Title

Development and validation of blood-based predictive biomarkers for response to PD-(L)-1 checkpoint inhibitors: evidence of a universal systemic core of 3D immunogenetic profiling across multiple oncological indications.

Authors

Ewan Hunter¹, Mehrnoush Dezfouli¹, Christina Koutsothanasi¹, Adam Wilson¹, Francisco C. Santos¹, Matthew Salter¹, Jurjen W. Westra¹, Ryan Powell¹, Ann Dring¹, Benedict Egan¹, Matthew Parnall¹, Morgan Thacker¹, Jayne Green¹, Aroul Ramadass¹, Serene Ng², Chun Ren Lim², Cheah Soon Keat^{3, 4}, Ang Tick Suan³, Rakesh Raman³, Ho Kean Fatt³, Fabian Lee Wei Luen³, Thomas Guiel⁵, Robert Heaton, Jr⁵, Jedd Levine⁵, Alexandre Akoulitchev¹

1 Oxford BioDynamics Plc, Oxford, UK

2 Oxford BioDynamics (M) Sdn Bhd, Penang, Malaysia

3 Mount Miriam Cancer Hospital (MMCH), Penang, Malaysia

4 Island Hospital, Penang, Malaysia

5 Oxford BioDynamics Inc., Gaithersburg, MD, USA

Address correspondence to: alexandre.akoulitchev@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Authors e-mails:

Ewan Hunter: ewan.hunter@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Mehnoush Dezfouli: mehrnoush.dezfouli@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Christina Koutsothanasi: christina.koutsothanasi@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Adam Wilson: adam.wilson@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Francisco Coroado Santos: francisco.santos@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Matthew Salter: matthew.salter@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Jurjen Westra: willem.westra@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Ryan Powell: ryan.powell@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Ann Dring: ann.dring@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Benedict Egan: benedict.egan@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Matthew Parnall: matthew.parnall@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Morgan Thacker: morgan.thacker@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Jayne Green: jayne.green@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Serene Ng: serene.ng@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Chun Ren Lim: cr.lim@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Cheah Soon Keat: cheahsoonkeat@gmail.com

Ang Tick Suan: angst@mountmiriam.com

Rakesh Raman: rakeshraman@mountmiriam.com

Ho Kean Fatt: hokeanfatt@mountmiriam.com

Fabian Lee Wei Luen: fabien@mountmiriam.com

Thomas Guiel : thomas.guiel@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Robert Heaton: rbheatonjr@gmail.com

Jedd Levine: jeddlevine1@gmail.com

Alexandre Akoulitchev: alexandre.akoulitchev@oxfordbiodynamics.com

Abstract

Unprecedented advantages in cancer treatment with immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICI) remain limited to a subset of patients. Systemic analyses of the regulatory 3D genome architecture linked to individual epigenetics and immunogenetic controls associated with tumour immune evasion mechanisms and immune checkpoint pathways reveals a highly prevalent patient molecular profiles predictive of response to PD-(L)1 immune checkpoint inhibitors. A clinical blood test based on the set of 8 3D genomic biomarkers has been developed and validated on several independent cancer patient cohorts to predict response to PD-(L)1 immune checkpoint inhibition. The predictive 8 biomarker set is derived from prospective observational clinical trials, representing 229 treatments with Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab, Durvalumab, in diverse indications: melanoma, non-small cell lung, urethral, hepatocellular, bladder, prostate cancer, head and neck, vulvar, colon, breast, bone, brain, lymphoma, larynx cancer, and cervix cancers.

The 3D genomic 8 biomarker panel for response to immune checkpoint therapy achieved high accuracy up to 85%, sensitivity of 93% and specificity of 82%. This study demonstrates that a 3D genomic approach could be used to develop a predictive clinical assay for response to PD-(L)1 checkpoint inhibition in cancer patients.

Background

Insights into tumour immunology related to mechanisms of tumour immunosurveillance and anti-tumour immune responses have led to unprecedented advances in cancer treatment. This breakthrough in cancer treatment takes advantage of key mechanisms that mitigate tumour immune evasion by targeting immune checkpoints to enhance anti-tumour immunity and harnesses overall patient immune system. These agents have shown considerable clinical benefit in certain patient populations [1–3] .

Under physiological conditions immune checkpoint molecules regulate the immune system by dampening the immune response following successful mitigation of an infection and preventing the onset auto-immune conditions. One of the first identified inhibitory checkpoints - CD152, also known as T lymphocyte-associated protein (CTLA-4), has been shown to prevent expansion of CD4+ helper T cells, boost regulatory T cells, and promote a pro-tumour immuno-suppressive phenotype [4,5]. Strategies to antagonize CTLA-4 as means of increasing anti-tumour immunity, eventually lead to US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval of ipilimumab for treatment of metastatic melanoma [6] . With limited other therapeutic options to improve survival of advanced melanoma patients, ipilimumab demonstrated 2-year survival rate of 23.5%. However, consistent with auto-immunity observed in pre-clinical models targeting CTLA-4 [7,8], treatment with ipilimumab was associated with immune-related adverse effects in 60% of patients [9] .

Today the two most successfully exploited immune checkpoints are CD279, called programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1), expressed on tumour infiltrating lymphocytes, B cells, NK cells and myeloid cells; and its ligand CD274, called

programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1), expressed on tumour cells. The PD-L1/PD-1 interaction is a major mechanism leading to tumour immune evasion. Agents that interfere with this interaction have demonstrated potent and durable anti-tumour activities, with less severe immune related toxicity compared to CTLA-4 blockade [3]. Accordingly, in earlier clinical trials the anti-PD-1 antibodies nivolumab and pembrolizumab have been already proven effective in treatments of melanoma, non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), and colorectal cancer [10–14], while anti-PD-L1 antibodies, such as atezolizumab, avelumab, durvalumab – in treatments of NSCLC, urothelial carcinoma, triple negative breast cancer [15–18]. Additional cancer types are currently under active clinical investigation.

In addition to the expanding array of therapeutic agents targeting PD-(L)1 (dostarlimab, tyvyt, libtayo, tislelizumab, camrelizumab and sasanlimab), a series of novel immune checkpoint molecules are undergoing evaluation (LAG-3/CD223, TIM-3, TIGIT, VISTA, B7-H3/CD276, BTLA/CD272) [3].

Limitations of currently approved immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) include variable responses among cancer types, primary resistance in the majority of patients with objective responses observed in the minority, acquired resistance in most cancer types, and significant risk of immune related adverse side effects. The objective response rate (ORR) for anti-CTLA-4 ipilimumab (Yervoy) in melanoma was 10.9%, with high-grade treatment-related adverse event rate of 15% [9]; for anti-PD-1 pembrolizumab (Keytruda) in advanced melanoma – 33% ORR, with 14% high-grade treatment related adverse events

[19]; for anti-PD-L1 avelumab (Bavenco) in urothelial carcinoma 17% ORR, with 8% high-grade treatment adverse events [20].

In practical terms, oncologists prescribing an ICI must weigh the risk of immune-related adverse effects against the ORR and benefits of ICI treatment, with very limited data to guide the decision. This has led to multiple efforts to develop predictive biomarkers to identify patients who will benefit from treatment. The predictive value of tumour intrinsic factors such as tumour mutational burden (TMB), microsatellite instability (MSI) and DNA mismatch repair deficiencies (dMMR) has been supported by several studies [21–23]. In 2017 the FDA approved pembrolizumab for treatment of advanced paediatric and adult solid tumours with high MSI and dMMR, which have not responded to prior treatments and have no other alternative treatment options [3]. The association of genetic biomarkers such as TMB with response to ICI treatment is not observed in all patients [21], and has been reported to have limited predictive value in particular study context [24].

Also, the advanced technology and standardization required for such biopsy-based tests impose practical limitations on applicability of these biomarkers in practice-based clinical settings.

Assessment of tumour infiltrating lymphocytes has been evaluated for predictive value with mixed success [25], but standardization of histologic evaluation may improve reliability [26].

Earlier trials of anti-PD-(L)1 inhibitors reported association between tumour PD-L1 expression and response to treatment in melanoma and NSCLC [27,28]. In contrast, other reports showed that durable responses to ICI could be obtained

150 in the absence of tumour PD-L1 expression [29]. The variability in the definitions
 151 of PD-L1 positivity and in methods of its evaluation account for significant
 152 inconsistencies in predictive results, with calls for further standardization [3] .
 153 The 3D configuration of the genome plays a crucial role in coordinated gene
 154 regulation and homeostasis of cellular phenotype [30–32]. Three-dimensional
 155 genome architecture has been shown to act as the regulatory interface and
 156 integration point for genetic risks, epigenetic cues and modifications, metabolic
 157 signalling, and transcriptional events all integrated into manifestation of specific
 158 cellular phenotypes and, ultimately, clinical outcomes [30,33,34] . *EpiSwitch*®
 159 is a biomarker platform and methodology for patient stratification developed on
 160 the basis of the original chromosome conformation capture (3C) approach as a
 161 novel biomarker modality [35,36]. *EpiSwitch*® platform has reduced to practice
 162 all stages of the discovery, development, validation and monitoring of blood-
 163 based biomarkers, based on 3D genome architecture. To date, 3D genomic
 164 *EpiSwitch*® biomarkers, also known as chromosome conformation signatures
 165 (CCSs); have been used in blood test format to stratify melanoma patients;
 166 prognostically stratify patients with fast versus slow progressing motor neurone
 167 disease; stratify patients with symptomatic and pre-symptomatic
 168 neurodegenerative disease; diagnose patients with thyroid cancer and various
 169 stages of prostate cancer; prognostically stratify patients for outcome in diffuse
 170 large B cell lymphoma; predictively stratify patients with non-small cell lung
 171 cancer for response to the anti-PD-L1 immune checkpoint inhibitor avelumab;
 172 prognostically stratify high-risk individuals with immune-health profile
 173 susceptible to systemic hyperreaction and severe COVID disease
 174 complications upon infection with SARS-CoV-2 [37–52].

Based on predictive and prognostic methodologies developed with systemic 3D genomic biomarkers, we looked at the *EpiSwitch*® platform 3D genomic profiles in patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors to see if any could be used to predict responsiveness to ICI treatment. We have focused on the PD-(L)1 pathway target, as it is the most advanced in terms of clinically developed inhibitors. We have based our analysis on a prospective observational study with the use of several of the approved ICIs for a variety of oncological indications.

We have used the *EpiSwitch*® Explorer array platform for whole genome profiling of patients prior to ICI treatment, with subsequent classification of clinical outcome of response based on standard ORR criteria/ RECIST 1.1, as a standard in clinical practice and trials settings [53,54]. After analysing 1.1 million data points with annotations across the whole genome for each screened patient, we identified significant and reproducible differences in marker profiles of responders and non-responders, as potential marker leads. The top leads representing alternative 3D genomic conformations were then translated into a qPCR format, evaluated and reduced to a molecular classifier. The classifier was then validated on samples from the observational trial and from independent validation cohorts. Here we report on the development of the 3D genomic biomarker panel with clinical utility in predicting response to immune checkpoint inhibitors targeting PD-(L)1 across a variety of oncological indications. These biomarkers reflect prevalent regulatory settings at the level of 3D genomics in the dynamic equilibrium with the patient immune system. They are systemically present at baseline, prior to treatment and have

predictive value for response/non-response outcomes to ICI treatments, either with a PD-1 or PD-L1 monoclonal antibody antagonist.

