCTURUS® PicoPure® DNA Extraction Kit (ThermoFisher
126 Scientific, USA) and quantitated using the Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer
127 (ThermoFisher Scientific, USA).

128 Targeted sequencing

129 DNA (45-75ng) was sequenced using a proprietary hypersensitive
130 cancer hotspot sequencing panel: FIND IT™, version 3.4 (Canexia
131 Health, Canada) (9, 10). This assay includes hotspots from 33
132 genes (10, 16) (Table S1). Mutations were considered “true”, if
133 they were genuine hotspot mutations targeted by the FIND IT
134 assay and previously reported in the Catalogue of Somatic
135 Mutations in Cancer (COSMIC) (17), as well as prior observations
136 with validation (9, 10), including a probability score >0.8 and a
137 variant allele frequency (VAF) >0.8% (see Table S2A).

138 Validation via droplet digital PCR

139 Somatic mutations identified by targeted sequencing were
140 orthogonally validated through droplet digital polymerase-chain-
141 reaction (ddPCR) assays. In addition, selected alterations were
142 tested by ddPCR in all available lesions from a given patient if
143 they were observed either in any one lesion from a given patient
144 (subjected to the FIND IT panel assay), regardless of the results
145 obtained in other panel-tested lesions from the same patient and
146 including any specimens from the same patient that were initially
147 omitted from panel testing due to low DNA yield. Using previously
148 established methods (10, 16), extracted DNA was pre-amplified
149 for targets over 10 cycles then diluted before assembling the

ddPCR assay. Droplets were generated using the QX200 Droplet Generator (Bio-Rad Laboratories, USA), amplified by thermal cycling, and quantified using the QX2000 Droplet Reader (Bio-Rad Laboratories, USA). As above alterations were considered “true” if they passed the above noted probability and VAF thresholds for targeted sequencing or were detected using ddPCR above a droplet count set at the average of the negative control specimens plus 3 times the standard deviation of negative controls the relevant assay. See Table S3 for primer/probe details.

ARID1A, PTEN and p53 Immunohistochemistry

Immunohistochemistry (IHC) assays for ARID1A (18) , p53 (19, 20) and PTEN (10, 16) (Table S3) were used as surrogate for somatic alterations following established standards for staining and scoring. ARID1A was stained on Dako Omnis automated immunostainer (Agilent Technologies, USA) or Ventana BenchMark Ultra autostainer (Ventana Medical Systems, USA) the ARID1A rabbit polyclonal antibody, HPA005456 (Sigma-Aldrich). PTEN was stained on Ventana Discovery Ultra (Ventana Medical Systems, USA) using the rabbit monoclonal antibody, 138G6 (Cell Signaling, USA). p53 was stained on Dako Omnis (Agilent Technologies, USA) using the p53 mouse monoclonal antibody DO-7 (GA61661-2; Agilent Technologies, USA). Slides were scored by pathologists TMN, and/or BTC, and/or MK.

Calling Criteria

174 Calling criteria was applied to all detected alterations as noted
 175 above, including a probability score >0.8 and VAF >0.8% for panel
 176 sequencing and individual droplet count thresholds for each
 177 ddPCR assay(10, 16).
 178 Immunohistochemistry assays were performed and scored
 179 according to established standards, briefly ARID1A loss if nuclear
 180 staining was absent in endometriosis epithelium cells and internal
 181 control (stroma) was intact (18). Mutant p53 (p53abn) if high
 182 intensity positive staining was observed in 10 or more adjacent
 183 cells in the epithelial cyst wall of endometriosis or complete
 184 absence of staining in the entire cyst wall, while maintaining a
 185 normal type pattern in surrounding tissue (19, 20). PTEN loss if
 186 cytoplasmic and nuclear staining was absent in endometriosis
 187 epithelium cells and internal control (stroma) was intact (10, 16).

188 Statistics

189 Student's t-test was performed to compare the affected genes and
 190 lesion types. However, given our limited sample size, they
 191 remained non-significant.

192

193 **Results**

194 We examined 73 endometriosis lesions from 27 patients with a
 195 mean age of 34.9 years (23-45 years; Table S2; Figure S1). 53
 196 lesions were subjected to panel-based sequencing with validation
 197 of selected alteration by ddPCR, 6 additional samples included in

ddPCR validation only. In cases with sufficient material, lesions were also subjected to mutation surrogate IHC for PTEN (66 interpretable), ARID1A (66 interpretable) and p53 (47 interpretable). A total of 27/59 (45.8%) lesions from 13/27 (48%) cases were confirmed to have identifiable somatic cancer-driver mutations. It should be noted that lesion with mutations observed near, but below, our positive detection thresholds were considered negative, as were alteration which appeared above threshold in panel sequencing data but failed to exceed detection threshold in ddPCR. For example, in a 14th case panel testing suggested alteration but these fell below detection threshold at the ddPCR stage (case 7; Table S2). Nonetheless, potential interpretation for sub-clonal/sub-detection threshold alterations is discussed in a limited context where relevant.

