1 **Integrated genomic and histopathological analysis of low grade serous ovarian carcinoma**
2 **identifies clinically distinct disease subtypes**

3 John P Thomson^{1a}, Robert L Hollis^{1a}, Juliette van Baal^{2a}, Narthana Ilenkovan¹, Michael
4 Churchman¹, Koen van de Vijver², Frederike Dijk³, Alison M Meynert⁴, Clare Bartos¹, Tzyvia
5 Rye¹, Ian Croy¹, Patricia Diana¹, Mignon van Gent³, Helen Creedon⁵, Rachel Nirsimloo⁵, Fiona
6 Nussey⁵, Christianne Lok^{2b}, C. Simon Herrington^{1,b} and Charlie Gourley^{1,b}

7 ¹Nicola Murray Centre for Ovarian Cancer Research, Cancer Research UK Edinburgh Centre,
8 MRC Institute of Genetics and Cancer, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

9 ²Department of Gynaecologic Oncology and Department of Pathology, The Netherlands Cancer
10 Institute, Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

11 ³Department of Gynaecologic Oncology and Department of Pathology, Amsterdam University
12 Medical Centres, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

13 ⁴MRC Human Genetics Unit, MRC Institute of Genetics and Cancer, University of Edinburgh,
14 Edinburgh, UK

15 ⁵Edinburgh Cancer Centre, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, UK.

16 ^{a,b}Authors contributed equally

17

18 **Corresponding Author(s):** Professor Charlie Gourley - Nicola Murray Centre for Ovarian
19 Cancer Research, Cancer Research UK Edinburgh Centre, MRC IGC, University of Edinburgh.
20 Crewe Road South, Edinburgh, EH4 2XU, UK. email: charlie.gourley@ed.ac.uk.

21

22

23

24

25 Abstract

26 Background.

27 Low-grade serous ovarian carcinoma (LGSOC) is a distinct, under-investigated and relatively
28 chemotherapy-resistant ovarian cancer type. Understanding the molecular landscape is crucial
29 to maximise the impact of molecularly-targeted therapy.

30 Methods

31 Whole exome sequencing and copy number data were integrated with histopathological patterns,
32 ER/PR expression, and detailed clinical annotation, including survival, in a carefully curated
33 LGSOC cohort.

34 Results

35 63 tumours were analysed in the largest comprehensive genomic LGSOC study to date. Three
36 genomic subgroups were identified: canonical MAPK mutant (cMAPKm: 52%,
37 *KRAS/BRAF/NRAS*), MAPK-associated mutation (27%, 14 MAPK-associated genes) and MAPK
38 wild-type (MAPKwt: 21%). MAPKwt patients were younger at diagnosis (median 47 versus 62
39 years in the cMAPKm subgroup) and demonstrated shorter survival [multivariable HR (mHR)
40 4.17]. The inferior survival in the MAPKwt subgroup was due to shorter post-relapse survival
41 (mHR 5.22) rather than shorter time to first progression (mHR 1.15). Patients in the MAPK-
42 associated mutation subgroup had similar survival to cMAPKm cases. The cMAPKm subgroup
43 more frequently demonstrated macropapillary invasion. Desmoplasia and micropapillary invasion
44 were independently associated with poor survival. NOTCH pathway activation occurred
45 independently of MAPK subgroup.

46 Conclusions

47 LGSOC comprises multiple genomic subgroups with distinct clinical, molecular and
48 histopathological features. True MAPKwt cases represent around a fifth of patients: they are
49 younger but have poorer survival. New therapeutic strategies with activity in this subgroup are
50 urgently required. NOTCH inhibitors represent a therapeutic strategy worthy of exploration.

51

52

53 Introduction

54 Low grade serous ovarian carcinoma (LGSOC) is an uncommon (<5%) and under-investigated
 55 ovarian cancer type, in some cases arising from serous borderline tumours [1]. In contrast to high
 56 grade serous ovarian cancers (HGSOCs), LGSOCs are *TP53* wild-type, do not demonstrate
 57 genomic instability or homologous recombination repair deficiency and frequently harbour
 58 classical activating mutations in canonical MAPK pathway components (*KRAS*, *BRAF* and
 59 *NRAS*) [2-5]. LGSOCs typically display high oestrogen receptor (ER) expression, with expression
 60 of progesterone receptor (PR) in a subset of cases [6].