Materials and Methods

Patient characteristics

Whole blood samples, 181 in total, were obtained from consented patients enrolled in observational trial “Identifying and Developing Chromosomal Conformation Signatures in Patients Undergoing Cancer Immunotherapy” at Mount Miriam Cancer Hospital (MMCH) in Penang, Malaysia. Additionally, 48 samples were procured commercially (**Supplemental Table 1**). Thirty-two (32) patients were used in *EpiSwitch*® screening and discovery stage, 77 in training model cohort, 24 and 128 patients in two independent validation cohorts. The subject pool represented a multinational set of ICI treated cases, with over 40 distinct oncological diagnoses, from the United States, Europe, and Asia. Patient indications, treatments, clinical outcomes, calls by *EpiSwitch*® classifier, sample use in different stages of the biomarker development are listed in (**Supplemental Table 1**). Disease response or progression to the therapy was assessed by the investigators according to RECIST 1.1 guidelines [53].

Preparation of 3D genomic templates

EpiSwitch® 3D libraries, with chromosome conformation analytes converted to sequence-based tags, were prepared from frozen whole blood samples. using *EpiSwitch*® protocols following the manufacturer's instructions for *EpiSwitch*® Explorer Array kits (Oxford BioDynamics Plc), samples were processed on the

Freedom EVO 200 robotic platform (Tecan Group Ltd). Briefly, 50 mL of whole blood sample was diluted and fixed with a formaldehyde containing EpiSwitch buffer. Density cushion centrifugation was used to purify intact nuclei. Following a short detergent-based step to permeabilise the nuclei, restriction enzyme digestion and proximity ligation were used to generate the 3D libraries. Samples were centrifuged to pellet the intact nuclei before purification with an adapted protocol from the QIAmp DNA FFPE Tissue kit (Qiagen) Eluting in 1x TE buffer pH7.5. 3D libraries were quantified using the Quant-iT™ Picogreen dsDNA Assay kit (Invitrogen) and normalised to 5 ng/ml prior to interrogation by PCR.

Array design

Custom microarrays were designed using the *EpiSwitch*® pattern recognition algorithm, which operates on Bayesian-modelling and provides a probabilistic score that a region is involved in long-range chromatin interactions. The algorithm was used to annotate the GRCh38 human genome assembly across ~1.1 million sites with the potential to form long-range chromosome conformations [29–36]. The most probable interactions were identified and filtered on probabilistic score and proximity to protein, long non-coding RNA, or microRNA coding sequences. Predicted interactions were limited to *EpiSwitch*® sites greater than 10 kb and less than 300 kb apart. Repeat masking and sequence analysis was used to ensure unique marker sequences for each interaction. The *EpiSwitch*® Explorer array (Agilent Technologies, Product Code X-HS-AC-02), containing 60-mer oligonucleotide probes was designed to interrogate potential 3D genomic interactions. In total, 964,631

experimental probes and 2,500 control probes were added to a 1 x 1 M CGH microarray slide design. The experimental probes were placed on the design in singlicate with the controls in groups of 250. The control probes consisted of six different *EpiSwitch*[®] interactions that are generated during the extraction processes and used for monitoring library quality. A further four external inline control probe designs were added to detect non-human (*Arabidopsis thaliana*) spike in DNA added during the sample labelling protocol to provide a standard curve and control for labelling. The external spike DNA consists of 400 bp ssDNA fragments from genomic regions of *A. thaliana*. Array-based comparisons were performed described previously, with the modification of only one sample being hybridised to each array slide in the Cy3 channel [46]

Translation of array-based 3D genomic markers to PCR readouts

The top array-derived markers identified in our previous study were interrogated using OBD's proprietary primer design software package to identify genomic positions suitable for a hydrolysis probe based real time PCR (RT-PCR) assay [47]. Briefly, the top array-derived markers associated with predictive potential to differentiate between response and non-response to ICI outcomes were filtered on logistic regression Glmnet coefficient. PCR primer probes were ordered from Eurofins genomics as salt-free primers. The probes were designed with a 5' FAM fluorophore, 3' IABkFQ quencher and an additional internal ZEN quencher and ordered from iDT (Integrated DNA Technologies) [55]. Each assay was optimised using a temperature gradient PCR with an annealing temperature range from 58-68° C. Individual PCR assays were tested across the temperature gradient alongside negative

controls including soluble and unstructured commercial TaqMan human genomic DNA control (Life Technologies) and used a TE buffer only negative control. Assay performance was assessed based on Cq values and reliability of detection and efficiency based on the slope of the individual amplification curves. Assays that passed the quality criteria and presented with reliable detection differences between the pooled samples associated with responders and non-responders to ICI treatment outcomes were used to screen individual patient samples.

EpiSwitch® PCR

Each patient sample was interrogated using RT-PCR in triplicate. Each reaction consisted of 50 ng of *EpiSwitch®* library template, 250 mM of each of the primers, 200 mM of the hydrolysis probe and a final 1X Kapa Probe Force Universal (Roche) concentration in a final 25 ml volume. The PCR cycling and data collection was performed using a CFX96 Touch Real-Time PCR detection system (Bio-Rad). The annealing temperature of each assay was changed to the optimum temperature identified in the temperature gradients performed during translation for each assay. Otherwise, the same cycling conditions were used: 98°C for 3 minutes followed by 45 cycles of 95°C for 10 seconds and 20 seconds at the identified optimum annealing temperature. The individual well Cq values were exported from the CFX manager software after baseline and threshold value checks. All Cq values obtained for individual samples and markers are available online (<https://github.com/oxfordBiodynamics/medrxiv/tree/main/CiRT%20publication>) A total of 20 3D genomic markers that passed the translation phase were

screened on 32 responder and non-responder samples as a marker reduction step based on statistical criteria to identify the top 8 discriminating markers. These markers were evaluated on 78 individual samples from the training cohort as part of classifier model design. They were then used to screen the independent validation cohorts of 24 and 128 samples.

Genomic mapping

The 24 3D genomic markers from the statistically filtered list with the greatest and lowest abundance scores were selected for genome mapping. Mapping was carried out using Bedtools closest function for the 3 closest protein coding loci – upstream, downstream and within the long-range chromosome interaction (Gencode v33). All markers were visualized using the *EpiSwitch*® Analytical Portal.

Statistical analysis

The 20 markers screened on 32 individual patient samples in Screen 1 and 2 were subject to permuted logistic modelling with bootstrapping for 500 data splits and non-parametric Rank Product analysis (*EpiSwitch*® RankProd R library). Two machine learning procedures (eXtreme Gradient Boosting: XGBoost and CatBoost) were used to further reduce the feature pool and identify the most predictive/prognostic, 3D genomic markers. The resulting markers were then used to build the final classifying models using CatBoost on 78 sample cohort. Catboost is a member of the Gradient Boosted Decision Trees (GBDT's) machine learning ensemble techniques [56]. All analysis was

performed using R statistical language with Caret, XGBoost, SHAPforxgboost and CatBoost libraries.

Biological network/pathway analysis

Protein interaction networks and pathway enrichment were generated using the Search Tool for the Retrieval of Interacting proteins (STRING) and Reactome Pathway Browser databases [57–59].

Results

Whole genome array profiling for discovery of predictive 3D genomic marker leads in baseline Immuno-Oncology (IO) patients at baseline

The *EpiSwitch*® array platform was used for whole genome screening and discovery of 3D genomic biomarker leads. It has been utilized to date on over 120 IO patients, generating over 104 million individual chromosome conformation data points. We based our initial selection of marker leads on the screening results from whole genome EpiSwitch array for 32 patients from the observational trial at Mount Miriam Cancer Hospital (MMCH). These patients were treated with either Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab or Durvalumab, and were diagnosed with one of the following indications: lung cancer, kidney cancer, nasopharyngeal cancer, sagittal sinus carcinoma, neuroendocrine tumour, vulvar carcinoma. Among the responders, those patients were

confirmed in the durable nature of their response and absence of acquired resistance.

From over 30 million data points, following the logistic regression Glmnet coefficient selection for baseline responders and non-responders we identified the top 72 marker leads associated with predictive value for response and non-response to ICI (Table 1).

It is important to point out that the most significant marker in this selection was associated with CD274 and PDCD1LG2 loci, at the junction of the genes encoding for PD-L1 and PD-L2 checkpoint inhibitors. Functionally this suggests a regulatory event associated with the predictive profile for response to ICI and leading to specific conditional differences among patients as captured systemically through regulatory 3D genomic profiles. This is consistent with earlier observations that PD-L1 expression levels, as reflected in HIT testing, could share predictive values under specific conditions [27,28].

Identification of the top predictive 3D genomic markers for ICI treatment outcomes

Following the establish methodology for *EpiSwitch*® marker reduction [43,47], we employed a stepwise approach to translate array-based marker leads and identify a minimal set of biomarkers for predictive stratification of ICI treatment response outcome (Figure 1). From over 30 million data points on array profiling, the top 72 markers were used for translation into qPCR format. The design and sequencing restrictions on the primers and fluorescent probes corresponding to the array probe sites of genome long-ranged junction points, has reduced 72 markers to 24 qPCR designs (denoted in Table 1). At the

experimental stage of temperature gradient optimization 20 qPCR marker designs have passed quality control (Table 2).

All 20 markers then underwent feature reduction in several steps (Materials and Methods). Firstly, they were evaluated in Screen 1 on pooled samples from 32 patients representing either responders, non-responders or stable disease. These sample cohorts represented patients treated with Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab and Durvalumab (marked in Supplemental Table 1). Based on the results from screen 1 the top 13 markers were advanced to screen 2, where 13 markers were run on 26 patients individually, further reducing the selection to top 8 markers (Table 2).

The 8 selected markers were further evaluated on the training cohort of 77 patients (see Supplemental Table 1). Blood samples taken from patients prior to initiation of ICI therapy were used together with clinical assessment for response status according to RECIST 1.1 criteria. Baseline clinical characteristics were similar between responders and non-responders (Supplemental Table 1). The training cohort of 77 patients represented ICI treatments: Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab and Durvalumab, with cancers from lung, pancreas, bladder, kidney, larynx, salivary gland, liver, breast, colon, nasopharynx, meninges, and vulva.

We used these 8 markers to generate the 3D genomic classifier with predictive ability for ICI response, which we then applied to the independent test cohorts.

Testing of the predictive 3D genomic biomarker panel for response to ICI treatments on independent patient cohorts

To access the predictive power of the classifier model, the 8-marker 3D genomic panel was validated on an independent baseline Test cohort #1 (Supplemental Table 1). No samples from that cohort were used to build and refine the model. Samples were collected at the Mount Miriam Cancer Hospital observational study and shipped to OBD's processing facility in Oxford, UK. The EpiSwitch platform readouts for the eight-marker classifier model were uploaded to the EpiSwitch Analytical Portal for analysis. Clinical outcomes for the test cohort #1 included a balanced representation of 12 responders and 8 non-responders and 3 stable diseases. It is important to mention that from the start of the model classification design all the stable disease cases were considered to be non-responders. EpiSwitch predictive calls based on 8-marker model demonstrated high performance of 83% balanced accuracy and 83% positive predictive value in the test cohort #1 (Figure 2A). Across all 101 patients used in this study in both training and testing cohorts, the test demonstrated positive predictive value 96% and balanced accuracy of 96% (Figure 2B). The patients represented ICI treatments: Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab and Durvalumab, and indications including cancer from cervix, kidney, liver, lung, neuroendocrine, meninges vulva.