Amongst the panel screened lesions, we found nearly half of the tested cases had at least one mutation; where identical assays were applied, *PIK3CA* alterations were the most common (27 hotspot mutations, affecting 12/53 lesions in 6 cases), followed by *KRAS* (16 hotspot mutations, affecting 15 lesions in 6 cases) and *CTNNB1* (10 hotspot mutations, affecting 7/53 lesions in 4 cases; Figure 1). In contrast to the overall frequency of alterations more lesions were affected by *KRAS* alteration overall. This trend was the same regardless of lesion type (Figure 1D) or if summarizing by fraction of affected cases (Figure 1E). Further, OMA tended to have a higher proportion of lesions affected by somatic cancer-

223 driver alterations and subsequently higher mutation load than
 224 other lesion types (Figure 1, Table S2).

225 Alterations were less frequently observed in *NRAS* (6 mutations,
 226 6/53 lesions, 4 cases), *ERBB2* (2 mutations, 2/53 lesions, 1 case)
 227 and *EGFR* (2 mutations, 2/53 lesions, 2 cases). Although our
 228 cohort had insufficient numbers to support strong associations, we
 229 noted many lesions, predominantly amongst OMA, contained
 230 multiple mutations in the same genes. OMA also tended to have
 231 higher mutational burden on average (amongst our screened
 232 panel mutations). No samples had identifiable p53-abnormal
 233 staining pattern (0/47 lesions), PTEN loss was observed in 5
 234 cases (8/66 lesions), and ARID1A loss was observed in 1 case
 235 (2/66 lesions).

236 Immunohistochemical data is inconclusive with respect to
 237 clonality, and similar abnormal patterns were considered in
 238 support of mutation findings. Our mutation data suggested a
 239 single *TP53* alteration but no abnormal p53 pattern was observed
 240 by IHC, we considered this as a false positive (case 22; Table
 241 S2A). We observed no *PTEN* mutations in sequencing data
 242 despite evidence of loss in PTEN protein expression by IHC in
 243 8/66 lesions (Table S2B), however only a small number of
 244 hotspots are covered in panel sequencing. In one case (case 2)
 245 with PTEN loss in multiple lesions other somatic (clonal) point
 246 mutations were shared between the PTEN-loss affected lesions
 247 (Table 1; Table S2A). Case 3 showed loss of ARID1A protein

248 consistent with loss-of function somatic mutation (18) in both an
249 EM and OMA samples from this patient (Figure 2). Unfortunately,
250 insufficient tissue was available to validate any mutation in the EM
251 sample, however, the *PIK3CA* (p.Met1043Ile) and *KRAS*
252 alterations were shared across all other lesions from this case.
253 Altogether we observed clonality between at least two
254 endometriotic lesions in 8 out of 13 informative cases (Table S2A;
255 Figure S2).

256 For ease in presenting results details we have divided informative
257 cases into two categories. Simple cases, with only one or two
258 altered genes and/or one or two informative lesions, and complex
259 cases, with larger numbers of alterations across lesions and
260 lesions with functionally redundant mutations.

261 Simple cases

262 We annotated 7 cases as simple (Table 1) based on presence of
263 up to 2 alterations and no functionally redundant (i.e. equivalent
264 activating change resulting from different nucleotide and/or amino
265 acid substitution in the same gene) mutations seen in same
266 lesion. We identified and validated shared mutations across
267 multiple lesions and different types in 3 cases (Figure S2). Case 6
268 shared mutations in *PIK3CA* between EM and DIE. The other two
269 cases shared mutations in *KRAS*. Case 19 shared a p.Gly12Ser
270 mutation between an OMA and a DIE. Case 21 shared a
271 p.Gly12Asp between an OMA and three different DIE lesions.

272 In 4 cases mutations were uninformative with respect to clonality
273 (Figure S2), 3 of which had mutations observed in only a single
274 lesion (*KRAS* or *EGFR*). In the last (Case 9) we detected different
275 mutations in the lesions, consisting of different *KRAS* alterations
276 as well as one *PIK3CA* alteration - none shared between lesions.

277 Complex Cases

278 All six cases in this complex category (Table 1) showed evidence
279 of a clonal relationships between lesions and in each case at least
280 one lesion showed multiple functionally redundant hotspot
281 alterations (Figure S2; Figure 2 and 3). In one case we observed
282 identical somatic alterations between EM and DIE lesions (case
283 13), in 4 cases between DIE and OMA (cases 1, 2, 3, 8; Figure 2)
284 and in one case between all three types (case 4; Figure 3).
285 Functional redundancy was most common with *PIK3CA*, seen in
286 12 lesions across 5 cases. Up to 5 simultaneously observed
287 activating changes in *PIK3CA* were validated in a single lesion
288 (case 2). In 4/5 cases with *PIK3CA* mutations we further observed
289 co-existing alterations in *CTNNB1*, where at least one was shared
290 across multiple sites/types within the affected patient. In 3/4 cases
291 redundancy in *CTNNB1* was seen with up to 3 simultaneously
292 observed alterations in the same lesion (case 1 OMA; case 2 DIE;
293 and case 4 shared between DIE and EM). The fourth case had
294 only a single observed (*PIK3CA*) co-existing *CTNNB1* alteration
295 shared between an OMA and a DIE (case 8). A single complex
296 case with a *PIK3CA* alteration had no co-existing *CTNNB1*

297 alterations, at least within our panel assay and therefore no further
298 testing by ddPCR was done. A single case (Case 13) lacking
299 *PIK3CA* alteration did have multiple redundant *CTNNB1*
300 alterations, with at least one shared between DIE and EM (an
301 OMA specimen from the same case had insufficient material for
302 testing).