61 LGSOC often affects younger women (median 47 years) [7]. The response rate to platinum-
 62 based chemotherapy is 5-25% [8, 9], compared to 70-80% in HGSOCs. Relapsed LGSOC
 63 follows a more indolent course than relapsed HGSOC, demonstrating prolonged post-relapse
 64 survival [10, 11]. Appreciation of LGSOC as a separate entity has driven a management shift
 65 away from the conventional 'one size fits all' approach to ovarian cancer treatment, with
 66 endocrine therapy showing significant activity [12, 13]. Recently, the MEK inhibitor trametinib
 67 also demonstrated notable efficacy, delaying disease progression in the context of LGSOC
 68 recurrence compared to standard of care therapies [14, 15]. Another MEK inhibitor binimetinib,
 69 while not demonstrating superiority to standard of care chemotherapy, did show an overall
 70 response rate of 16% with a suggestion that patients whose tumours harboured activating *KRAS*
 71 mutations were more likely to respond [16].

72 Until recently, genomic characterisation of LGSOC had been limited to targeted sequencing of
 73 selected genes [3, 4, 17-19] or whole exome sequencing of a small number of cases (n=8, n=9,
 74 n=22) [5, 17, 20]. Most recently, a targeted sequencing study of 71 LGSOC cases [19] identified
 75 mutation of *KRAS*, *BRAF* or *NRAS* in 47% of cases, alongside further less common potentially
 76 actionable mutations.

77 Here we investigate whether comprehensive genomic characterisation of LGSOC can be
 78 implemented to stratify LGSOC cases into clinically meaningful subgroups. We perform whole
 79 exome sequencing (WES) on tumour material from 63 LGSOC patients, identifying genomic
 80 subgroups centred around the MAPK pathway. These subgroups demonstrate significant
 81 differences in patient age, clinical outcome and histopathological features; we identify patient
 82 groups more likely to experience long-term survival, and highlight high-risk patient groups for
 83 which new treatment strategies are required to improve outcome.

84

85 **Methods**

86 **Ethical approval**

87 Ethical approval was obtained from the Lothian Human Annotated Bioresource (reference
88 15/ES/0094-SR925), NKI-AVL Translational Research Board (reference CFMPB284), and
89 University of Amsterdam AMC Biobank Assessment Committee (reference 2016_070#A201641).
90 All participants provided written informed consent or had consent waived by the ethics committee
91 due to the retrospective nature of the study.

92 **Cohort identification and pathology review**

93 Cases were identified from local databases. All cases underwent expert gynaecological
94 pathology review (KvdV, CSH). Cases were excluded if: WT1 negative; aberrant p53
95 expression; no definitive stromal invasion; *TP53* gene mutation.

96 **Assessment of histopathological patterns in LGSOC**

97 H&E-stained sections underwent secondary review to identify the presence of desmoplasia and
98 the macropapillary (MaP) and micropapillary (MiP) patterns of invasion[22]. MaP was defined as
99 stromal invasion by papillary structures containing fibrovascular cores[22]; MiP was defined as
100 invasion by papillary structures without fibrovascular cores.

101 **Clinical data**

102 Baseline patient characteristics, treatment information and outcome data were retrieved from
103 local databases and from patient file review. Disease-specific survival (DSS) was calculated from
104 the date of confirmed ovarian cancer (OC) diagnosis.

105 **Whole exome sequencing, variant calling and analysis**

106 Following DNA extraction from macrodissected FFPE sections (Supplementary Methods 1),
107 exome capture was performed using the Illumina TruSeq Exome Library Prep kit and WES was
108 performed on the Illumina NextSeq 550 (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA). Samples failed
109 sequencing QC if mean on-target coverage was <30X. Data were aligned to the GRCh38 human
110 reference genome using bwa-0.7.17[29], duplicates marked and base quality scores recalibrated
111 with the GenomeAnalysisToolkit (GATK) v4[30] within the bcbio 1.0.6 pipeline (Supplementary
112 Methods 2). Variants were called using a majority vote system from three callers (VarDict[31],
113 Mutect2[32] and Freebayes[33]) and were filtered to remove common and likely non-functional
114 variation. Analysis of variants and oncogenic pathways was performed using the R package
115 maftools[34]. Functional tumour mutational burden (fTMB) was calculated as the number of
116 mutations present following filtering. CNV analysis was carried out using a custom script utilising
117 the Python package multiBamSummary, comparing read normalised 10kb binned scores
118 between in house “normal” buffy coat derived sample datasets and LGSOC samples. For more
119 information on these analyses see Supplementary Methods 3-6.

