

1 **Added-value of whole exome and RNA Sequencing in advanced and refractory cancer**
2 **patients with no molecular-based treatment recommendation based on a 90-gene panel**

3
4 Armelle Dufresne¹, Valéry Attignon², Anthony Ferrari³, Laurie Tonon³, Séverine Tabone-
5 Eglinger⁴, Philippe Cassier¹, Olivier Trédan¹, Nadège Corradini⁵, Armelle Vinceneux¹,
6 Aurélie Swalduz¹, Alain Viari³, Sylvie Chabaud⁶, David Pérol⁶, Jean Yves Blay^{1,7}, Pierre
7 Saintigny^{1,7}.

8
9 1-Department of Medical Oncology, Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon, France; 2-Platform of Cancer
10 Genomics, Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon, France; 3-Platform of Bioinformatics Gilles-Thomas,
11 Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon, France; 4-Biobank, Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon, France ; 5-
12 Department of Pediatric Oncology, Institute of Pediatric Hematology and Oncology, Centre
13 Leon Bérard, Lyon, France; 6-Department of Clinical Research, Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon,
14 France; 7-Univ Lyon, Claude Bernard Lyon 1 University, INSERM 1052, CNRS 5286,
15 Centre Léon Bérard, Cancer Research Center of Lyon, Lyon, France.

16
17 **Funding information** : This work was supported by funding from the Integrated Cancer
18 Research Site LYriCAN (INCa-DGOS-Inserm_12563), NetSARC (INCA & DGOS),
19 InterSARC (INCA), LabEx DEvweCAN (ANR-10-LABX 0061), PIA Institut Convergence
20 Francois Rabelais PLAsCAN (PLASCAN, 17-CONV-0002), Fondation ARC contre le
21 Cancer, La Ligue contre le Cancer (Canopée), and EURACAN (EC 739521).

22
23 **Corresponding authors**

24 Pierre Saintigny (pierre.saintigny@lyon.unicancer.fr) and Jean-Yves Blay ([jean-](mailto:jean-yves.blay@lyon.unicancer.fr)
25 yves.blay@lyon.unicancer.fr), Department of Medical Oncology, Centre Léon Bérard, Univ

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 Lyon, Claude Bernard Lyon 1 University, INSERM 1052, CNRS 5286, Centre Léon Bérard,
27 Cancer Research Center of Lyon, Lyon, France.

28 **Key Points** (99 words)

29

30 **Question:** Does WES/RNA-Seq provide additional targeted treatment guidance for advanced
31 cancer patients with no molecular-based treatment recommendation (MBTR) from a 90-tumor
32 gene panel (TGP) sequencing and array-based comparative genomic hybridization (aCGH)?

33

34 **Findings:** For fifty advanced cancer patients included in the PROFILER trial with no
35 treatment recommendation based on a TGP/aCGH, frozen tumor sample was processed for
36 WES and RNA-Seq. MBTR was given in 4/50 (8%) patients using the reanalyzed TGP/aCGH
37 vs. 9/50 (18%) patients using WES/RNA-Seq findings.

38

39 **Meanings:** WES/RNA-Seq increased the number of patients with MBTR as compared to a
40 TGP/aCGH screening to yet only a minority of patients.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54 **Abstract** (307 words)

55

56 **Importance:** While comprehensive tumor molecular profile by whole exome and RNA
57 sequencing (WES/RNA-Seq) is now feasible in routine practice, it remains unclear whether
58 this increases therapeutic options as compared to a more limited targeted gene panel (TGP)
59 plus array-based comparative genomic hybridization (aCGH) in advanced cancer patients.