We have further extended our validation exercise, obtaining additional 128 samples as Test cohort #2 (Supplemental Table 1). In contrast to the balanced testing cohort #1, these 128 base line patients represented largely non-responder group, with only 9 responders present. EpiSwitch predictive calls based on 8-marker model demonstrated 76% accuracy, 78% sensitivity and 76% specificity on 128 patients in the test cohort #2 (Figure 3A). Across all 229

patients used in this study, with 170 non-responders and 59 responders in training and both testing cohorts, the test demonstrated accuracy of 85%, sensitivity 93%, specificity 82%, with positive predictive value 64%, and negative predictive value 97% (Figure 3B). The combined cohort of patients represented treatments with anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 ICI therapies, including: Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab, Durvalumab, in a variety of indications including cancer from: pancreas, soft tissue (alveolar soft part sarcoma), bile duct (cholangiocarcinoma), bladder, cervix, vulva, kidney, larynx, parotid gland (mucoepidermoid carcinoma), colon, liver, breast, lung (adenocarcinoma, small cell carcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma), lymphoepithelial carcinoma, prostate, stomach, high-grade neuroendocrine tumor, melanoma, nasopharynx, meninges, oral cavity, brain, and maxilla.

Discussion

Cancer treatment has been revolutionized by the development of therapies that target the immune checkpoint response [3]. However, only a minority of patients benefit from ICI therapies today. With high prevalence of immune-related adverse events accompanying ICI treatments, clinical decisions and evaluation of risk-benefit ratio would greatly benefit from the development of molecular biomarkers to predict clinical response.

Here we used a 3D genomics biomarker approach, which has already demonstrated successful development of valuable prognostic and predictive biomarkers in oncology and autoimmune conditions [52,60,61]. We have identified 8 systemic 3D genomic biomarkers, that when assessed as a molecular classifier in blood samples from a diverse group of baseline patients

treated with anti-PD-(L)1 immune checkpoint inhibitors, gave an early readout of likely response or non-response to ICI therapies prior to treatment initiation. Importantly, as a reflection of the network regulation, the identified 3D genomic markers are associated with genes related to the regulation of the immune system (Figure 4). This is consistent with the concept that ICI therapies exert their therapeutic effects on tumour cells by enhancing the cell-mediated immune response [3]. The captured 3D genomic differences observed between responder and non-responder baseline patients also identified 3D biomarkers corresponding to genetic loci and pathways (Figure 5) including NF- κ B and TGF- β , whose biologic functions are related to checkpoint response [62–64].

The top 3D genomic markers identified by the EpiSwitch Explorer Array profile as associated at baseline with response/non-response to ICI treatment were also analysed using the Search Tool for Retrieval of Interacting Genes (STRING) database. The view from the established protein-protein networks confirmed that the coding regions associated with EpiSwitch top 24 marker leads are highly connected (Figure 6). In fact, no additional nodes were added to generate the network based on the 24 EpiSwitch marker leads. This is consistent with the regulatory network formed by the 3D genome architecture, as an integrator of molecular multi-omics mechanisms [30] and being concordant with controls of the protein expression and cellular phenotype.

Among other interesting observations is the high prevalence of the validated 3D marker responsible for conditional regulatory long-range interactions in the region spanning CD274(PD-L1) and PDCD1LG2 (PD-L2) (Figure 7). In fact, this systemic predictive marker has been consistently observed across multiple

cohorts of IO patients, indicating that the complex network regulation manifestly shares predictive values both at the systemic 3D genomic level and at the level of PD-L1 gene expression in established IHC testing [3]. The EpiSwitch Portal view of this marker (Figure 7) identifies variable allelic frequency SNPs and the affected transcriptional factor (TF) binding motifs around the marker anchor sites. Three TFs were identified at the proximal anchor site of the marker: NFIC, ZEB1, MZF1. Analysis of GeneHancer repository (GeneCards) shows evidence of enhancer controls (Gene association score) over CD274 (PD-L1) for the distal anchor site of the same marker. All together this strongly suggests that the regulatory effect of the EpiSwitch marker over the PD-L1 locus is executed through coordinated activities of the CD274 enhancer and ZEB1 TF activities, well in line with other independent studies [65,66].

Altogether, this indicates that the predictive model developed in this study has high biological relevance and is anchored on baseline presence of a prevalent systemic 3D genomic profile, functionally linked to immuno-genetic settings conducive to clinical outcome of response to PD-(L)1 blockade. The systemic nature of the observed marker profile is not surprising since the 3D genomic approach described here was done on whole blood samples, with dominant lymphocytic representation. The fact that some T-cell related loci were found to bear conditional regulatory differences in 3D genome architecture, in association with clinical phenotypes of responder/non-responder profiles, is a fascinating regulatory phenomenon. It is consistent with multiple observations of the role 3D genome architecture plays in regulation of oncological phenotype and clinical outcomes [30].

497

498 A simple blood-based assay that provides a readout of likely response to PD-
 499 (L)1 ICI therapy could be a valuable asset for oncologists considering ICI
 500 therapy, since only a minority of patients experience durable tumour responses.
 501 For example, ORR for metastatic NSCLC is 24% and 16%, for treatment-naïve
 502 and previously treated patients, respectively [67]. A positive PD-L1 expression
 503 result from an immunohistochemistry (IHC) test, which increases ORR to
 504 39.7% (PD-L1 50% or greater) [67]. Many of the remaining patients derive no
 505 clinical benefit, suffering significant drug-related adverse events (~14%) or
 506 even death from pulmonary toxicity (>1%) [68]. Moreover, approximately 15%
 507 of non-responders may also be at risk of hyper-progressive disease (HPD),
 508 accelerated by ICI therapy and shortening their lives by months [69]. Today,
 509 despite a low response rate, many patients are prescribed ICI therapies at a
 510 substantial financial cost to both payers and patients [70]. All together, these
 511 aspects highlight the importance of a response predictive assay to improve
 512 patient selection for optimized treatment, better overall treatment-decision
 513 planning, potential utilization of alternative effective treatments, and avoiding
 514 futile care and unnecessarily toxicity, and efficiently managing costs and
 515 resources [70].

516

517 The current study represents a proof-of-concept that 3D genomic changes,
 518 measurable in blood, can be used as biomarkers of response prediction to PD-
 519 (L)1 ICIs in oncology. In this study all patients underwent ICI treatment, with no
 520 comparator arm undergoing control treatment or basic standard of care. The
 521 single-arm design of this study does not allow us to definitively differentiate

between predictive and prognostic values of the classifier. Extension of this work to a larger number of advanced patients with different ICI therapies and with a comparator treatment arm, could help further validate the predictive value of the developed EpiSwitch ICI biomarker classifier. A pan-therapy application of the test with response prediction across tumour types with historically low ORRs could help to improve both patient outcomes and increase the cost effectiveness of cancer care [71,72].

Conclusions

With the rapid advancement of novel therapies targeting the immune checkpoint pathway, there is a pressing need to develop better biomarkers to assess likely clinical response in advance of therapeutic intervention. Here we report on a novel 3D genomics approach to identify predictive blood-based markers that can identify, with high accuracy, individuals that are likely to respond to PD-(L)1 ICIs monotherapy across tumour types with low ORRs. The 3D genomics approach described here has been developed into a clinical assay to assist in treatment decisions, help improve patient selection for optimized treatment, help better utilize alternative effective treatments, minimize or avoid unnecessarily toxicity, and efficiently manage costs and resources.

Figures & Tables

Figure 1

Figure 1. Workflow for development and testing the 3D genomic classifier model for prediction of ICI treatment response outcome. From EpiSwitch array screening profiles accounting for over 30 million data points, 72 top array markers were selected based on Glmnet logistic regression. 24 markers qualified for translation into EpiSwitch qPCR format, of which 20 markers have

passed quality control and feature reduction control on 32 patient samples. Training cohort of 77 patients was used to build predictive classifier model based on 8 qPCR marker. It was then validated on independent cohorts of 24 and 128 patients.

Figure 2

A	Response to ICI				
	Test	R	n	NR	n
	R	True Positive	10	False Positive	2
	NR	False Negative	2	True Negative	10
	Total		12		12
Results					
	Statistic		Value		95 % CI
	Sensitivity		83.33%		51.59% to 97.91%
	Specificity		83.33%		51.59% to 97.91%
	Positive Likelihood Ratio		5.00		1.38 to 18.17
	Negative Likelihood Ratio		0.20		0.06 tot 0.73
	Disease prevalence*		50.00%		29.12% to 94.78%
	Positive Predictive Value*		83.33%		51.59% to 97.91%
	Negative Predictive Value*		83.33%		51.59% to 97.91%
	Accuracy*		83.33%		62.62% to 95.26%

B	Response to ICI				
	Test	R	n	NR	n
	R	True Positive	48	False Positive	2
	NR	False Negative	2	True Negative	49
	Total		50		51
Results					
	Statistic		Value		95 % CI
	Sensitivity		96.00%		86.29 % to 99.51%
	Specificity		96.08%		86.54 % to 99.52%
	Positive Likelihood Ratio		24.48		6.29 to 95.35
	Negative Likelihood Ratio		0.04		0.01 tot 0.16
	Disease prevalence*		49.50%		39.40% to 59.64%
	Positive Predictive Value*		96.00%		86.04 % to 98.94%
	Negative Predictive Value*		96.08%		86.29 % to 98.96%
	Accuracy*		96.04%		90.17% to 98.91%

Figure 2. Performance of the prognostic biomarker classifier for calling response (R) and non-response (NR) to ICI treatment outcome. (A) Confusion matrix and test performance statistics for the 8-marker classifier on the 24 patients of the test cohort and (B) in the combined Train and Test cohorts of 102 patients. Note: (*) These values are dependent on disease prevalence.

Figure 3

A

Response to ICI					
Test	R	n	NR	n	Total
R	True Positive	7	False Positive	29	36
NR	False Negative	2	True Negative	90	90
Total		9		119	

Results

Statistic	Value	95 % CI
Sensitivity	77.78%	39.99% to 97.19%
Specificity	75.63%	66.91% to 83.03%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	3.19	1.99 to 5.11
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.29	0.09 to 1.00
Disease prevalence*	7.03%	3.27% to 12.93%
Positive Predictive Value*	19.44%	13.09% to 27.89%
Negative Predictive Value*	97.83%	92.96% to 99.35%
Accuracy*	75.78%	67.42% to 82.91%

B

Response to ICI					
Test	R	n	NR	n	Total
R	True Positive	55	False Positive	31	86
NR	False Negative	4	True Negative	139	143
Total		59		170	

Results

Statistic	Value	95 % CI
Sensitivity	93.22%	83.54% to 98.12%
Specificity	81.76%	75.13% to 87.26%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	5.11	3.69 to 7.08
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.08	0.03 to 0.21
Disease prevalence*	25.76%	20.23% to 31.94%
Positive Predictive Value*	63.95%	56.16% to 71.07%
Negative Predictive Value*	97.20%	93.08% to 98.90%
Accuracy*	84.72%	79.39% to 89.12%

Figure 3. Performance of the prognostic biomarker classifier for calling response (R) and non-response (NR) to ICI treatment outcome. (A) Confusion matrix and test performance statistics for the 8-marker classifier on the 128 patients of the test cohort and (B) in the combined Train and Test cohorts of 240 patients. Note: (*) These values are dependent on disease prevalence

Figure 4

1	Marker	Gene	Distance	Rank_Model
2	OBD189_q065_q067	ITK	0	1
3	OBD189_q065_q067	CYFIP2	0	1
4	OBD189_q053_q055	CPB2	0	2
5	OBD189_q053_q055	LCP1	0	2
6	OBD189_q081_q083	IFT88	0	3
7	OBD189_q081_q083	IL17D	3493	3
8	OBD148_q893_q895	CCL8	0	4
9	OBD148_q893_q895	CCL13	0	4
10	OBD148_q893_q895	CCL1	0	4
11	OBD189_q049_q051	TNFSF8	0	5
12	OBD189_q049_q051	TNFSF15	49628	5
13	OBD189_q049_q051	TNC	90160	5
14	OBD189_q029_q031	TNFRSF25	0	6
15	OBD189_q029_q031	PLEKHG5	0	6
16	OBD189_q057_q059	PDCD1LG2	0	7
17	OBD189_q057_q059	CD274	25427	7
18	OBD189_q005_q007	CASP6	0	8
19	OBD189_q005_q007	PLA2G12A	0	8
20	OBD189_q005_q007	CFI	0	8

587 **Figure 4. Mapping of the top 8 predictive 3D genetic markers.** Genes –
 588 genes associated with location of the 8 top 3D genomic markers analyzed in
 589 this study. Distance – actual distance of the 3D long-range interaction marker
 590 from the gene ORF. Rank_Model – ranking order of the markers in the classifier
 591 model.