303 *KRAS* alterations were seen in 5 of 6 complex cases, only case 1
304 in this category showed multiple redundant activating changes
305 (p.Gly12Val in DIE, p.Gly12Ser in both DIE and OMA). This
306 particular case also had multiple redundant mutations in *PIK3CA*
307 (4/4 shared), and *CTNNB1* (3/3 shared), as well as an *NRAS*
308 (shared) alteration. As *PIK3CA*, *CTNNB1* and *KRAS* alteration
309 were all relatively common we saw co-existence between these in
310 3/6 cases. The single case (Case 13) that lacked *PIK3CA*
311 alterations had both *CTNNB1*, *EGFR* and *ERBB2*, shared
312 between DIE and EM. A *KRAS* mutation was detectable in this
313 case only in the DIE.

314 *NRAS* alteration were detected in 4 of 6 complex cases, no case
315 showed multiple redundant alterations of *NRAS* itself but overlaps
316 with *KRAS* mutations were present. In 3 cases (Cases 1, 2, 8) an
317 *NRAS* alteration was shared between an OMA and a DIE lesion.
318 In case 4 we detected one *NRAS* alteration shared between an
319 OMA, a DIE lesion and an EM.

320 *ERBB2* alterations were detected in 2 of 6 complex cases, one
321 alteration shared between an OMA and two DIE lesions (case 3)

as well as the shared mutation in case 13 as noted above. An *EGFR* alteration was also shared between the two analyzed lesions in case 13.

Discussion

We examined a total of 73 lesions from 27 individuals affected by endometriosis, we focused on within patient heterogeneity – a largely overlooked feature amongst current genomic studies on endometriosis. Cases were specifically selected to have multiple anatomical sites affected as well as multiple “types” of endometriosis including EM, DIE and OMA. Using a high-sensitivity, and error-correcting, sequencing technology followed by validation and additional screening with ddPCR we identified somatic cancer driver alterations in lesions from 13 patients. A total of 27 lesions had at least one driver alteration, 7 lesions had more than 5.

We found evidence of identical alteration across lesions in 10 individuals, all of which spanned more than one type of endometriosis. The relatively commonplace finding of identical mutations across lesions suggests that at least a subset is clonal, sharing a common ancestor. Given our present data set the order/directionality of dissemination cannot be determined (Figures 2 and 3). We found that in 9 lesions there appeared to be multiple functionally redundant alterations, which is consistent with

individual lesions being oligoclonal. Functionally redundant mutations were seen in *PIK3CA*, *KRAS*, and *CTNNB1*. This extended to 6 of 13 cases with observed somatic alterations. In 3 of these cases the redundant alterations were identified in two or more, suggesting dissemination likely involved multiple epithelial clones traveling together.

Examining the specific prevalence of mutations across lesions we observed more *PIK3CA* mutations than any other. Amongst informative cases OMAs tended to have a higher average mutation burden, at least within our panel, with OMA lesions from cases 1, 2, 3 having multiple activating *PIK3CA* and/or *CTNNB1* (and others) driving this average mutation burden up. When examining prevalence at a per lesion or per individual level we found more lesions, and more individuals, to be affected by somatic *KRAS* mutations. Despite a higher mutation burden within a subset of OMAs, DIE appeared to have a wider range of mutations from our panel with *EGFR* and *ERBB2* mutations seen only in DIE.

Our study is unique in examination of a modest number of co-existing lesions. Particular strengths include enrichment of endometriosis glands and stroma, the use of proven high-sensitivity and specificity digital sequencing methods, and orthogonal validation for the majority of alterations (21). We elected to be relatively conservative in calling mutations, however, it should be noted that a number of alterations were found to be

371 just below detection thresholds, if a single assay was done, or
372 both just above on panel sequencing and just below on ddPCR. In
373 such cases we considered alteration to be negative/unvalidated.
374 In sampling tissue for sequencing assays and subsequent ddPCR
375 we took sequential tissue sections from a block for enrichment
376 and analysis, often requiring re-sampling of tissue for validation.
377 Hence, we must consider that in a small population of cells, such
378 as a microscopic glands of endometriosis epithelium, it is possible
379 that the proportion of mutation harboring cells changes as a
380 specimen is sectioned such that it would genuinely yield a fraction
381 of cells below a detection threshold in one sampling and above a
382 detection threshold in another. If we were to be more liberal with
383 assessment of ground-truth mutations our overall conclusion
384 would not change though it would suggest greater complexity and
385 more examples of oligoclonal dissemination throughout our
386 cohort.