Immunohistochemistry for ER and PR

Immunohistochemistry for ER and PR was performed using protocol F on the Leica BOND III Autostainer (Supplementary Methods 7). ER immunohistochemistry used rabbit anti-ER antibody M3643 clone EP1; PR immunohistochemistry used mouse anti-PR antibody M3569 clone PgR-636. Nuclear expression was quantified using histoscore, generated by multiplying the proportion of positive tumour nuclei (0 – 100%) by the intensity of nuclear staining (0 – 3) to produce weighted scores from 0 to 300[35]. Two independent observers scored digital images of stained slides, demonstrating excellent agreement ($\rho=0.96$ for PR, $\rho=0.93$ for ER) (Supplementary Methods 7). Final patient histoscore was calculated as the mean score of the two observers.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.0.3. The Mann Whitney-U test or T-test were used to compare continuous data, as appropriate. Survival analyses were performed using the Cox proportional hazards regression analysis in the Survival package. Univariable survival analyses are presented as hazard ratios (HRs) alongside 95% confidence intervals. Multivariable analyses are presented similarly, detailing multivariable hazard ratios (mHRs). Median follow-up time was calculated using the reverse Kaplan-Meier method. Comparisons of frequency were performed using the Chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.

Data availability

The genomic data presented in this manuscript are being made available via deposition in the European Genome-Phenome Archive.

Results

Cohort characteristics

118 LGSOC cases were identified. 41 cases were excluded for insufficient tumour material or cellularity; 3 failed DNA quality control; 5 had insufficient sequencing coverage. 69 cases underwent genomic characterisation by WES. 6 cases harbouring *TP53* mutations were excluded as potential occult HGSOC, leaving 63 cases in the final LGSOC study cohort (Figure S1). The median per-sample on-target coverage in the study cohort was 64X (range 32X-132X).

Clinical characteristics of the LGSOC study cohort are summarized in Table 1. The median follow-up time was 13.3 years. All patients underwent cytoreductive surgery. The median disease-specific survival (DSS) was 12.9 years.

Genomic features identify subgroups of low grade serous ovarian carcinoma

WES identified canonical MAPK pathway mutations in 33 cases (52.4%) (cMAPKm subgroup): 24 *KRAS* (38.1%), 6 *BRAF* (9.5%) and 3 *NRAS* (4.8%) (Figures 1, S2, S3), which occurred mutually exclusively. The majority of these events occurred at known mutational hotspots (83% of *KRAS* G12R/C/D/V, 100% *BRAF* V600E, 100% *NRAS* Q61R/K) (Figure S4).

Pathway analysis of mutated genes revealed a further 17 cases (27.0%) with perturbation of the MAPK/RAS pathway by mutations across 14 other MAPK-associated genes defined by the TCGA PanCanAtlas [21] (MAPK-associated mutations) (Figures 1 S5). These events were largely mutually exclusive (co-occurrence in 1 case), and genomic events in these genes seldom occurred in cMAPKm cases (co-occurrence in 2 cases). The total frequency of MAPK/RAS pathway alteration was 50 of 63 cases (79.4%) (33 cMAPKm, 17 MAPK-associated mutations).

A further 13 cases were MAPK wild-type (MAPKwt). These patients demonstrated significantly younger age at diagnosis compared to cMAPKm cases (median 47 vs 62 years, $P=0.048$) (Figures 1, 2A & Table S1).

NOTCH pathway perturbation was also common (21.0% of cases), occurring both in the context of MAPK/RAS pathway alteration (34.0%, 17/50) and in MAPKwt cases (30.8%, 4/13) (Figure S5). Recurrent gene targets of mutation beyond MAPK pathway components included *ATM* (5 cases, 7.9%), *USP9X* (5 cases, 7.9%) and *EIF1AX* (3 cases, 4.8%) (Figures 1, S3). There was significant co-occurrence between *NRAS* and *EIF1AX* mutation ($P=0.005$).