592

593

594

595 **Figure 5**

596

	Score	Name	# Matched Genes (Total Genes)	Sources
+	23.30	SuperPath: PEDF Induced Signaling	8 (745)
+	21.90	SuperPath: NF-kappaB Signaling	6 (327)
+	19.89	SuperPath: Akt Signaling	7 (682)
+	19.83	SuperPath: PAK Pathway	7 (686)
+	17.18	SuperPath: CCR5 Pathway in Macrophages	5 (322)
+	16.80	SuperPath: Translocation of ZAP-70 to Immunological Synapse	3 (46)
+	16.44	SuperPath: Apoptosis and Survival Anti-apoptotic TNFs/NF-kB/Bcl-2 Pathway	3 (50)
+	16.11	SuperPath: TNF Superfamily - Human Ligand-Receptor Interactions and Their Associated Functions	3 (54)
+	14.67	SuperPath: ERK Signaling	7 (1185)
+	13.25	SuperPath: Integrin Pathway	5 (570)
+	13.19	SuperPath: Chemokine Superfamily: Human/Mouse Ligand-Receptor Interactions	3 (107)
+	12.74	SuperPath: Death Receptor Signaling	3 (119)
+	12.14	SuperPath: Innate Immune System	8 (2124)
+	10.88	SuperPath: Cell Adhesion_Cell-matrix Glycoconjugates	2 (39)
+	10.82	SuperPath: TRAF Pathway	3 (188)
+	10.42	SuperPath: TNFR1 Pathway	3 (207)
+	9.56	SuperPath: IL 10 Signaling Pathway	2 (62)
+	8.87	SuperPath: TGF-Beta Pathway	4 (653)
+	8.63	SuperPath: CD28 Co-stimulation	2 (86)
+	8.57	SuperPath: Complement and Coagulation Cascades	2 (88)

Figure 5. Mapping of the top 8 predictive 3D genomic markers to biological pathways. Analysis of the top 8 3D genomic markers separating PD-(L)1 ICI responders and non-responders at baseline.

Figure 6

Figure 6. STRING Network associated with baseline prediction of response /non-response to ICI treatment. The proteins encoded by genes in the top 3D genomic markers associated with baseline response/non-response to ICI profile show a highly connected network. The yellow nodes mark the coding regions associated with the top 8 markers of the validated classifier.

Figure 7

Figure 7. EpiSwitch Data Portal view of the EpiSwitch Marker located in CD274/PDCD1LG2 region. Anchor sites brought into juxtaposition by chromosome long range interactions of the EpiSwitch marker, overlap with the listed SNPs and enhancers. Analysis of SNPs identified affected binding sites for transcription factors (TFs) such as ZEB1 [65]. GeneCards analysis of the enhancers identifies CD274 enhancer at the distal anchor site of the EpiSwitch marker. CD274 corresponds to PD-L1, and PDCD1LG2 to PD-L2 immune checkpoints.