387 Potential weaknesses include the use of macrodissection instead
388 of laser capture microdissection. In this context we cannot reliably
389 use the variant allele frequency for anything other than binary
390 presence or absence assessment of somatic alterations. IHC
391 observations suggested somatic alteration were exclusive to the
392 epithelium, similar to prior observation with laser-capture
393 microdissection, though this was not explicitly monitored in
394 sequencing experiments. In addition, we used only a relatively
395 limited panel assay to screen for mutations. Therefore, while we

396 can make suggestions about potential lineage of samples with
397 informative mutations, we are missing considerable data about the
398 un-analyzed genome. Thus, this should be considered as a
399 minimum estimate of clonality. We cannot strictly conclude that
400 any cells or lesions (within a given patient) that do not share
401 mutations with those found within our panel are of unrelated
402 lineage. Nonetheless, the presence of functionally redundant
403 alterations (multiple *KRAS*, *PIK3CA*, and *CTNNB1* alterations)
404 does suggest at the very least divergence of subclones within
405 lesions is likely.

406 Broad dissemination and metastasis in general are common
407 features of advanced cancers but are not typical for a benign
408 neoplastic disease. Endometriosis knowingly shares many
409 characteristics with tumors, and it is also associated with the most
410 lethal gynecologic cancer: ovarian carcinomas, where
411 endometriosis is both a risk factor and proven precursor lesion for
412 both endometrioid and clear cell ovarian carcinomas.

413 All major anatomically described types of endometriosis can
414 harbor recurrent somatic cancer-driver alterations. Our findings
415 validate a modest spectrum of driver alterations, as has been
416 described previously (9, 10, 22). While single cases have been
417 described to share alteration between lesions of the same type (9,
418 14), we provide considerable evidence that shared lineage
419 between lesions is common, not only between lesions of the same
420 type, but across anatomically defined lesion types. If we consider

421 the likelihood of clonal dissemination of endometriosis, then
 422 anatomical lesion type descriptions alone are insufficient and
 423 should be supplemented with molecular characterizations – albeit
 424 which features are clinically useful is not yet established.

425 In recent years there has been a shift away from seeing
 426 endometriosis as one disease entity. In addition to biochemical
 427 variations, considerable efforts are being applied to identify
 428 subtype-specific genomic alterations. This ongoing trajectory of
 429 thought has spiked research of endometriosis biomarkers and
 430 subtype-tailored treatment. However, here we demonstrate that
 431 sampling and comparing lesions from different individuals based
 432 solely upon anatomical classification, may yield inadequate
 433 results. Our data supports the presence of identical mutations
 434 among lesions of the same individual and suggests the clonal
 435 dissemination and metastasis mechanism of disease spreading.
 436 This underscores the need for molecular classification when
 437 designing personalized endometriosis care.

438 To make significant impact the next generation of endometriosis-
 439 genomic studies must apply high stringency methods, with
 440 appropriate enrichment of tissues, orthogonal validation and/or
 441 error correcting sequencing technologies, and most critically be
 442 coupled to large clinical data registries conforming to accepted
 443 standards in phenotyping data (21) - such as those promoted by
 444 WERF-EPHect (23, 24). Early studies on somatic genomics of
 445 endometriosis have suggested relatively few alterations per lesion

446 (9, 11, 22, 25). However, this work suggests endometriosis may
 447 have moderate genomic complexity. Any future study wishing to
 448 correlate genomic heterogeneity with the clinical phenotypic
 449 spectrum may be complex, it is not sufficiently informative to
 450 sample only one lesion per patient for mutation testing. Accurate
 451 assessment of somatic mutation profiles may require a significant
 452 fraction of lesions are excised and tested at surgery (rather than
 453 ablated without biopsy).

454 In addition to the already appreciated complexity of endometriosis,
 455 it has now become even more evident that disease presentation is
 456 unique and may depend on many factors. This work has also
 457 shown that OMAs had the highest mutation burden, while DIE
 458 lesions were associated with wider range of mutation. Considering
 459 previous work in the field (26-29), this data is consistent with
 460 observations that lesion microenvironment may be more
 461 permissive for expansion of multiple clones, and hence the higher
 462 risk of malignant transformation (30). DIEs might be surrounded
 463 by a more restrictive microenvironment conditions resulting in
 464 fewer clones and lower malignant potential. As a specific example
 465 of clonal expansion, we observed that multiple redundant *PIK3CA*
 466 activating mutation were prevalent in OMAs. These *PIK3CA*
 467 alterations are also common to endometriosis-associated cancers
 468 and appear necessary (in combination with *ARID1A*) for the
 469 generation of a representative clear cell ovarian carcinomas
 470 model in mice (31), together suggesting they are critical in

471 underlying malignant potential. Extraovarian microenvironment
472 restriction on malignant potential has been suggested as a
473 potential mechanism for the generally favorable outcomes
474 observed in low-stage synchronous (yet metastatic) endometrioid
475 ovarian and endometrial carcinomas – etiologies tightly linked to
476 endometriosis(32).