60 **Objective:** To determine the added value of WES/RNA-Seq in advanced and refractory
61 cancer patients who had no molecular-based treatment recommendation (MBTR) based on a
62 TGP/aCGH in the course of a clinical trial. **Design:** Retrospective analysis. **Setting:** Single

63 center. **Participants:** We selected 50 patients previously included in the PROFILER trial
64 (NCT01774409) for which no molecular-based therapy could be recommended in the course
65 of the clinical trial based on a targeted 90-gene panel and aCGH. For each patient, the frozen

66 tumor sample mirroring the FFPE sample used for TGP/aCGH analysis were processed for
67 WES and RNA-Seq. Data from TGP/aCGH were reanalyzed and together with WES/RNA-
68 Seq, findings were simultaneously discussed at a new molecular tumor board (MTB). **Main**

69 **outcomes and Measures:** MBTR based on TGP/aCGH versus WES/RNA-Seq were
70 compared. **Results:** After exclusion of variants of unknown significance, a total of 167
71 somatic molecular alterations were identified in 50 patients (median: 3; range: 1-10). Out of

72 these 167 relevant molecular alterations reported by the biologist, 51 (31%) were common to
73 both TGP/aCGH and WES/RNA-Seq, 19 (11%) were identified by the TGP/aCGH only and
74 97 (58%) were identified by WES/RNA-Seq only, including 2 fusion transcripts in two

75 patients. A MBTR was provided in 4/50 (8%) patients using the information from TGP/aCGH
76 vs. 9/50 (18%) patients using WES/RNA-Seq findings. Three patients had similar
77 recommendations based on TGP/aCGH and WES/RNA-Seq. **Conclusion and Relevance:** In

78 advanced and refractory cancer patients in whom no MBRT was recommended from
79 TGP/aCGH, WES/RNA-Seq allowed to identify more alterations which may in turn, in a
80 limited fraction of patients, lead to new MBRT.

81 **Introduction**

82 The concept of tumor-agnostic precision oncology is now integrated in routine for a
83 limited set of somatic molecular alterations. [1-3]. In studies assessing the throughput of
84 tumor molecular analysis for patients with advanced solid tumor, the proportion of patients
85 treated with molecular-based therapy ranged from 6% to 26% [4-7]. This low proportion may
86 have prevented these trials to conclude on the benefit of agnostic precision oncology [8-10].
87 In contrast, several meta-analysis studies reported a significant benefit of a genomic-driven
88 personalized approach to drive patients in phase I and II trials. Extending the molecular
89 analysis to the entire exome may increase the proportion of actionable molecular alterations,
90 of molecular-based treatment recommendations (MBTR) and eventually, of treated patients.

91 To determine to which extent a whole exome and RNA sequencing (WES/RNA-Seq)
92 analysis increases the proportion of patients with MBTR, a retrospective analysis was
93 conducted in a subset of 50 patients who had available germ line DNA and fresh frozen tumor
94 mirroring the FFPE sample used for Tumor gene Panel and array-based Comparative
95 Genomic Hybridization (TGP/aCGH) analysis and had no MBTR based on the TGP/aCGH
96 [7].

97

98 **Methods**

99

100 *Patients, sample qualification and molecular analysis*

101 The study was conducted at Centre Léon Bérard, was approved on 2/2/2018 by the
102 institutional review board, and was conducted in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki
103 and Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

104 We retrospectively selected 50 patients among the 2,579 patients included in the
105 previously reported PROFILER molecular screening program (NCT01774409) who had no
106 MBTR based on the TGP/aCGH during the course of the trial and for whom a fresh frozen
107 tumor mirroring the FFPE sample together with germ line DNA were available in Centre
108 Léon Bérard certified Biobank (BB-0033-00050) [7]. Fresh frozen surgically resected tumor
109 specimens mirroring the FFPE sample were evaluated by an experienced pathologist for
110 tumor cell content $\geq 30\%$ was required. The first 50 cases achieving those criteria were
111 included in the study.

112 The molecular analysis conducted in PROFILER trial was reported elsewhere [7].
113 Details on WES/RNA-Seq sequencing and bioinformatics analysis is provided in
114 Supplementary Methods.