631 *Table 1*

Probe ^a	Glmnet_Coeff ^b	P.Value	adj.P.Val ^c	FC ^d	Primers Design ID ^e	Primer1 ^f	Primer2 ^g	Gene ^h
Hg38_9_5495992_5572986_RR	0.247101522	0.01213344	0.039106564	1.18337794	OBID189-q0s57/q059	GAGGGTCACTCACTGCCCCAACAGGC	GACTGTAAAGGTAGAAATCCTGCCTGGGT	PDCD1LG2_CD274
Hg38_9_5495992_5572986_RR	0.247101522	0.01213344	0.039106564	1.18337794	OBID189-q057/q059	GAGGGTCACTCACTGCCCCAACAGGC	GACTGTAAAGGTAGAAATCCTGCCTGGGT	CD274
Hg38_9_5495992_5572986_RR	0.247101522	0.01213344	0.039106564	1.18337794	OBID189-q057/q059	GAGGGTCACTCACTGCCCCAACAGGC	GACTGTAAAGGTAGAAATCCTGCCTGGGT	RIC1
Hg38_13_20664875_20698635_FF	0.111815729	0.039447494	0.258498898	1.165419467	OBID189-q081/q083	GAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	GGGCTGTGCTCTGATAAACCCATTGTTA	IFT88
Hg38_13_20664875_20698635_FF	0.111815729	0.039447494	0.258498898	1.165419467	OBID189-q081/q083	GAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	GGGCTGTGCTCTGATAAACCCATTGTTA	IL17D
Hg38_13_20664875_20698635_FF	0.111815729	0.039447494	0.258498898	1.165419467	OBID189-q081/q083	GAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	GGGCTGTGCTCTGATAAACCCATTGTTA	N6AMT2
Hg38_13_46087370_46193039_RF	0.132758731	0.097937296	0.391249484	1.09303819	OBID189-q053/q055	TAGAAGCAGGGAGTAGTTGAGCAATGGG	TCTTCACTTGCTGCTATTGGCTTTCCAGC	CPB2
Hg38_13_46087370_46193039_RF	0.132758731	0.097937296	0.391249484	1.09303819	OBID189-q053/q055	TAGAAGCAGGGAGTAGTTGAGCAATGGG	TCTTCACTTGCTGCTATTGGCTTTCCAGC	LCP1
Hg38_13_46087370_46193039_RF	0.132758731	0.097937296	0.391249484	1.09303819	OBID189-q053/q055	TAGAAGCAGGGAGTAGTTGAGCAATGGG	TCTTCACTTGCTGCTATTGGCTTTCCAGC	LRR063
Hg38_15_98731539_98790114_FF	0.165726908	108961414	0.410037537	1.08563184	OBID189-q001/q003	GGCTGGTGGGAGTATTTTCAAAGAGAAC	GCTCTGTTCAAGTGGCTCTGTCCA	IGF1R
Hg38_15_98731539_98790114_FF	0.165726908	108961414	0.410037537	1.08563184	OBID189-q001/q003	GGCTGGTGGGAGTATTTTCAAAGAGAAC	GCTCTGTTCAAGTGGCTCTGTCCA	PGPEP1L
Hg38_15_98731539_98790114_FF	0.165726908	108961414	0.410037537	1.08563184	OBID189-q001/q003	GGCTGGTGGGAGTATTTTCAAAGAGAAC	GCTCTGTTCAAGTGGCTCTGTCCA	FAM169B
Hg38_8_42264241_42332799_FR	0.10211307	160069169	0.484452574	1.079808853	OBID148_261/263	CGGTGAGCACGGTCTGCTACTT	GTCTCGGGTCTGGGTGAAAGTC	IKBKB
Hg38_8_42264241_42332799_FR	0.10211307	160069169	0.484452574	1.079808853	OBID148_261/263	CGGTGAGCACGGTCTGCTACTT	GTCTCGGGTCTGGGTGAAAGTC	POLB
Hg38_8_42264241_42332799_FR	0.10211307	160069169	0.484452574	1.079808853	OBID148_261/263	CGGTGAGCACGGTCTGCTACTT	GTCTCGGGTCTGGGTGAAAGTC	DKK4
Hg38_1_6461604_6515315_FR	0.049660907	171178937	0.498342453	1.125005092	OBID189-q029/q031	TGCCCGTCGTGGTTCCGCCCTTCA	AGAGACCCACCCAGCCTCCTGA	TNFRSF25
Hg38_1_6461604_6515315_FR	0.049660907	171178937	0.498342453	1.125005092	OBID189-q029/q031	TGCCCGTCGTGGTTCCGCCCTTCA	AGAGACCCACCCAGCCTCCTGA	PLEKHG5
Hg38_1_6461604_6515315_FR	0.049660907	171178937	0.498342453	1.125005092	OBID189-q029/q031	TGCCCGTCGTGGTTCCGCCCTTCA	AGAGACCCACCCAGCCTCCTGA	ESPN
Hg38_4_109703339_109741090_RF	0.050864625	218283899	0.551427137	1.109210269	OBID189-q005/q007	CCCCAACTCACAACACCCAGAC	AGAGGAGGGCAAGGTGCTGGCT	CASP6
Hg38_4_109703339_109741090_RF	0.050864625	218283899	0.551427137	1.109210269	OBID189-q005/q007	CCCCAACTCACAACACCCAGAC	AGAGGAGGGCAAGGTGCTGGCT	PLA2G12A
Hg38_4_109703339_109741090_RF	0.050864625	218283899	0.551427137	1.109210269	OBID189-q005/q007	CCCCAACTCACAACACCCAGAC	AGAGGAGGGCAAGGTGCTGGCT	CFI
Hg38_8_81007411_81099880_FR	0.115763362	224881246	0.55802192	1.062648413	OBID189-q061/q063	TGGACAGCCACTACTCAACCTTTTCTTA	CAAACCCAGATTGGACCTCACAGCCCC	PAG1
Hg38_8_81007411_81099880_FR	0.115763362	224881246	0.55802192	1.062648413	OBID189-q061/q063	TGGACAGCCACTACTCAACCTTTTCTTA	CAAACCCAGATTGGACCTCACAGCCCC	ZNF704
Hg38_8_81007411_81099880_FR	0.115763362	224881246	0.55802192	1.062648413	OBID189-q061/q063	TGGACAGCCACTACTCAACCTTTTCTTA	CAAACCCAGATTGGACCTCACAGCCCC	FABP5
Hg38_1_161633494_161661864_RF	0.027579594	247573207	0.581047746	1.148972903	OBID189-q041/q043	TTGCCACCTGTCTCAGATACCCCTGGTT	GCTGCTCCTCTTGCTGGGAATGCCTATT	FCGR2B
Hg38_1_161633494_161661864_RF	0.027579594	247573207	0.581047746	1.148972903	OBID189-q041/q043	TTGCCACCTGTCTCAGATACCCCTGGTT	GCTGCTCCTCTTGCTGGGAATGCCTATT	FCGR3B
Hg38_1_161633494_161661864_RF	0.027579594	247573207	0.581047746	1.148972903	OBID189-q041/q043	TTGCCACCTGTCTCAGATACCCCTGGTT	GCTGCTCCTCTTGCTGGGAATGCCTATT	FCRLA
Hg38_5_157178319_157271762_RR	0.026456597	298498007	0.628568025	1.13173441	OBID189-q065/q067	TGTATGTCTCCTGAGGTGAAGCAAGAGG	CTTCCACCGTGCCCCGACGCCAGC	ITK
Hg38_5_157178319_157271762_RR	0.026456597	298498007	0.628568025	1.13173441	OBID189-q065/q067	TGTATGTCTCCTGAGGTGAAGCAAGAGG	CTTCCACCGTGCCCCGACGCCAGC	CYFIP2
Hg38_5_157178319_157271762_RR	0.026456597	298498007	0.628568025	1.13173441	OBID189-q065/q067	TGTATGTCTCCTGAGGTGAAGCAAGAGG	CTTCCACCGTGCCCCGACGCCAGC	FAM71B
Hg38_9_114957908_114977746_RF	-0.026269829	301172707	0.630926161	-1.124920787	OBID148-q917/q919	TTGCTTGTGAGTTTGTATGCAG	AAGCCAAATGGGCCTAGCCA	TNFSF25
Hg38_9_114957908_114977746_RF	-0.026269829	301172707	0.630926161	-1.124920787	OBID148-q917/q919	TTGCTTGTGAGTTTGTATGCAG	AAGCCAAATGGGCCTAGCCA	TNC
Hg38_9_114957908_114977746_RF	-0.026269829	301172707	0.630926161	-1.124920787	OBID148-q917/q919	TTGCTTGTGAGTTTGTATGCAG	AAGCCAAATGGGCCTAGCCA	TNFSF15
Hg38_18_62330039_62362521_FR	-0.102570352	301374789	0.631092221	-1.070331563	OBID189-q037/q039	CCTACTGGCACCAGTGTGTTGGCTGG	TATCATAATCAGGCAACTGGCTGGTGC	TNFRSF11A
Hg38_18_62330039_62362521_FR	-0.102570352	301374789	0.631092221	-1.070331563	OBID189-q037/q039	CCTACTGGCACCAGTGTGTTGGCTGG	TATCATAATCAGGCAACTGGCTGGTGC	KIAA1468
Hg38_18_62330039_62362521_FR	-0.102570352	301374789	0.631092221	-1.070331563	OBID189-q037/q039	CCTACTGGCACCAGTGTGTTGGCTGG	TATCATAATCAGGCAACTGGCTGGTGC	PIGN
Hg38_9_136904007_136941363_RF	0.021876797	302188532	0.631834649	1.115259064	OBID189-q009/q011	AGCACTCGTCTGTTGGCGTGATG	CGGCACACCTCTACTCTCAGCCT	RABL6
Hg38_9_136904007_136941363_RF	0.021876797	302188532	0.631834649	1.115259064	OBID189-q009/q011	AGCACTCGTCTGTTGGCGTGATG	CGGCACACCTCTACTCTCAGCCT	TRAF2
Hg38_9_136904007_136941363_RF	0.021876797	302188532	0.631834649	1.115259064	OBID189-q009/q011	AGCACTCGTCTGTTGGCGTGATG	CGGCACACCTCTACTCTCAGCCT	FBXW5
Hg38_17_34316073_34373948_RF	-0.243856053	359171973	0.67918219	-1.036704719	OBID148-q893/q895	ACTTTGGCTTCCCTTAGGCC	TCCTTTGCAGGTATGGACATC	CCL8
Hg38_17_34316073_34373948_RF	-0.243856053	359171973	0.67918219	-1.036704719	OBID148-q893/q895	ACTTTGGCTTCCCTTAGGCC	TCCTTTGCAGGTATGGACATC	CCL13
Hg38_17_34316073_34373948_RF	-0.243856053	359171973	0.67918219	-1.036704719	OBID148-q893/q895	ACTTTGGCTTCCCTTAGGCC	TCCTTTGCAGGTATGGACATC	CCL1
Hg38_13_20664875_20744490_FR	0.080919132	460746676	0.752684253	1.036210668	OBID189-q073/q075	GGAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	GGTAAGATGAGGCTGTGGCGAAGGAGC	IFT88
Hg38_13_20664875_20744490_FR	0.080919132	460746676	0.752684253	1.036210668	OBID189-q073/q075	GGAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	GGTAAGATGAGGCTGTGGCGAAGGAGC	IL17D
Hg38_13_20664875_20744490_FR	0.080919132	460746676	0.752684253	1.036210668	OBID189-q073/q075	GGAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	GGTAAGATGAGGCTGTGGCGAAGGAGC	N6AMT2
Hg38_11_77430379_77519103_RF	0.150008419	482939086	0.766977325	1.027489411	OBID189-q033/q035	CATAACCACTGCTACCAACACACCTA	CTGGTATTTCGGACACTCATAGGACTGG	PAK1
Hg38_11_77430379_77519103_RF	0.150008419	482939086	0.766977325	1.027489411	OBID189-q033/q035	CATAACCACTGCTACCAACACACCTA	CTGGTATTTCGGACACTCATAGGACTGG	CLNS1A
Hg38_11_77430379_77519103_RF	0.150008419	482939086	0.766977325	1.027489411	OBID189-q033/q035	CATAACCACTGCTACCAACACACCTA	CTGGTATTTCGGACACTCATAGGACTGG	AQP11
Hg38_8_42264241_42292124_FR	0.028350069	486591863	0.769305711	1.0425716	OBID189-q025/q027	GGTGAGCACGGTCTGTCTACTTTCCC	GAACCCAGGCTCTGCTGCTACAG	IKBKB
Hg38_8_42264241_42292124_FR	0.028350069	486591863	0.769305711	1.0425716	OBID189-q025/q027	GGTGAGCACGGTCTGTCTACTTTCCC	GAACCCAGGCTCTGCTGCTACAG	POLB
Hg38_8_42264241_42292124_FR	0.028350069	486591863	0.769305711	1.0425716	OBID189-q025/q027	GGTGAGCACGGTCTGTCTACTTTCCC	GAACCCAGGCTCTGCTGCTACAG	PLAT
Hg38_18_62296384_62386748_FF	0.055316179	499574836	0.777354809	1.031115956	OBID189-q045/q047	CATAGACCCAGGTGTGCTCCGTGGCAGC	GAGCACTGGTTCCCGCAAATACTGGG	KIAA1468
Hg38_18_62296384_62386748_FF	0.055316179	499574836	0.777354809	1.031115956	OBID189-q045/q047	CATAGACCCAGGTGTGCTCCGTGGCAGC	GAGCACTGGTTCCCGCAAATACTGGG	TNFRSF11A
Hg38_18_62296384_62386748_FF	0.055316179	499574836	0.777354809	1.031115956	OBID189-q045/q047	CATAGACCCAGGTGTGCTCCGTGGCAGC	GAGCACTGGTTCCCGCAAATACTGGG	PIGN
Hg38_9_114855753_114929419_FR	0.134189513	52698868	0.793876125	1.033468601	OBID189-q049/q051	CCATTGTTGCTCAGGCTGCCCTCTTGC	GCATTCAAGTGACAGAGAGAAAAGAGGC	TNFSF8
Hg38_9_114855753_114929419_FR	0.134189513	52698868	0.793876125	1.033468601	OBID189-q049/q051	CCATTGTTGCTCAGGCTGCCCTCTTGC	GCATTCAAGTGACAGAGAGAAAAGAGGC	TNFSF15
Hg38_9_114855753_114929419_FR	0.134189513	52698868	0.793876125	1.033468601	OBID189-q049/q051	CCATTGTTGCTCAGGCTGCCCTCTTGC	GCATTCAAGTGACAGAGAGAAAAGAGGC	TNC
Hg38_8_26561792_26644530_FR	0.055843287	625162161	0.848039488	1.042292141	OBID189-q069/q071	CAGTATGAGTGTCTGTGGCTGCTCCCA	CGGTGTCTCTCAGGGAAGGCAGGATGC	DPYSL2
Hg38_8_26561792_26644530_FR	0.055843287	625162161	0.848039488	1.042292141	OBID189-q069/q071	CAGTATGAGTGTCTGTGGCTGCTCCCA	CGGTGTCTCTCAGGGAAGGCAGGATGC	PNMA2
Hg38_8_26561792_26644530_FR	0.055843287	625162161	0.848039488	1.042292141	OBID189-q069/q071	CAGTATGAGTGTCTGTGGCTGCTCCCA	CGGTGTCTCTCAGGGAAGGCAGGATGC	BNIP3L
Hg38_8_127691489_127740424_FR	-0.000580983	676617738	0.873913467	1.034088403	OBID189-q013/q015	GTCACCTTCATCTCCTTCTCACAGCAG	GCTTCGCTTACCAGAGTGCCTGC	MYC
Hg38_8_127691489_127740424_FR	-0.000580983	676617738	0.873913467	1.034088403	OBID189-q013/q015	GTCACCTTCATCTCCTTCTCACAGCAG	GCTTCGCTTACCAGAGTGCCTGC	AC108925.1
Hg38_8_127691489_127740424_FR	-0.000580983	676617738	0.873913467	1.034088403	OBID189-q013/q015	GTCACCTTCATCTCCTTCTCACAGCAG	GCTTCGCTTACCAGAGTGCCTGC	POU5F1B
Hg38_9_120888366_120919710_RR	0.018753385	784545989	0.922028968	1.010214644	OBID189-q017/q019	CCCAGTTGTCCAGGTTGCTGCCT	CCTGGAGCAGAACCTGTGCAGACC	PHF19
Hg38_9_120888366_120919710_RR	0.018753385	784545989	0.922028968	1.010214644	OBID189-q017/q019	CCCAGTTGTCCAGGTTGCTGCCT	CCTGGAGCAGAACCTGTGCAGACC	TRAF1
Hg38_9_120888366_120919710_RR	0.018753385	784545989	0.922028968	1.010214644	OBID189-q017/q019	CCCAGTTGTCCAGGTTGCTGCCT	CCTGGAGCAGAACCTGTGCAGACC	C5
Hg38_13_20664875_20691044_FF	-0.023912747	80365095	0.929901824	-1.012741717	OBID189-q077/q079	GGAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	CCACCCAGTTCCTCCAGGCATAGCAGG	IFT88
Hg38_13_20664875_20691044_FF	-0.023912747	80365095	0.929901824	-1.012741717	OBID189-q077/q079	GGAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	CCACCCAGTTCCTCCAGGCATAGCAGG	IL17D

Hg38_13_20664875_20691044_FF	-0.023912747	80365095	0.929901824	-1.012741717	OBD189-q077/q079	GGAAGTGCCACGAGAAGGAGGATGGTCC	CCACCCAGTTCTCCAGGCATAGCAGG	N6AMT2
Hg38_5_168579937_168620163_RR	0.019685283	8953453	0.964751362	-1.005369684	OBD189-q021/q023	CCGACCCTAACATTCAAGGTGTCTCTAT	GAGTCAGCGTGTAGTGCTCCAC	PANK3
Hg38_5_168579937_168620163_RR	0.019685283	8953453	0.964751362	-1.005369684	OBD189-q021/q023	CCGACCCTAACATTCAAGGTGTCTCTAT	GAGTCAGCGTGTAGTGCTCCAC	SLIT3
Hg38_5_168579937_168620163_RR	0.019685283	8953453	0.964751362	-1.005369684	OBD189-q021/q023	CCGACCCTAACATTCAAGGTGTCTCTAT	GAGTCAGCGTGTAGTGCTCCAC	FBLL1