477 As we move forward, consideration should be made to determine
478 if patient-wide endometriosis mutation profiles should include
479 ranking of allele frequency, dissemination/spread, clonality across
480 lesions and anatomic types. Phenotyping clinical characteristics
481 could also monitor eutopic endometrium (16) and pathway
482 enrichment across mutations. Intra-lesion spatial heterogeneity
483 (such as in a large OMA or deep nodules) may warrant study
484 especially in relapse/persistent chronic disease and those
485 associated with malignant progression. Simple binary assessment
486 now seems insufficient and modeling with machine learning
487 approaches may be paramount to identify associations between
488 heterogeneous molecular profiles and heterogeneous clinical
489 presentation.

490

491 Figure Legends

492 **Figure 1:** Fraction of cohort affected by somatic hotspot mutations
493 detected in panel sequencing. (A) Overall split of cases with at
494 least one lesions having at least one somatic cancer-driver

495 alteration. (B) Numbers of detected somatic mutations, split by
496 affected gene, across our entire cohort. (C) Fraction of mutation
497 affected lesions, split by mutation type. (D) Fraction of mutation
498 affected lesions, split by lesion type. (E) Fraction of mutation
499 affected lesions, summarized by fraction of affected cases.

500 **Figure 2:** Clonal relationships in Case 3 patient presenting with
501 DIE of the vagina, DIE of the cul-de-sac, an OMA of the left ovary,
502 and EM of the rectum. (A) Detected somatic alteration from
503 sequencing and mutation surrogate IHC suggest identical/clonal
504 alteration in *KRAS*, *ERBB2*, and *PIK3CA* (p.Met1043Ile) between
505 OMA and two anatomically distinct lesions of DIE. Additional
506 *PIK3CA* alterations are also visible in the OMA and vaginal DIE.
507 Heterogeneous loss of ARID1A is observed in only the OMA and
508 EM (insufficient material was available for mutation testing in EM).
509 (B) Three possible dissemination models explaining the mutational
510 pattern: (1) top panel illustrates a linear pattern wherein clones
511 from the cul-de-sac travel to the vagina and acquired additional
512 alterations in *PIK3CA*. Subsequent transfer of all clones to the
513 ovary where subclonal-ARID1A loss occurs. It may further be
514 speculated that the EM resulted from a transfer of clones between
515 the vaginal DIE and OMA (as the initial site for ARID1A loss) or
516 subsequent spread after clones established on the ovary. Given
517 the lack of mutational data on the EM it may also be entirely
518 independent. (2) middle panel illustrates an example where a
519 complex set of clones exist at the ovary and only a subset of these

520 break-off and colonize vaginal, cul-de-sac and EM/rectal sites.

521 Finally, (3) Lower panel illustrates parallel dissemination from the

522 cul-de-sac lesion to both the vaginal and ovarian sites. Herein we

523 may consider sub-threshold signal from ddPCR of p.Arg88Gln,

524 p.Glu545Lys and p.Gly1049Ser PIK3CA alteration (Table S2) as

525 weak evidence of emerging/undetectable clones that

526 subsequently expand post-transfer of cells to both vagina and

527 ovary. In this model again, the OMA acquires loss-of function

528 ARID1A alterations. Additional possibilities may also explain the

529 mutational patterns. (C-D-E) photomicrographs showing ARID1A

530 IHC results including regions of loss (surrogate for loss-of function

531 mutation; black arrows) and normal (retained nuclear staining; red

532 arrows) in endometriosis epithelium.

533 **Figure 3:** Clonal relationships in Case 4 patient presenting with

534 DIE of the rectum, EM of the cul-de-sac and an OMA on the left

535 ovary. (A) Detected somatic alteration from sequencing suggest

536 all variants are shared between DIE and EM lesions. In contrast

537 the ovarian lesion shares only 1 *PIK3CA* and 1 *KRAS* alteration

538 with the other two and has no (detected) unique changes. (B)

539 Three possible dissemination models explaining the mutational

540 pattern: (1) top panel illustrates a linear model wherein clones

541 from the ovary travel to the rectum, expand and acquire additional

542 alteration. Cells from the DIE containing all clones then seed the

543 EM on the Cul-de-sac. (2) middle panel illustrates another linear

544 model of dissemination wherein a complex clonal population at the

545 Rectum seed the cul-de-sac. Subsequently only a subset of these
546 clone travel to and populate the ovary. Finally, (3) illustrates a
547 differing model of spread wherein a complex clonal population at
548 the Rectum seed the cul-de-sac with all clones. Only a subset with
549 a single *PIK3CA* and *KRAS* altered clone break-off to the ovary
550 (or alternatively only a subset with these specific alterations can
551 colonize the ovary).