115

116 *Variants interpretation and treatment recommendation*

117 Analysis pipelines are regularly updated overtime, TGP raw data for the 50 selected
118 patients were thus reanalyzed and a new report issued. Both the TGP and WES/RNA-Seq
119 reports were presented at the Molecular Tumor Board (MTB). The interpretation of somatic
120 single nucleotide variants (SNV) was focused on their clinical impacts and categorized into
121 five TIERS according to the ESMO Scale for Clinical Actionability of molecular Targets
122 (ESCAT) classification [11] (Supplementary Figure 1). MTB presentation was done at the
123 same time to ensure similar treatment options for both tests.

124

125 *Statistical analysis*

126 Statistical analyses were conducted with SPSS 23.0 package (IBM, Paris, France). The
127 proportion of variants in each Tier of the ESCAT classification identified with TGP/aCGH
128 versus WES/RNA-Seq was compared using a Fisher's exact test. A P value of .05 was
129 considered significant.

130

131 **Results**

132

133 The cohort of 50 patients included 14 different histological subtypes of cancer (Table
134 1). They were comparable to the overall population of the PROFILER study.

135 After exclusion of 4 (TGP) and 9,619 (WES) variants of unknown significance, TGP
136 and WES identified 52 SNVs and 121 indels. Respectively 70 and 148 molecular alterations
137 including SNVs (n=135, 80%), CNVs (n=29, 17%), one indel (n=1, <1%), one tumor
138 mutational burden (TMB) > 10 mutations per megabase (median TMB: 1, range: 0-24.5) and
139 fusion transcripts (n=2, 1-2%) were reported by the biologist with TGP/aCGH (median per
140 patient 1, range 0-6) and WES/RNA-Seq (median per patient 2, range 0-8). Out of 167
141 molecular alterations, 51 (30%) were common to both TGP/aCGH and WES/RNA-Seq, 19
142 (11%) were identified by the TGP/aCGH only and 97 (58%) were identified by WES/RNA-
143 Seq only. Among the latest, two patients were found with a fusion gene by RNAseq
144 (COL1A1::PDGFB or PAX5::FOXP1) that were already known from the initial diagnostic
145 workup. More ESCAT TIER IV and X molecular alterations were identified by WES/RNA-
146 Seq (Table 2).

147 Whether MBTR differed when they were based on TGP/aCGH vs WES/RNA-Seq was
148 discussed at the MTB (Figure 1). A MBTR was recommended in 4/50 (8%) patients using the
149 information from TGP/aCGH vs. 9/50 (18%) patients using WES/RNA-Seq findings. Three
150 patients had similar recommendations (PI3K/Akt/mTOR inhibitor and KRAS G12C inhibitor
151 in two and one cases respectively) based on either TGP/aCGH or WES/RNA-Seq (Figure 1).
152 The six MBTR exclusively provided by WES/RNA-Seq were 1) a PKC inhibitor for a
153 choroidal melanoma with a GNAQ SNV (not included in the TGP panel, 2) a KIT inhibitor
154 for a gastrointestinal stromal tumor with a KIT D820E mutation (region not covered by TGP),
155 3) an immune therapy based on a high TMB on WES (not available on TGP) for a malignancy

156 of unknown origin, 4) a PARP inhibitor based on a BRCA loss not identified by TGP for a
157 serous ovarian cancer and 5) and 6) were recommended a PI3K/Akt/mTOR inhibitor based on
158 a PI3K p.N345K mutation not identified by TGP for an invasive ductal carcinoma and a
159 PTEN p.M1L for a pyloric adenocarcinoma.

160

161 **Discussion**

162

163 Molecular analysis by WES/RNA-Seq is now available in routine for diagnosis and
164 theranostic purposes to increase the rate of MBTR for patients with advanced cancer. To our
165 knowledge, this is the first report comparing the percentage of candidate patients for a MBTR
166 using both TGP/aCGH and WES/RNA-Seq available in all patients. As expected, WES/RNA-
167 Seq led to the identification of more molecular alterations but most were not used for MBTR
168 in the absence of documented clinical significance. However, a numerically higher rate of
169 MBTR was recommended compared to TGP/aCGH. The translation of these
170 recommendations into clinical benefit for the patients remains to be determined. The
171 prospective randomized trial PROFILER02 trial (NCT03163732) has been completed and
172 compares the value of a narrow- vs. larger TGP.