Copy number alterations in low grade serous carcinoma

Across the cohort, loss of all or part of chromosome 19 (chr19) was common (22 cases (34.9%): p and q arms; 6 cases (9.5%): p arm; 2 cases (3.2%): q arm). Chr19p loss was most frequent in MAPKwt cases (9 of 13 cases, 69.2%), but this was not statistically significantly higher than in the cMAPKm group ($P=0.056$) (Figure S6).

Gain of the q arm of chr1 occurred in 19 cases (30.2%), while loss of the p arm of chr1 occurred in 13 cases (20.6%). Gain of the q arm of chr8 was also common (16 cases, 25.4%). In agreement with previous reports, four cases (6.3%) demonstrated copy number loss specifically over the *USP9X* locus.

Histopathological patterns in low grade serous carcinoma

A MiP pattern of invasion was identified in 38 cases (60.3%), while a MaP invasion pattern was identified in 23 cases (36.5%) (Figure 1)[22]. The MiP and MaP patterns were largely mutually exclusive ($P<0.0001$, co-occurrence in only 3 cases). 5 cases demonstrated neither MaP nor MiP pattern. The MaP pattern was more common in cMAPKm cases (54.5%) compared to MAPKwt (23.1%; $p=0.004$; Figure 2B).

Desmoplasia was identified in 40 cases (63.5%). Desmoplasia was associated with advanced stage at diagnosis (92.5%, 37 of 40 desmoplastic cases with FIGO III/IV vs 50.0%, 11 of 22 evaluable non-desmoplastic cases with FIGO III/IV; $P<0.001$). Desmoplasia was also associated with the presence of macroscopic RD (67.5%, 27 of 40 desmoplastic cases demonstrated macroscopic RD vs 33.3%, 14 of 21 evaluable non-desmoplastic cases, $P=0.015$) (Figures 2C, 3A, 3B).

ER and PR expression in low grade serous carcinoma

LGSOC samples stained uniformly for ER (histoscore ≥ 50 in 60 of 61 evaluable cases, 98.4%; 2 non-evaluable) (Figure S7A). Median ER and PR histoscores were 220 (range 7.5-300) and 50 (range 0-295) respectively (Figure S7A and S7B). Analysis of ER and PR levels across the genomic classes revealed higher levels of PR expression in the MAPKwt subgroup (median PR histoscore 105) (Figure 2D, Figure S7C), but this was not significantly higher compared to the cMAPKm and MAPK-associated subgroups (median PR histoscore 45 and 35, $P=0.083$).

Desmoplastic tumours demonstrated significantly lower PR expression (median histoscore 30 vs 110, Bonferroni-adjusted $P=0.003$) (Figure 3C) than non-desmoplastic tumours.

Features associated with outcome in low grade serous carcinoma

Patients with LGSOC demonstrating desmoplasia experienced significantly shorter DSS (HR for no desmoplasia 0.18, 95% CI 0.05-0.62) (Figures 4A, S8A); the MiP pattern was also associated with poor DSS (HR for absence of MiP 0.29, 95% CI 0.10-0.86) (Figures 4B, S8B). Conversely, high PR expression was associated with significantly prolonged survival (HR for PR histoscore ≥ 50 0.23, 95% CI 0.09-0.60) (Figures 4C, S8C).

Multivariable analysis of LGSOC features (genomic subgroup, PR status, MiP pattern and desmoplasia) accounting for clinicopathological variables identified the MAPKwt subgroup (multivariable HR [mHR] for cMAPKm vs MAPKwt 0.24, 95% CI 0.07-0.79), desmoplastic cases (mHR for absence of desmoplasia 0.20, 95% CI 0.04-0.89) and the MiP pattern (mHR for absence of MiP=0.27, 95% CI 0.08-0.91) as independently associated with shorter DSS (Figure 4D, Table S2). PR status was not independently associated with significantly longer DSS (mHR 0.38, 95% CI 0.12-1.14).

Further endpoint analysis suggested that inferior DSS in the MAPKwt group was due to shorter post-relapse survival (mHR 5.22, 95% CI 1.20-22.67) rather than rapid disease progression following first-line treatment (mHR 1.15, 95% CI 0.43-3.08).

Discussion

LGSOC affects younger women than HGSOC and demonstrates greater intrinsic chemoresistance. Although survival is better than HGSOC, patients frequently relapse resulting in morbidity from largely ineffectual therapies and premature mortality. As such, better (molecular) characterization and new therapies are urgently required.