552

553 Tables

554 **Table 1:** Cohort Overview. Each cell shows the number of lesions
555 available and tested from the noted anatomical site/type (number
556 in brackets denote lesions were not tested in panel sequencing).
557 Blue cell = shared alteration within case/between lesions marked
558 by blue cells in table (cells not in blue were uninformative/did not
559 show evidence of clonality with any other lesion from the given
560 case), Grey lines/cases were entirely uninformative (no mutation
561 detected in panel sequencing from any tested lesion).
562 Abbreviations: DIE= Deep infiltrating endometriosis, EM=
563 superficial endometriosis, OMA= endometrioma

564

565

566 References

- 567
568 1. Munksgaard PS, Blaakaer J. The association between
569 endometriosis and ovarian cancer: a review of histological,
570 genetic and molecular alterations. *Gynecol Oncol* **124**,
571 164-9 (2012). <https://10.1016/j.ygyno.2011.10.001>
572
- 573 2. Zondervan KT, Becker CM, Missmer SA. Endometriosis. *N*
574 *Engl J Med* **382**, 1244-56 (2020).
575 <https://10.1056/NEJMra1810764>
576
- 577 3. Giudice LC. Clinical practice. Endometriosis. *N Engl J Med*
578 **362**, 2389-98 (2010). <https://10.1056/NEJMc1000274>
579
- 580 4. Eskenazi B, Warner ML. Epidemiology of endometriosis.
581 *Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am* **24**, 235-58 (1997).
582
- 583 5. Bulun SE. Endometriosis. *N Engl J Med* **360**, 268-79
584 (2009). <https://10.1056/NEJMra0804690>
585
- 586 6. Vercellini P, Vigano P, Somigliana E, Fedele L.
587 Endometriosis: pathogenesis and treatment. *Nat Rev*
588 *Endocrinol* **10**, 261-75 (2014).
589 <https://10.1038/nrendo.2013.255>
590
- 591 7. Johnson NP, Hummelshoj L, Adamson GD, *et al.* World
592 Endometriosis Society consensus on the classification of
593 endometriosis. *Hum Reprod* **32**, 315-24 (2017).
594 <https://10.1093/humrep/dew293>
595
- 596 8. American Society for Reproductive Medicine. Revised
597 American Society for Reproductive Medicine classification
598 of endometriosis: 1996. *Fertil Steril* **67**, 817-21 (1997).
599
- 600 9. Anglesio MS, Papadopoulos N, Ayhan A, *et al.* Cancer-
601 Associated Mutations in Endometriosis without Cancer. *N*
602 *Engl J Med* **376**, 1835-48 (2017).
603 <https://10.1056/NEJMoa1614814>
604
- 605 10. Lac V, Verhoef L, Aguirre-Hernandez R, *et al.* Iatrogenic
606 endometriosis harbors somatic cancer-driver mutations.
607 *Hum Reprod* **34**, 69-78 (2019).
608 <https://10.1093/humrep/dey332>
609
- 610 11. Suda K, Nakaoka H, Yoshihara K, *et al.* Clonal Expansion
611 and Diversification of Cancer-Associated Mutations in
612 Endometriosis and Normal Endometrium. *Cell Rep* **24**,
613 1777-89 (2018). <https://10.1016/j.celrep.2018.07.037>

- 614
- 615 12. Piriye E, Schiermeier S, Romer T. Coexistence of
- 616 endometriomas with extraovarian endometriosis and
- 617 adhesions. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol **263**, 20-4
- 618 (2021). <https://10.1016/j.ejogrb.2021.05.044>
- 619
- 620 13. Exacoustos C, De Felice G, Pizzo A, *et al.* Isolated
- 621 Ovarian Endometrioma: A History Between Myth and
- 622 Reality. J Minim Invasive Gynecol **25**, 884-91 (2018).
- 623 <https://10.1016/j.jmig.2017.12.026>
- 624
- 625 14. Suda K, Cruz Diaz LA, Yoshihara K, *et al.* Clonal lineage
- 626 from normal endometrium to ovarian clear cell carcinoma
- 627 through ovarian endometriosis. Cancer Sci, (2020).
- 628 <https://10.1111/cas.14507>
- 629
- 630 15. Montgomery GW, Giudice LC. New Lessons about
- 631 Endometriosis - Somatic Mutations and Disease
- 632 Heterogeneity. N Engl J Med **376**, 1881-2 (2017).
- 633 <https://10.1056/NEJMe1701700>
- 634
- 635 16. Lac V, Nazeran TM, Tessier-Cloutier B, *et al.* Oncogenic
- 636 mutations in histologically normal endometrium: the new
- 637 normal? J Pathol **249**, 173-81 (2019).
- 638 <https://10.1002/path.5314>
- 639
- 640 17. Forbes SA, Bindal N, Bamford S, *et al.* COSMIC: mining
- 641 complete cancer genomes in the Catalogue of Somatic
- 642 Mutations in Cancer. Nucleic Acids Res **39**, D945-50
- 643 (2011). <https://10.1093/nar/gkq929>
- 644
- 645 18. Khalique S, Naidoo K, Attygalle AD, *et al.* Optimised
- 646 ARID1A immunohistochemistry is an accurate predictor of
- 647 ARID1A mutational status in gynaecological cancers. J
- 648 Pathol Clin Res **4**, 154-66 (2018). <https://10.1002/cjp2.103>
- 649
- 650 19. Kobel M, Piskorz AM, Lee S, *et al.* Optimized p53
- 651 immunohistochemistry is an accurate predictor of TP53
- 652 mutation in ovarian carcinoma. J Pathol Clin Res **2**, 247-58
- 653 (2016). <https://10.1002/cjp2.53>
- 654
- 655 20. Kobel M, Ronnett BM, Singh N, *et al.* Interpretation of P53
- 656 Immunohistochemistry in Endometrial Carcinomas: Toward
- 657 Increased Reproducibility. Int J Gynecol Pathol **38 Suppl**
- 658 **1**, S123-S31 (2019).
- 659 <https://10.1097/PGP.0000000000000488>
- 660
- 661 21. Yong PJ, Talhouk A, Anglesio MS. Somatic Genomic
- 662 Events in Endometriosis: Review of the Literature and
- 663 Approach to Phenotyping. Reprod Sci, (2021).
- 664 <https://10.1007/s43032-020-00451-9>