632 ^a Internal Array probe ID
633 ^b Glment Coefficient
634 ^c Adjusted P.Value
635 ^d Fold Change
636 ^e Internal Primers Design ID
637 ^f Primer sequence.
638 ^g Gene at the locus of the probe
639

640 **Table 1. Array based 3D genomic marker leads for baseline response to**
641 **ICI. Top array-based 3D genomic markers identified from over 30 million data**
642 **points in 32 responders and non-responders across several indications and**
643 **several choices of ICI: Pembrolizumab, Atezolizumab or Durvalumab. Probe –**
644 **array-based marker coordinates for long-range interaction junction; Glmnet**
645 **Coefficient, P value, Adjusted P value and Fold Change (FC) are array-based**
646 **measures of markers in comparison of responders and non-responders groups;**
647 **Primer Design ID – qPCR primer probes designs corresponding to array**
648 **probes. 24 optimal in silico designs (marked in green) were taking forward to**
649 **quality control checks in temperature gradient analysis. Gene – identity of**
650 **genes of interest in the location of 3D genomic markers.**

651

652 **Table 2**

Episwitch Interaction ^a	Primers Design ID ^b	Probe Used	Opt Ann Tm ^c	QC Optimisation ^d	Screen 1	Screen 2
CASP6_4_109703339_109741090_RF	OBD189-q005/q007	OBD189-p005	68	Passed	Passed	Passed
IGF1R_15_98731539_98790114_FF	OBD189-q001/q003	OBD189-p003	64.4	Passed		Failed
IKBKB_8_42264241_42292124_FR	OBD189-q025/q027	OBD189-p025	66.4	Passed		Failed
IKBKB_8_42264241_42332799_FR	OBD148_261/263	OBD189-p261	68	Passed		Failed
IL17D_13_20664875_20691044_FF	OBD189-q077/q079	OBD189-p077	67.5	Passed		Failed
ITK_5_157178319_157271762_RR	OBD189-q065/q067	OBD189-p065	66.4	Passed	Passed	Passed
MYC_8_127691489_127740424_FR	OBD189-q013/q015	OBD189-p013	66.4	Passed		Failed
ORF102_17_34316073_34373948_RF	OBD148-q893/q895	OBD148-p893	62	Passed	Passed	Passed
ORF197_8_26561792_26644530_FR	OBD189-q069/q071	N/A ^e	N/A	Failed		Failed
ORF243_1_161633494_161661864_RF	OBD189-q041/q043	OBD189-p043	62	Passed		Failed
ORF313_13_20664875_20698635_FF	OBD189-q081/q083	OBD189-p081	64.4	Passed	Passed	Passed
ORF313_13_20664875_20744490_FR	OBD189-q073/q075	N/A	N/A	Failed		Failed
ORF369_13_46087370_46193039_RF	OBD189-q053/q055	OBD189-p053	67.5	Passed	Passed	Passed
ORF479_8_81007411_81099880_FR	OBD189-q061/q063	OBD189-p061	64.4	Passed		Failed

ORF480_11_77430379_77519103_RF	OBD189-q033/q035	OBD189-p033	66.4	Passed		Failed
ORF482_5_168579937_168620163_RR	OBD189-q021/q023	OBD189-p021	66.4	Passed		Failed
ORF698_18_62296384_62386748_FF	OBD189-q045/q047	OBD189-p045	66.4	Passed		Failed
ORF698_18_62330039_62362521_FR	OBD189-q037/q039	N/A	N/A	Failed		Failed
ORF703_1_6461604_6515315_FR	OBD189-q029/q031	OBD189-p031	67.5	Passed	Passed	Passed
ORF705_9_114855753_114929419_FR	OBD189-q049/q051	OBD189-p049	66.4	Passed	Passed	Passed
ORF712_9_120888366_120919710_RR	OBD189-q017/q019	OBD189-p017	68	Passed		Failed
PDCD1LG2_9_5495992_5572986_RR	OBD189-q057/q059	OBD189-p057	67.5	Passed	Passed	Passed
TNFSF8_9_114957908_114977746_RF	OBD148-q917/q919	N/A	N/A	Failed		Failed
TRAF2_9_136904007_136941363_RF	OBD189-q009/q011	OBD189-p009	64.4	Passed		Failed

^a Internal EpiSwitch Interaction ID

^b Internal Primers Design ID

^c Optimum Annealing Time

^d Quality Control Optimisation

^e Not Available

Table 2. Translation and selection of top markers into qPCR format.

Temperature gradient optimization for primer probe designs of the top 24 markers. Markers that failed quality control and feature reduction in Screen 1 and Screen 2 are marked. EpiSwitch interaction – marker position; Primer Design ID and Probe Used – primer and probe identities; Opt Ann Tm – optimized annealing T for detection; QC Optimization – temperature gradients testing; Screen 1 – selection on pooled groups of responders and non-responders; Screen 2 – final selection on the basis of individual patients profiling.

Declarations

EH, MD, CK, AW, FCS, MS, RP, AD, BE, MP, AR, and AA are full-time employees at Oxford BioDynamics plc and have no other competing financial interests.

Author Contributions

EH, AA conceived the study, SN, CRL, CSK, ATS, RR, HKF, FLWL assisted with study design and clinical samples collection. AD, MS, EH and AR assisted with EpiSwitch® array design. JWM, AB and ZL assisted with design of experiments. MD and AA planned and reviewed experiments. CK, AW, FCS and EH analysed the data. MD, RP, AD, MP, BE performed experiments, with support from MT. JWW, RH, JL helped with interpretation of the data and writing of the manuscript. JWW, MD, EH, and AA. wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Professor Jane Mellor, University of Oxford, for helpful discussions; members of OBD Louis James, Thomas Lavin, Catriona Williams, Aemilia Katzinski, Paulina Braier, Pieter Harvey, and Kalsoom Rana for their operational support, Olly Hunter for assistance in data analysis. In addition, we acknowledge Agilent Technologies, Inc. for supply of EpiSwitch® designed CGH microarray slides.

Competing interests

703 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

704

705 **Consent for publication**

706 Written informed consent for publication was obtained from all authors.

707

708 **Availability of data and materials**

709 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from
710 the corresponding author on reasonable request.

711

712

713 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

714 All patients signed informed consent forms prior to providing blood samples. All
715 ethical guidelines were followed.

716

717 **Funding**

718 This work is part of the programme funded by Oxford BioDynamics Plc and by
719 award “Development and validation of baseline blood-based epigenetic
720 biomarkers for predicting non-responders to ICB monotherapies” by PACT,
721 FNIH, USA (2021-PACT001).

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732 **References**

733

734 1. Pardoll DM. The blockade of immune checkpoints in cancer
735 immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2012;12(4):252–64.

736 2. Wykes MN, Lewin SR. Immune checkpoint blockade in infectious diseases.
737 *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2018;18(2):91–104.

738 3. Morad G, Helmink BA, Sharma P, Wargo JA. Hallmarks of response,
739 resistance, and toxicity to immune checkpoint blockade. *Cell*.
740 2021;184(21):5309–37.

741 4. Doyle AM, Mullen AC, Villarino AV, Hutchins AS, High FA, Lee HW, et al.
742 Induction of Cytotoxic T Lymphocyte Antigen 4 (Ctla-4) Restricts Clonal
743 Expansion of Helper T Cells. *J Exp Medicine*. 2001;194(7):893–902.

744 5. Wing K, Onishi Y, Prieto-Martin P, Yamaguchi T, Miyara M, Fehervari Z, et
745 al. CTLA-4 control over Foxp3+ regulatory T cell function. *Sci New York N Y*.
746 2008;322(5899):271–5.

747 6. O'Day SJ, Maio M, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gajewski TF, Pehamberger H,
748 Bondarenko IN, et al. Efficacy and safety of ipilimumab monotherapy in
749 patients with pretreated advanced melanoma: a multicenter single-arm phase
750 II study. *Ann Oncol*. 2010;21(8):1712–7.

751 7. Leach DR, Krummel MF, Allison JP. Enhancement of Antitumor Immunity
752 by CTLA-4 Blockade. *Science*. 1996;271(5256):1734–6.

753 8. Tivol EA, Borriello F, Schweitzer AN, Lynch WP, Bluestone JA, Sharpe AH.
754 Loss of CTLA-4 leads to massive lymphoproliferation and fatal multiorgan
755 tissue destruction, revealing a critical negative regulatory role of CTLA-4.
756 *Immunity*. 1995;3(5):541–7.

757 9. Hodi FS, O'Day SJ, McDermott DF, Weber RW, Sosman JA, Haanen JB, et
758 al. Improved Survival with Ipilimumab in Patients with Metastatic Melanoma.
759 *New Engl J Medicine*. 2010;363(8):711–23.

760 10. Brahmer J, Reckamp KL, Baas P, Crinò L, Eberhardt WEE, Poddubskaya
761 E, et al. Nivolumab versus Docetaxel in Advanced Squamous-Cell Non-
762 Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New Engl J Medicine*. 2015;373(2):123–35.

763 11. Robert C, Long GV, Brady B, Dutriaux C, Maio M, Mortier L, et al.
764 Nivolumab in Previously Untreated Melanoma without BRAF Mutation. *New*
765 *Engl J Med*. 2015;372(4):320–30.

766 12. Garon EB, Rizvi NA, Hui R, Leighl N, Balmanoukian AS, Eder JP, et al.
767 Pembrolizumab for the Treatment of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New Engl*
768 *J Med*. 2015;372(21):2018–28.

- 769 13. Patnaik A, Kang SP, Rasco D, Papadopoulos KP, Ellassaiss-Schaap J,
770 Beeram M, et al. Phase I Study of Pembrolizumab (MK-3475; Anti-PD-1
771 Monoclonal Antibody) in Patients with Advanced Solid Tumors. Clin Cancer
772 Res. 2015;21(19):4286–93.
- 773 14. Topalian SL, Sznol M, McDermott DF, Kluger HM, Carvajal RD, Sharfman
774 WH, et al. Survival, Durable Tumor Remission, and Long-Term Safety in
775 Patients With Advanced Melanoma Receiving Nivolumab. J Clin Oncol.
776 2014;32(10):1020–30.
- 777 15. Iwata H, Inoue K, Kaneko K, Ito Y, Tsugawa K, Hasegawa A, et al.
778 Subgroup analysis of Japanese patients in a Phase 3 study of atezolizumab in
779 advanced triple-negative breast cancer (IMpassion130). Jpn J Clin Oncol.
780 2019;49(12):1083–91.
- 781 16. Kaufman HL, Russell JS, Hamid O, Bhatia S, Terheyden P, D'Angelo SP,
782 et al. Updated efficacy of avelumab in patients with previously treated
783 metastatic Merkel cell carcinoma after ≥1 year of follow-up: JAVELIN Merkel
784 200, a phase 2 clinical trial. J Immunother Cancer. 2018;6(1):7.
- 785 17. Powles T, Durán I, Heijden MS van der, Loriot Y, Vogelzang NJ, Giorgi
786 UD, et al. Atezolizumab versus chemotherapy in patients with platinum-
787 treated locally advanced or metastatic urothelial carcinoma (IMvigor211): a
788 multicentre, open-label, phase 3 randomised controlled trial. Lancet.
789 2018;391(10122):748–57.
- 790 18. Rittmeyer A, Barlesi F, Waterkamp D, Park K, Ciardiello F, Pawel J von, et
791 al. Atezolizumab versus docetaxel in patients with previously treated non-
792 small-cell lung cancer (OAK): a phase 3, open-label, multicentre randomised
793 controlled trial. Lancet. 2017;389(10066):255–65.
- 794 19. Ribas A, Hamid O, Daud A, Hodi FS, Wolchok JD, Kefford R, et al.
795 Association of Pembrolizumab With Tumor Response and Survival Among
796 Patients With Advanced Melanoma. Jama. 2016;315(15):1600–9.
- 797 20. Patel MR, Ellerton J, Infante JR, Agrawal M, Gordon M, Aljumaily R, et al.
798 Avelumab in metastatic urothelial carcinoma after platinum failure (JAVELIN
799 Solid Tumor): pooled results from two expansion cohorts of an open-label,
800 phase 1 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2018;19(1):51–64.
- 801 21. Snyder A, Makarov V, Merghoub T, Yuan J, Zaretsky JM, Desrichard A, et
802 al. Genetic basis for clinical response to CTLA-4 blockade in melanoma. New
803 Engl J Medicine. 2014;371(23):2189–99.
- 804 22. Rizvi NA, Hellmann MD, Snyder A, Kvistborg P, Makarov V, Havel JJ, et
805 al. Mutational landscape determines sensitivity to PD-1 blockade in non-small
806 cell lung cancer. Science. 2015;348(6230):124–8.