Few studies have performed molecular characterisation of robustly curated LGSOC cohorts. Where molecular profiling studies have been performed, these have been limited to panel based sequencing of selected genes [3, 18, 19], or have included only a small number of patient samples [5, 20]. Few of these studies have used immunohistochemistry for WT1/p53 to confirm LGSOC diagnosis. Here we report comprehensive genomic profiling by WES, integrating these data with histopathological analysis, clinical data and assessment of ER and PR expression patterns in a sizeable LGSOC cohort.

52% of cases harboured mutations in the canonical MAPK pathway components *KRAS*, *BRAF* and *NRAS*. This cMAPKm group more frequently demonstrated the MaP pattern of invasion, represented older patients (median 62 years) and was associated with more favourable DSS and post-relapse survival. These data are consistent with previously reported favourable survival in LGSOC patients with tumours harbouring *KRAS* or *BRAF* mutations identified by targeted sequencing [3]. Our data suggest that this survival benefit is due to prolonged post-relapse survival.

While the rate of cMAPKm within our LGSOC cohort (52%) is similar to that reported in previous targeted sequencing studies [17, 19] and WES of small LGSOC cohorts [20], we also identified a further 27% of cases (MAPK-associated group) demonstrating mutational disruption of genes related to the MAPK pathway [21]; these cases demonstrated a survival profile similar to that of the cMAPKm cases. The remaining MAPKwt cases (21%) represented patients with younger age at diagnosis (median 47 years) and who experienced shorter survival. This suggests that previous observations of poorer survival in younger LGSOC patients may be underpinned by differences in disease biology between younger and older patients [23]. MAPKwt cases often demonstrated the MiP pattern of invasion (62%), with only 23% demonstrating the MaP pattern.

While different histopathological patterns of invasion (MaP and MiP) were associated with the genomic subgroups, we demonstrate that the MiP pattern is independently associated with shorter survival time (mHR 3.76). We also demonstrate that the presence of desmoplasia is associated with poorer outcome (mHR 5.10), independent of its relationship with more advanced stage disease and residual disease status.

Both the GOG281/LOGS and MILO studies suggested that the response rates to MEK inhibition were greater in patients with canonical MAPK defects [14, 16]. However, to date, no assessment of relative MEK inhibitor efficacy has been made with regard to MAPK pathway mutations beyond *KRAS/BRAF/NRAS*; future work should seek to quantify efficacy within these patients, and should determine whether patients with no identifiable genomic MAPK defect (MAPKwt) derive any benefit from MEK inhibition.

Beyond the MAPK pathway, analysis of genomic events from our WES data suggest perturbation of the NOTCH signalling pathway is common, affecting a notable proportion of cases both with and without MAPK defects (34% and 31%, respectively). NOTCH pathway inhibition may therefore represent a novel therapeutic strategy for LGSOC patients with intrinsic or acquired resistance to chemotherapy and/or MEK inhibitors.

We report the first investigation using WES in a sizeable LGSOC cohort (n=63) with detailed clinical annotation and extensive follow-up. The use of immunohistochemistry for WT1 and p53 status to robustly curate our cohort, represents a major strength of this work. However, while our dataset represents one of the largest LGSOC collections reported to date, the overall cohort size remains modest due to the rarity of LGSOC. Confirmatory studies characterising the behaviour of the described genomic subgroups, and associations with age, histopathological features and outcome, are therefore required.

Collectively, our data identify a subgroup of LGSOC with mutations in MAPK pathway components beyond *KRAS*, *BRAF* and *NRAS*. Alongside the cMAPKm subgroup, these cases demonstrate more favourable outcome when compared to MAPKwt patients, who are younger at

diagnosis. The MaP pattern of invasion is a potential histopathological indicator of cMAPKm LGSOC. Desmoplasia and the MiP pattern are features independently associated with survival.

Acknowledgements

Funding: RLH was supported by Target Ovarian Cancer. This work was funded in part by a HANARTH Foundation grant. We extend our thanks to The Nicola Murray Foundation for their generous support of The Nicola Murray Centre for Ovarian Cancer Research. JT and CB were supported by core funding from the CRUK Edinburgh Centre. AMM was supported by core funding awarded to the MRC Human Genetics Unit.