665
666 22. Noe M, Ayhan A, Wang TL, Shih IM. Independent
667 development of endometrial epithelium and stroma within
668 the same endometrios. J Pathol, (2018).
669 <https://10.1002/path.5082>
670
671 23. Fassbender A, Rahmioglu N, Vitonis AF, *et al.* World
672 Endometriosis Research Foundation Endometriosis
673 Phenome and Biobanking Harmonisation Project: IV.
674 Tissue collection, processing, and storage in endometriosis
675 research. Fertil Steril **102**, 1244-53 (2014).
676 <https://10.1016/j.fertnstert.2014.07.1209>
677
678 24. Rogers PA, Adamson GD, Al-Jefout M, *et al.* Research
679 Priorities for Endometriosis. Reprod Sci **24**, 202-26 (2017).
680 <https://10.1177/1933719116654991>
681
682 25. Bulun SE, Wan Y, Matei D. Epithelial Mutations in
683 Endometriosis: Link to Ovarian Cancer. Endocrinology
684 **160**, 626-38 (2019). <https://10.1210/en.2018-00794>
685
686 26. Artemova D, Vishnyakova P, Khashchenko E, *et al.*
687 Endometriosis and Cancer: Exploring the Role of
688 Macrophages. Int J Mol Sci **22**, (2021).
689 <https://10.3390/ijms22105196>
690
691 27. Olkowska-Truchanowicz J, Bialoszewska A,
692 Zwierzchowska A, *et al.* Peritoneal Fluid from Patients with
693 Ovarian Endometriosis Displays Immunosuppressive
694 Potential and Stimulates Th2 Response. Int J Mol Sci **22**,
695 (2021). <https://10.3390/ijms22158134>
696
697 28. Oda K, Hamanishi J, Matsuo K, Hasegawa K. Genomics to
698 immunotherapy of ovarian clear cell carcinoma: Unique
699 opportunities for management. Gynecol Oncol **151**, 381-9
700 (2018). <https://10.1016/j.ygyno.2018.09.001>
701
702 29. Lai CR, Hsu CY, Chen YJ, *et al.* Ovarian cancers arising
703 from endometriosis: a microenvironmental biomarker study
704 including ER, HNF1ss, p53, PTEN, BAF250a, and COX-2.
705 J Chin Med Assoc **76**, 629-34 (2013).
706 <https://10.1016/j.jcma.2013.07.008>
707
708 30. Saavalainen L, Lassus H, But A, *et al.* Risk of Gynecologic
709 Cancer According to the Type of Endometriosis. Obstet
710 Gynecol, (2018). <https://10.1097/AOG.0000000000002624>
711
712 31. Chandler RL, Damrauer JS, Raab JR, *et al.* Coexistent
713 ARID1A-PIK3CA mutations promote ovarian clear-cell
714 tumorigenesis through pro-tumorigenic inflammatory

715 cytokine signalling. Nat Commun **6**, 6118 (2015).
 716 <https://10.1038/ncomms7118>
 717
 718 32. Anglesio MS, Wang YK, Maassen M, *et al.* Synchronous
 719 Endometrial and Ovarian Carcinomas: Evidence of
 720 Clonality. J Natl Cancer Inst **108**, (2016).
 721 <https://10.1093/jnci/djv428>
 722

723 Acknowledgements

724 The authors thank all the study participants who contributed to this
 725 study. We further recognize the invaluable contributions of Prof.
 726 Dr. Sara Y. Brucker for continuous support of international
 727 collaborations between the University Hospital Tübingen and the
 728 University of British Columbia, as well as PD Dr. Annette Staebler
 729 and the staff of the Institute of Pathology, University Hospital
 730 Tübingen for facilitating access to pathology archives.
 731 Funding was provided by Canadian Institutes of Health Research
 732 (Early Career Investigator Grant in in Maternal, Reproductive,
 733 Child & Youth Health to MS Anglesio). M Köbel received support
 734 through the Calgary Laboratory Services research support fund
 735 (RS19-609). MS Anglesio is funded through a Michael Smith
 736 Foundation for Health Research Scholar Award (18274) and the
 737 Janet D. Cottrelle Foundation Scholars program (managed by the
 738 BC Cancer Foundation). This project received technical and data
 739 management support from Calgary Laboratory Services and the
 740 Genetic Pathology Evaluation Centre (GPEC). GPEC receive core
 741 support from BC's Gynecological Cancer Research team
 742 (OVCARE), and the VGH+UBC Hospital Foundation. M Köbel

743 was supported by internal research support (RS19-621). No
744 funder had any role in the study design, collection of data,
745 recruitment or participants, interpretation of results, manuscript
746 content, or decision to publish.