- 807 23. Le DT, Durham JN, Smith KN, Wang H, Bartlett BR, Aulakh LK, et al.
808 Mismatch repair deficiency predicts response of solid tumors to PD-1
809 blockade. *Science*. 2017;357(6349):409–13.
- 810 24. Riaz N, Havel JJ, Makarov V, Desrichard A, Urba WJ, Sims JS, et al.
811 Tumor and Microenvironment Evolution during Immunotherapy with
812 Nivolumab. *Cell*. 2017;171(4):934-949.e16.
- 813 25. Tumei PC, Harview CL, Yearley JH, Shintaku IP, Taylor EJM, Robert L,
814 et al. PD-1 blockade induces responses by inhibiting adaptive immune
815 resistance. *Nature*. 2014;515(7528):568–71.
- 816 26. Hendry S, Salgado R, Gevaert T, Russell PA, John T, Thapa B, et al.
817 Assessing Tumor-Infiltrating Lymphocytes in Solid Tumors: A Practical
818 Review for Pathologists and Proposal for a Standardized Method from the
819 International Immuno-Oncology Biomarkers Working Group: Part 2: TILs in
820 Melanoma, Gastrointestinal Tract Carcinomas, Non-Small Cell Lung
821 Carcinoma and Mesothelioma, Endometrial and Ovarian Carcinomas,
822 Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck, Genitourinary Carcinomas,
823 and Primary Brain Tumors. *Adv Anat Pathol*. 2017;24(6):311–35.
- 824 27. Herbst RS, Soria J-C, Kowanetz M, Fine GD, Hamid O, Gordon MS, et al.
825 Predictive correlates of response to the anti-PD-L1 antibody MPDL3280A in
826 cancer patients. *Nature*. 2014;515(7528):563–7.
- 827 28. Reck M, Rodríguez-Abreu D, Robinson AG, Hui R, Csőszi T, Fülöp A, et
828 al. Pembrolizumab versus Chemotherapy for PD-L1–Positive Non–Small-Cell
829 Lung Cancer. *New Engl J Medicine*. 2016;375(19):1823–33.
- 830 29. Daud AI, Wolchok JD, Robert C, Hwu W-J, Weber JS, Ribas A, et al.
831 Programmed Death-Ligand 1 Expression and Response to the Anti–
832 Programmed Death 1 Antibody Pembrolizumab in Melanoma. *J Clin Oncol*.
833 2016;34(34):4102–9.
- 834 30. Tordini F, Aldinucci M, Milanesi L, Liò P, Merelli I. The Genome
835 Conformation As an Integrator of Multi-Omic Data: The Example of Damage
836 Spreading in Cancer. *Frontiers Genetics*. 2016;7:194.
- 837 31. Bonev B, Cavalli G. Organization and function of the 3D genome. *Nat Rev*
838 *Genet*. 2016;17(11):661–78.
- 839 32. Stadhouders R, Filion GJ, Graf T. Transcription factors and 3D genome
840 conformation in cell-fate decisions. *Nature*. 2019;569(7756):345–54.
- 841 33. Huang J, Li K, Cai W, Liu X, Zhang Y, Orkin SH, et al. Dissecting super-
842 enhancer hierarchy based on chromatin interactions. *Nat Commun*.
843 2018;9(1):943.

- 844 34. Iulio J di, Bartha I, Wong EHM, Yu H-C, Lavrenko V, Yang D, et al. The
845 human noncoding genome defined by genetic diversity. *Nat Genet.*
846 2018;50(3):333–7.
- 847 35. Kempfer R, Pombo A. Methods for mapping 3D chromosome architecture.
848 *Nat Rev Genetics.* 2019;21(4):207–26.
- 849 36. Dekker J, Rippe K, Dekker M, Kleckner N. Capturing Chromosome
850 Conformation. *Science.* 2002;295(5558):1306–11.
- 851 37. Jakub JW, Grotz TE, Jordan P, Hunter E, Pittelkow M, Ramadass A, et al.
852 A pilot study of chromosomal aberrations and epigenetic changes in
853 peripheral blood samples to identify patients with melanoma. *Melanoma Res.*
854 2015;25(5):406–11.
- 855 38. Carini C, Hunter E, Porter D, McInnes I, Reid D, Ralston SH, et al.
856 Chromosome conformation signatures define predictive markers of
857 inadequate response to methotrexate in early rheumatoid arthritis. *J Transl*
858 *Med.* 2018;16(1):18.
- 859 39. W. J James, E. G Travis, Philip J, Ewan H, Mark P, Aroul R, et al. A pilot
860 study of chromosomal aberrations and epigenetic changes in peripheral blood
861 samples to identify patients with melanoma. *Melanoma Res [Internet].*
862 2015;25(5):1–1. Available from:
863 [http://content.wkhealth.com/linkback/openurl?sid=WKPTLP:landingpage&an=](http://content.wkhealth.com/linkback/openurl?sid=WKPTLP:landingpage&an=00008390-9000000000-99549)
864 [00008390-9000000000-99549](http://content.wkhealth.com/linkback/openurl?sid=WKPTLP:landingpage&an=00008390-9000000000-99549)
- 865 40. Emanuela B, Magdalena J, Megan F, Katarzyna J, Emily C, Mehrnoush D,
866 et al. Chromatin barcodes as biomarkers for melanoma. *Pigm Cell Melanoma*
867 *R [Internet].* 2014;27(5):788–800. Available from:
868 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24807349>
- 869 41. Salter M, Corfield E, Ramadass A, Grand F, Green J, Westra J, et al.
870 Initial Identification of a Blood-Based Chromosome Conformation Signature
871 for Aiding in the Diagnosis of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. *Ebiomedicine.*
872 2018;33:169–84.
- 873 42. Yan H, Hunter E, Akoulitchiev A, Park P, Winchester DJ, Moo-Young TA,
874 et al. Epigenetic chromatin conformation changes in peripheral blood can
875 detect thyroid cancer. *Surgery.* 2019;165(1):44–9.
- 876 43. Hunter E, McCord R, Ramadass AS, Green J, Westra JW, Mundt K, et al.
877 Comparative molecular cell-of-origin classification of diffuse large B-cell
878 lymphoma based on liquid and tissue biopsies. *Transl Medicine Commun.*
879 2020;5(1):5.
- 880 44. Salter M, Powell R, Back J, Grand F, Koutsothanasi C, Green J, et al.
881 Genomic architecture differences at the HTT locus associated with
882 symptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases of Huntington’s disease in a pilot
883 study. *F1000research.* 2019;7:1757.

- 884 45. Alshaker H, Mills R, Hunter E, Salter M, Ramadass A, Skinner BM, et al.
885 Chromatin conformation changes in peripheral blood can detect prostate
886 cancer and stratify disease risk groups. J Transl Med. 2021;19(1):46.
- 887 46. Hunter E, Koutsothanasi C, Wilson A, Santos FC, Salter M, Powell R, et
888 al. 3D genomic capture of regulatory immuno-genetic profiles in COVID-19
889 patients for prognosis of severe COVID disease outcome. Biorxiv.
890 2021;2021.03.14.435295.
- 891 47. Ewan H, Christina K, Adam W, C. S Francisco, Matthew S, W. W Jurjen,
892 et al. Development and validation of blood-based prognostic biomarkers for
893 severity of COVID disease outcome using EpiSwitch 3D genomic regulatory
894 immuno-genetic profiling. Medrxiv [Internet]. 2021;2021.06.21.21259145.
895 Available from:
896 <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/06/28/2021.06.21.21259145.abstract>
- 897 48. Fan C, Yiwen F, Kee T Hong, Yufen G, Hui C Jocelyn Yeen, Howe K
898 Bryan Thean, et al. Super-Enhancers and Broad H3K4me3 Domains Form
899 Complex Gene Regulatory Circuits Involving Chromatin Interactions. Sci Rep-
900 uk [Internet]. 2017;7(1):2186–2186. Available from:
901 <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-02257-3>
- 902 49. Salter M, Powell R, Back J, Grand F, Koutsothanasi C, Green J, et al.
903 Genomic architecture differences at the HTT locus associated with
904 symptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases of Huntington’s disease in a pilot
905 study. Edelweiss Psychiatry Open Access. 2021;1–6.
- 906 50. Subhankar M, Selvam R Aroul, Alexandre A, Siamon G. Formation of
907 distinct chromatin conformation signatures epigenetically regulate
908 macrophage activation. Int Immunopharmacol [Internet]. 2014;18(1):7–11.
909 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24211766>
- 910 51. Hunter E, Akoulitchiev A. Clinical and Statistical Considerations in
911 Personalized Medicine. In: Carini C, Menon SM, Chang M, editors. Current
912 Advances in Epigenetics. 2014.
- 913 52. P S, E H, S P, S Z, M D, J B, et al. Development and validation of
914 baseline predictive biomarkers for response to avelumab in second-line (2L)
915 non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) using EpiSwitch epigenetic profiling.
916 Journal for Immunotherapy of Cancer. 2019;(7).
- 917 53. Aykan NF, Özatlı T. Objective response rate assessment in oncology:
918 Current situation and future expectations. World J Clin Oncol. 2020;11(2):53–
919 73.
- 920 54. Levy BP, Giaccone G, Besse B, Filip E, Garassino MC, Gomez MD, et al.
921 Randomised phase 2 study of pembrolizumab plus CC-486 versus
922 pembrolizumab plus placebo in patients with previously treated advanced
923 non-small cell lung cancer. Eur J Cancer. 2019;108:120–8.

924 55. Tsourkas A, Behlke MA, Xu Y, Bao G. Spectroscopic Features of Dual
925 Fluorescence/Luminescence Resonance Energy-Transfer Molecular
926 Beacons. *Anal Chem.* 2003;75(15):3697–703.

927 56. Hancock JT, Khoshgoftaar TM. CatBoost for big data: an interdisciplinary
928 review. *J Big Data.* 2020;7(1):94.

929 57. Szklarczyk D, Morris JH, Cook H, Kuhn M, Wyder S, Simonovic M, et al.
930 The STRING database in 2017: quality-controlled protein–protein association
931 networks, made broadly accessible. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2017;45(D1):D362–8.