We are grateful to the NHS Lothian Department of Pathology, Edinburgh Experimental Cancer Medicine Centre, the Edinburgh Ovarian Cancer Database and the NRS Lothian Human Annotated Bioresource for their ongoing support. The high throughput sequencing described here was supported by the Edinburgh Clinical Research Facility, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, UK. We would like to acknowledge the NKI- AVL Core Facility Molecular Pathology & Biobanking (CFMPB) for supplying NKI-AVL Biobank material and providing laboratory support.

Declaration of interest statement:

RLH: consultancy fees from GlaxoSmithKline. FN: non-personal interests in AstraZeneca and Tesaro. CG: research funding from Roche, AstraZeneca, Novartis, Aprea, Nucana, GSK, Tesaro, BerGen Bio, Medannexin, Verastem; honoraria/consultancy fees Roche, AstraZeneca, MSD, GSK, Tesaro, Nucana, Clovis, Foundation One, Chugai, Sierra Oncology, Cor2Ed and Takeda; named on issued/pending patents related to predicting treatment response in ovarian cancer outside the scope of the work described here. All other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Shih Ie M, Kurman RJ. Ovarian tumorigenesis: a proposed model based on morphological and molecular genetic analysis. *Am J Pathol.* 2004;164:1511-8.
- [2] Cheasley D, Nigam A, Zethoven M, Hunter S, Etemadmoghadam D, Semple T, et al. Genomic analysis of low-grade serous ovarian carcinoma to identify key drivers and therapeutic vulnerabilities. *J Pathol.* 2020.
- [3] Gershenson DM, Sun CC, Wong KK. Impact of mutational status on survival in low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary or peritoneum. *Br J Cancer.* 2015;113:1254-8.
- [4] Hunter SM, Anglesio MS, Ryland GL, Sharma R, Chiew YE, Rowley SM, et al. Molecular profiling of low grade serous ovarian tumours identifies novel candidate driver genes. *Oncotarget.* 2015;6:37663-77.
- [5] Jones S, Wang TL, Kurman RJ, Nakayama K, Velculescu VE, Vogelstein B, et al. Low-grade serous carcinomas of the ovary contain very few point mutations. *J Pathol.* 2012;226:413-20.
- [6] Sieh W, Kobel M, Longacre TA, Bowtell DD, deFazio A, Goodman MT, et al. Hormone-receptor expression and ovarian cancer survival: an Ovarian Tumor Tissue Analysis consortium study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2013;14:853-62.
- [7] Gershenson DM, Bodurka DC, Lu KH, Nathan LC, Milojevic L, Wong KK, et al. Impact of Age and Primary Disease Site on Outcome in Women With Low-Grade Serous Carcinoma of the Ovary or Peritoneum: Results of a Large Single-Institution Registry of a Rare Tumor. *J Clin Oncol.* 2015;33:2675-82.
- [8] Grabowski JP, Harter P, Heitz F, Pujade-Lauraine E, Reuss A, Kristensen G, et al. Operability and chemotherapy responsiveness in advanced low-grade serous ovarian cancer. An analysis of the AGO Study Group metadatabase. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2016;140:457-62.
- [9] Schmeler KM, Sun CC, Bodurka DC, Deavers MT, Malpica A, Coleman RL, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary or peritoneum. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2008;108:510-4.
- [10] Gershenson DM, Sun CC, Lu KH, Coleman RL, Sood AK, Malpica A, et al. Clinical behavior of stage II-IV low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2006;108:361-8.
- [11] Irodi A, Rye T, Herbert K, Churchman M, Bartos C, Mackean M, et al. Patterns of clinicopathological features and outcome in epithelial ovarian cancer patients: 35 years of prospectively collected data. *Bjog.* 2020;127:1409-20.
- [12] Gershenson DM. Current advances in the management of malignant germ cell and sex cord-stromal tumors of the ovary. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2012;125:515-7.
- [13] Gershenson DM, Bodurka DC, Coleman RL, Lu KH, Malpica A, Sun CC. Hormonal Maintenance Therapy for Women With Low-Grade Serous Cancer of the Ovary or Peritoneum. *J Clin Oncol.* 2017;35:1103-11.
- [14] Gershenson DM, Miller A, Brady W, Paul J, Carty K, Rodgers W, et al. LBA61 - A randomized phase II/III study to assess the efficacy of trametinib in patients with recurrent or progressive low-grade serous ovarian or peritoneal cancer. *Annals of Oncology.* 2019;30:v897-v8.
- [15] Gershenson DM, Miller A, Brady WE, Paul J, Carty K, Rodgers W, et al. Trametinib versus standard of care in patients with recurrent low-grade serous ovarian cancer (GOG 281/LOGS): a randomised, open-label phase 2/3 trial. *The Lancet.* In press.
- [16] Monk BJ, Grisham RN, Banerjee S, Kalbacher E, Mirza MR, Romero I, et al. MILO/ENGOT-ov11: Binimetinib Versus Physician's Choice Chemotherapy in Recurrent or Persistent Low-Grade Serous Carcinomas of the Ovary, Fallopian Tube, or Primary Peritoneum. *J Clin Oncol.* 2020;38:3753-62.
- [17] Hunter SM, Anglesio MS, Ryland GL, Sharma R, Chiew YE, Rowley SM, et al. Molecular profiling of low grade serous ovarian tumours identifies novel candidate driver genes. *Oncotarget.* 2015;6:37663-77.
- [18] Emmanuel C, Chiew YE, George J, Etemadmoghadam D, Anglesio MS, Sharma R, et al. Genomic classification of serous ovarian cancer with adjacent borderline differentiates RAS pathway and TP53-mutant tumors and identifies NRAS as an oncogenic driver. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research.* 2014;20:6618-30.
- [19] Cheasley D, Nigam A, Zethoven M, Hunter S, Etemadmoghadam D, Semple T, et al. Genomic analysis of low-grade serous ovarian carcinoma to identify key drivers and therapeutic vulnerabilities. *The Journal of pathology.* 2021;253:41-54.