747

748 Compliance with ethical standards

749 *Conflict of interest*

750 The authors declare no competing interests.

751 *Ethics approval/consent to participate*

752 All work was done in compliance with the Canadian Tri-Council
753 Policy Statement (TCPS2 2018) on ethical conduct for research
754 involving humans. Effort to obtain written informed consent was
755 exercised for all patients. Specimen from non-contactable patients
756 (lost contact/deceased) treated more than 5 years before the start
757 of the study were included under institutionally approved waiver of
758 consent (Tübingen University Hospital Research Ethics Board).
759 Research Ethics Boards of all participating institutions approved
760 the study and use of materials.

761 *Author contributions*

762 MSA and SK designed the study and concept. THP, MG, BK, and
763 SK identified candidate patients and obtained consent. THP, VL,
764 and JS processed and enriched samples and conducted
765 molecular experiments. BTC, TMN and MK conducted and scored

766 immunohistochemical experiments and reviewed/confirmed
767 endometriosis pathology. THP, JS, and MSA analyzed and
768 interpreted data. THP, AL, and MSA wrote the original draft. PJY,
769 BK, SK reviewed finding and all authors approved the draft
770 manuscript. Final draft was completed by AL and MSA.

771 *Funding*

772 This study received funding from the Canadian Institutes of Health
773 Research, the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research, the
774 Janet D. Cottrelle Foundation, and the Calgary Laboratory
775 Services Research Support Fund.

776 *Data availability*

777 All data generated are available in this manuscript and
778 supplemental documents. Access to unprocessed/raw data from
779 the authors will be made available upon request, subject to REB
780 approval and applicable privacy laws.

Figure 1

Figure 2

A

Case 4 Detected Alterations				
Gene	Hotspot	DIE Rectum	OMA Left ovary	EM Cul-de-sac
PIK3CA	p.Glu542Lys	X		X
PIK3CA	p.Glu545Lys	X		X
PIK3CA	p.Gly1049Ser	X		X
PIK3CA	p.Met1043Ile	X	X	X
NRAS	p.Gly13Asp	X	X	X
CTNNB1	p.His36Tyr	X	X	X
CTNNB1	p.Gly34Glu	X		X
KRAS	p.Gly12Asp	X	X	X

B

Figure 3

Table 1 - Cohort overview

Overall View		DIE																	EM													OMA			Grand Total
	Case ID	appendix	bladder	cul-de-sac	left sacrouterine ligament	rectovaginal septum	rectum	right psoas	right sacrouterine ligament	right pelvic wall	left pelvic wall	right pararectal space	right fossa ovarica	sigmoid	incisional	vagina	umbilicus	bladder	cul-de-sac	rectum	right abdominal wall	right pelvic wall	left pelvic wall	right sacrouterine ligament	left sacrouterine ligament	colon	right ovary	left pararectal space	left ovary	pararectal space	right ovary				
Complex Cases	1						1																								1	2			
	2						1																								1	2			
	3			1													1				[1]									1		4			
	4						1												1											1		3			
	8	1																	1						[1]					1		3			
	13		1																				1								[1]		4		
Simple Cases	6								1															1									2		
	9	1																													1	2			
	19													1																	1	2			
	20					1													1													2			
	21		1		1	1				[1]																				1	6				
	22				1				1											1												3			
Uninformative Cases	24				1	1		1											[1]													4			
	5						1																					1				2			
	7															1								1								2			
	10		1																							[1]						2			
	11													1;[1]																[1]		3			
	12		1																											1		2			
	14													1																1		2			
	15						1										[1]													1		3			
	16					1																										2			
	17															1											1					2			
	18	1																														1	2		
	23																	1														1	2		
25										1													1							1		3			
26											1								[1]													2			
27									1				[1]	[1]					[1]										1			5			
Grand Total		3	4	1	4	3	5	1	4	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	7	70		

Each cell shows the number of lesions available and tested from the noted anatomical site/type (number in brackets denote lesions were not tested in panel sequencing and detected only in ddPCR). Blue cell = shared alteration within case/between lesions marked by blue cells in table (cells not in blue were uninformative/did not show evidence of clonality with any other lesion from the given case), Grey lines/cases were entirely uninformative (no mutation detected in panel sequencing from any tested lesion). Abbreviations: DIE= Deep infiltrating endometriosis, EM= superficial endometriosis, OMA= endometrioma