932 58. Fabregat A, Sidiropoulos K, Viteri G, Forner O, Marin-Garcia P, Arnau V,
933 et al. Reactome pathway analysis: a high-performance in-memory approach.
934 *Bmc Bioinformatics.* 2017;18(1):142.

935 59. Fabregat A, Korninger F, Viteri G, Sidiropoulos K, Marin-Garcia P, Ping P,
936 et al. Reactome graph database: Efficient access to complex pathway data.
937 *Plos Comput Biol.* 2018;14(1):e1005968.

938 60. Hunter E, McCord R, Ramadass AS, Green J, Westra JW, Mundt K, et al.
939 Comparative molecular cell-of-origin classification of diffuse large B-cell
940 lymphoma based on liquid and tissue biopsies. *Transl Medicine Commun.*
941 2020;5(1):5.

942 61. Carini C, Hunter E, Porter D, McInnes I, Reid D, Ralston SH, et al.
943 Chromosome conformation signatures define predictive markers of
944 inadequate response to methotrexate in early rheumatoid arthritis. *J Transl*
945 *Med.* 2018;16(1):18.

946 62. Betzler AC, Theodoraki M-N, Schuler PJ, Döscher J, Laban S, Hoffmann
947 TK, et al. NF-κB and Its Role in Checkpoint Control. *Int J Mol Sci.*
948 2020;21(11):3949.

949 63. Ganesh K, Massagué J. TGF-β Inhibition and Immunotherapy:
950 Checkmate. *Immunity.* 2018;48(4):626–8.

951 64. Ravi R, Noonan KA, Pham V, Bedi R, Zhavoronkov A, Ozerov IV, et al.
952 Bifunctional immune checkpoint-targeted antibody-ligand traps that
953 simultaneously disable TGFβ enhance the efficacy of cancer immunotherapy.
954 *Nat Commun.* 2018;9(1):741.

955 65. Guo Y, Lu X, Chen Y, Rendon B, Mitchell RA, Cuatrecasas M, et al. Zeb1
956 induces immune checkpoints to form an immunosuppressive envelope around
957 invading cancer cells. *Sci Adv.* 2021;7(21):eabd7455.

958 66. Chen L, Gibbons DL, Goswami S, Cortez MA, Ahn Y-H, Byers LA, et al.
959 Metastasis is regulated via microRNA-200/ZEB1 axis control of tumour cell
960 PD-L1 expression and intratumoral immunosuppression. *Nat Commun.*
961 2014;5(1):5241.

962 67. Man J, Millican J, Mulvey A, GebSKI V, Hui R. Response Rate and
963 Survival at Key Timepoints With PD-1 Blockade vs Chemotherapy in PD-L1
964 Subgroups: Meta-Analysis of Metastatic NSCLC Trials. *Jnci Cancer Spectr*.
965 2021;5(3):pkab012.

966 68. Topalian SL, Hodi FS, Brahmer JR, Gettinger SN, Smith DC, McDermott
967 DF, et al. Safety, Activity, and Immune Correlates of Anti-PD-1 Antibody in
968 Cancer. *New Engl J Medicine*. 2012;366(26):2443–54.

969 69. Adashek JJ, Subbiah IM, Matos I, Garralda E, Menta AK, Ganeshan DM,
970 et al. Hyperprogression and Immunotherapy: Fact, Fiction, or Alternative
971 Fact? *Trends Cancer*. 2020;6(3):181–91.

972 70. Nesline MK, Knight T, Colman S, Patel K. Economic Burden of
973 Checkpoint Inhibitor Immunotherapy for the Treatment of Non–Small Cell
974 Lung Cancer in US Clinical Practice. *Clin Ther*. 2020;42(9):1682-1698.e7.

975 71. Vaddepally RK, Kharel P, Pandey R, Garje R, Chandra AB. Review of
976 Indications of FDA-Approved Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors per NCCN
977 Guidelines with the Level of Evidence. *Cancers*. 2020;12(3):738.

978 72. Twomey JD, Zhang B. Cancer Immunotherapy Update: FDA-Approved
979 Checkpoint Inhibitors and Companion Diagnostics. *Aaps J*. 2021;23(2):39.

980

Development Cohort

Test Cohorts

Array Profiling:
30 million data points

Glmnet Selection:
72 Markers, 32 Patients

EpiSwitch[®]
Array

qPCR Translation:
24 Markers

QC:
20 Markers, 32 patients

Training Cohort:
8 Markers, 77 patients

EpiSwitch[®]
qPCR

Validations for
8 Markers Classifier:
24 patients,
128 patients

A

Test	Response to ICI				Total
	R	n	NR	n	
R	True Positive	10	False Positive	2	12
NR	False Negative	2	True Negative	10	12
Total		12		12	

Results

Statistic	Value	95 % CI
Sensitivity	83.33%	51.59% to 97.91%
Specificity	83.33%	51.59% to 97.91%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	5.00	1.38 to 18.17
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.20	0.06 tot 0.73
Disease prevalence*	50.00%	29.12% to 94.78%
Positive Predictive Value*	83.33%	51.59% to 97.91%
Negative Predictive Value*	83.33%	51.59% to 97.91%
Accuracy*	83.33%	62.62% to 95.26%

B

Test	Response to ICI				Total
	R	n	NR	n	
R	True Positive	48	False Positive	2	50
NR	False Negative	2	True Negative	49	51
Total		50		51	

Results

Statistic	Value	95 % CI
Sensitivity	96.00%	86.29 % to 99.51%
Specificity	96.08%	86.54 % to 99.52%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	24.48	6.29 to 95.35
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.04	0.01 tot 0.16
Disease prevalence*	49.50%	39.40% to 59.64%
Positive Predictive Value*	96.00%	86.04 % to 98.94%
Negative Predictive Value*	96.08%	86.29 % to 98.96%
Accuracy*	96.04%	90.17% to 98.91%

A

Test	Response to ICI				Total
	R	n	NR	n	
R	True Positive	7	False Positive	29	36
NR	False Negative	2	True Negative	90	90
Total		9		119	

Results

Statistic	Value	95 % CI
Sensitivity	77.78%	39.99% to 97.19%
Specificity	75.63%	66.91% to 83.03%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	3.19	1.99 to 5.11
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.29	0.09 to 1.00
Disease prevalence*	7.03%	3.27% to 12.93%
Positive Predictive Value*	19.44%	13.09% to 27.89%
Negative Predictive Value*	97.83%	92.96% to 99.35%
Accuracy*	75.78%	67.42% to 82.91%

B

Test	Response to ICI				Total
	R	n	NR	n	
R	True Positive	55	False Positive	31	86
NR	False Negative	4	True Negative	139	143
Total		59		170	

Results

Statistic	Value	95 % CI
Sensitivity	93.22%	83.54% to 98.12%
Specificity	81.76%	75.13% to 87.26%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	5.11	3.69 to 7.08
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.08	0.03 to 0.21
Disease prevalence*	25.76%	20.23% to 31.94%
Positive Predictive Value*	63.95%	56.16% to 71.07%
Negative Predictive Value*	97.20%	93.08% to 98.90%
Accuracy*	84.72%	79.39% to 89.12%

1	Marker	Gene	Distance	Rank_Model
2	OBD189_q065_q067	ITK	0	1
3	OBD189_q065_q067	CYFIP2	0	1
4	OBD189_q053_q055	CPB2	0	2
5	OBD189_q053_q055	LCP1	0	2
6	OBD189_q081_q083	IFT88	0	3
7	OBD189_q081_q083	IL17D	3493	3
8	OBD148_q893_q895	CCL8	0	4
9	OBD148_q893_q895	CCL13	0	4
10	OBD148_q893_q895	CCL1	0	4
11	OBD189_q049_q051	TNFSF8	0	5
12	OBD189_q049_q051	TNFSF15	49628	5
13	OBD189_q049_q051	TNC	90160	5
14	OBD189_q029_q031	TNFRSF25	0	6
15	OBD189_q029_q031	PLEKHG5	0	6
16	OBD189_q057_q059	PDCD1LG2	0	7
17	OBD189_q057_q059	CD274	25427	7
18	OBD189_q005_q007	CASP6	0	8
19	OBD189_q005_q007	PLA2G12A	0	8
20	OBD189_q005_q007	CFI	0	8

	<div> <div>+</div> <div>+</div> </div> <div> <div>?</div> </div> <div> <div>Score</div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div>?</div> </div> <div> <div>Name</div> </div>	<div> <div>?</div> </div> <div> <div># Matched Genes (Total Genes)</div> </div>	<div> <div>Sources</div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>23.30</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: PEDF Induced Signaling</div> </div>	<div> <div>8 (745)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>21.90</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: NF-kappaB Signaling</div> </div>	<div> <div>6 (327)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div></div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>19.89</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Akt Signaling</div> </div>	<div> <div>7 (682)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>19.83</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: PAK Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>7 (686)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>17.18</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: CCR5 Pathway in Macrophages</div> </div>	<div> <div>5 (322)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>16.80</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Translocation of ZAP-70 to Immunological Synapse</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (46)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>REACTOME</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>16.44</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Apoptosis and Survival Anti-apoptotic TNFs/NF-kB/Bcl-2 Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (50)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>16.11</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: TNF Superfamily - Human Ligand-Receptor Interactions and Their Associated Functions</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (54)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>REACTOME</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div>RD</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>14.67</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: ERK Signaling</div> </div>	<div> <div>7 (1185)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>13.25</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Integrin Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>5 (570)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>13.19</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Chemokine Superfamily: Human/Mouse Ligand-Receptor Interactions</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (107)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div>REACTOME</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div>RD</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>12.74</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Death Receptor Signaling</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (119)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>SB</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div>RD</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>12.14</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Innate Immune System</div> </div>	<div> <div>8 (2124)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>REACTOME</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>10.88</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Cell Adhesion_Cell-matrix Glycoconjugates</div> </div>	<div> <div>2 (39)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>10.82</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: TRAF Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (188)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>10.42</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: TNFR1 Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>3 (207)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> <div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> <div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>9.56</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: IL 10 Signaling Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>2 (62)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>SB</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>8.87</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: TGF-Beta Pathway</div> </div>	<div> <div>4 (653)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>QIAGEN</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>8.63</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: CD28 Co-stimulation</div> </div>	<div> <div>2 (86)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div>REACTOME</div> </div> </div> </div>
<div>+</div>	<div> <div>8.57</div> </div>	<div> <div>SuperPath: Complement and Coagulation Cascades</div> </div>	<div> <div>2 (88)</div> </div>	<div> <div> <div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> <div> <div></div> </div> </div> </div>

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.27.21268994>; this version posted December 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

EpiSwitch Loops

EpiSwitch Anchors

enhancers_2.bed

SNP2TF.bed

||

rs10975143 (ZEB1)

GH09F005568 (49.36)

Chr_Hg38	Position	SNP_ID	TF	Ref Allele	Alt Allele
chr9	5496519	rs7851547	NFIC	G=0.75431	A=0.24569
chr9	5497407	rs10975143	ZEB1	G=0.66829	A=0.33171
chr9	5497407	rs10975143	MZF1	G=0.66829	A=0.33171

Chr_Hg38	Start	Stop	GeneHancer	Gene	Gene Association Score
chr9	5568801	5570400	GH09F005568	CD274	49.36
chr9	5568801	5570400	GH09F005568	PDCD1LG2	12.08
chr9	5565457	5567528	GH09F005565	CD274	11.66
chr9	5565457	5567528	GH09F005565	PDCD1LG2	11.53