[20] Etemadmoghadam D, Azar WJ, Lei Y, Moujaber T, Garsed DW, Kennedy CJ, et al. EIF1AX and NRAS Mutations Co-occur and Cooperate in Low-Grade Serous Ovarian Carcinomas. *Cancer Res.* 2017;77:4268-78.

[21] Sanchez-Vega F, Mina M, Armenia J, Chatila WK, Luna A, La KC, et al. Oncogenic Signaling Pathways in The Cancer Genome Atlas. *Cell.* 2018;173:321-37.e10.

[22] Yemelyanova A, Mao TL, Nakayama N, Shih IM, Kurman RJ. Low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary displaying a macropapillary pattern of invasion. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 2008;32:1800-6.

[23] Gershenson DM, Bodurka DC, Lu KH, Nathan LC, Milojevic L, Wong KK, et al. Impact of age and primary disease site on outcome in women with low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary or peritoneum: Results of a large single-institution registry of a rare tumor. *Journal of Clinical Oncology.* 2015;33:2675-82.

[24] Slomovitz B, Gourley C, Carey MS, Malpica A, Shih IM, Huntsman D, et al. Low-grade serous ovarian cancer: State of the science. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2020;156:715-25.

[25] Gershenson DM. Low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary or peritoneum. *Ann Oncol.* 2016;27 Suppl 1:i45-i9.

[26] Langdon SP, Herrington CS, Hollis RL, Gourley C. Estrogen Signaling and Its Potential as a Target for Therapy in Ovarian Cancer. *Cancers (Basel).* 2020;12.

[27] Marchetti C, De Felice F, Ergasti R, Scambia G, Fagotti A. Letrozole in the management of advanced ovarian cancer: an old drug as a new targeted therapy. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2020;30:1058-64.

[28] Gershenson DM, Sun CC, Iyer RB, Malpica AL, Kavanagh JJ, Bodurka DC, et al. Hormonal therapy for recurrent low-grade serous carcinoma of the ovary or peritoneum. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2012;125:661-6.

[29] Li H, Durbin R. Fast and accurate long-read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England).* 2010;26:589-95.

[30] McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernysky A, et al. The Genome Analysis Toolkit: a MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome research.* 2010;20:1297-303.

[31] Lai Z, Markovets A, Ahdesmaki M, Chapman B, Hofmann O, McEwen R, et al. VarDict: a novel and versatile variant caller for next-generation sequencing in cancer research. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2016;44:e108.

[32] Cibulskis K, Lawrence MS, Carter SL, Sivachenko A, Jaffe D, Sougnez C, et al. Sensitive detection of somatic point mutations in impure and heterogeneous cancer samples. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2013;31:213-9.

[33] Garrison E, Marth G. Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read sequencing. *arXiv preprint.* 2012;arXiv:1207.3907 [q-bio.GN].

[34] Mayakonda A, Lin DC, Assenov Y, Plass C, Koeffler HP. Maftools: efficient and comprehensive analysis of somatic variants in cancer. *Genome Res.* 2018;28:1747-56.

[35] Kirkegaard T, Edwards J, Tovey S, McGlynn LM, Krishna SN, Mukherjee R, et al. Observer variation in immunohistochemical analysis of protein expression, time for a change? *Histopathology.* 2006;48:787-94.

Table 1. Clinical characteristics of low grade serous ovarian carcinoma cases.

		N	%
Cases	Total	63	
Age	Median	54 years	Range 19-66
Centre	Edinburgh Cancer Centre	31	49.2
	University of Amsterdam Academic Medical Centre	10	15.9
	Netherlands Cancer Institute	22	34.9
FIGO stage	I	9	14.5
	II	5	8.1
	III	39	62.9
	IV	9	14.5
	NA	1	-
RD following cytoreduction	Macroscopic RD	34	55.7
	No macroscopic RD	27	44.3
	Unknown RD status	2	-
Neoadjuvant chemo	No	48	76.2
	Yes	15	23.8
Macropapillary invasion pattern	No	40	63.5
	Yes	23	36.5
Micropapillary invasion pattern	No	25	29.7
	Yes	38	60.3
Desmoplasia	No	23	36.5
	Yes	40	63.5
Diagnosis period	Pre-2000	10	15.9
	2000s	24	38.1
	2010 onward	29	46.0
Death details at last follow-up	Alive	25	39.7
	Died of OC	21	33.3
	Died of other causes	9	14.3
	Died, unknown cause	8	12.7
Outcome	5-year DSS	70.6%	95% CI 59.1-84.4
	Median follow-up	13.3 years	95% CI 6.36-NA

FIGO, International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics; NA, not available; RD, residual disease; OC, ovarian carcinoma; DSS, disease-specific survival

Figure 1: Molecular landscape of low grade serous ovarian carcinoma. fTMB, functional tumour mutational burden; Ti, transitions; Tv, transversions; SNV, single nucleotide variant; CNV, copy number variant ; cMAPK, canonical MAPK pathway mutation (KRAS/BRAF/NRAS); MAPK-assoc, MAPK-associated mutation; MAPKwt, MAPK pathway wild-type.

Figure 2. Characteristics of genomic subgroups in low grade serous ovarian carcinoma. (A) Patient age at diagnosis across genomic subgroups; labelled P value represents the comparison between the canonical MAPK mutation (cMAPKm) group and the MAPK wild-type (MAPKwt) group. (B) Histopathological patterns across genomic subgroups; labelled P value represents comparison of MaP frequency in cMAPKm versus subgroups by Chi-squared test. (C) Desmoplasia across genomic subgroups; labelled P value represents comparison of desmoplasia frequency between all subgroups by Chi-squared test. (D) Progesterone receptor (PR) expression across genomic subgroups; labelled P value represents comparison of MAPKwt group versus other subgroups by Mann Whitney-U test. MiP: micropapillary; MaP: macropapillary. No des = no desmoplasia identified.

Figure 3. Features associated with desmoplasia in low grade serous ovarian carcinoma. (A) Distribution of stage at diagnosis between tumours with and without desmoplasia. (B) Distribution of stage at diagnosis between tumours with and without desmoplasia. (C) Progesterone receptor (PR) expression between cases with and without desmoplasia. Desmo = desmoplastic; No des = no desmoplasia identified; zero RD = zero macroscopic residual disease after debulking surgery; macro RD = macroscopic residual disease after debulking surgery.

Figure 4. Impact of low grade serous ovarian carcinoma features on disease-specific survival. (A) Disease-specific survival (DSS) of patients with tumours demonstrating desmoplasia. (B) DSS of patients with tumours demonstrating the micropapillary (MiP) pattern of invasion. (C) DSS of patients with tumours expressing progesterone receptor (PR). (D) Forest plot summarising multivariable survival analysis of low grade serous ovarian carcinoma features. HR, hazard ratio; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval; mHR, multivariable HR; no des, no desmoplasia identified; RD, residual disease; cMAPKm, canonical MAPK pathway mutation (KRAS/BRAF/NRAS); MAPK-assoc, MAPK-associated mutation; MAPKwt, MAPK pathway wild-type.