173 Only 51 (30%) molecular alterations were common to both TGP/aCGH and
174 WES/RNA-Seq. These discrepancies may be explained by tumor heterogeneity: although the
175 same tumor was analyzed, nucleic acids were extracted from a FFPE sample (TGP/aCGH)
176 and from a frozen sample (WES/RNA-Seq). As expected, some molecular alterations were
177 missed by TGP because genes were not included in the panel, or because no fusion can be
178 studied with TGP. Discrepancies between TGP and WES/RNAseq may also be related to
179 lower sequencing depth (false negatives), and to the subtraction of constitutional variants (true
180 negatives).

181 Other groups reported an “actionable” alteration ranging from 38% to 57% of patients
182 suitable to molecular-based therapy after extensive genomic analysis [12, 13]. However, the
183 definition of “actionability” of a given molecular alteration remains unclear. In the study, we
184 selected patients who were given no recommendation in the course of the trial based on
185 TGP/aCGH, possibly explaining the low rate of patients with MBTR based on WES/RNA-
186 Seq [9/50 (18%)].

187

188 **Conclusion**

189

190 In this work, WES/RNA-Seq analysis resulted in a significantly superior but modest
191 improvement of the number of MBTR compared to TGP/aCGH. Discrepancies were observed
192 between the two tests, owing possibly to sample quality bias, and subclonal analysis. As more
193 knowledge is gained on the significance of individual and combined mutations based on
194 WES/RNA-Seq, a careful clinical evaluation of the utility of WES/RNA-Seq for the
195 management of cancer patients with advanced and refractory disease must be undertaken to
196 further compare the utility of narrow panels versus broader but more expensive approaches.

197

198 **Acknowledgement**

199 The authors thank the Biobank at Centre Léon Bérard (BB-0033-00050, CRB Centre Léon
200 Bérard, Lyon, France).

201 **References (max 15 ref.)**

- 202 1. Drlon, A., et al., *Efficacy of Larotrectinib in TRK Fusion-Positive Cancers in Adults and*
203 *Children*. N Engl J Med, 2018. **378**(8): p. 731-739.
- 204 2. Le, D.T., et al., *Mismatch repair deficiency predicts response of solid tumors to PD-1 blockade*.
205 *Science*, 2017. **357**(6349): p. 409-413.
- 206 3. Marcus, L., et al., *FDA Approval Summary: Entrectinib for the Treatment of NTRK gene Fusion*
207 *Solid Tumors*. Clin Cancer Res, 2021. **27**(4): p. 928-932.
- 208 4. Le Tourneau, C., et al., *Molecularly targeted therapy based on tumour molecular profiling*
209 *versus conventional therapy for advanced cancer (SHIVA): a multicentre, open-label, proof-of-*
210 *concept, randomised, controlled phase 2 trial*. Lancet Oncol, 2015. **16**(13): p. 1324-34.
- 211 5. Massard, C., et al., *High-Throughput Genomics and Clinical Outcome in Hard-to-Treat*
212 *Advanced Cancers: Results of the MOSCATO 01 Trial*. Cancer Discov, 2017. **7**(6): p. 586-595.
- 213 6. Stockley, T.L., et al., *Molecular profiling of advanced solid tumors and patient outcomes with*
214 *genotype-matched clinical trials: the Princess Margaret IMPACT/COMPACT trial*. Genome
215 *Med*, 2016. **8**(1): p. 109.
- 216 7. Tredan, O., et al., *Molecular screening program to select molecular-based recommended*
217 *therapies for metastatic cancer patients: analysis from the ProfILER trial*. Ann Oncol, 2019.
218 **30**(5): p. 757-765.
- 219 8. Jardim, D.L., et al., *Impact of a Biomarker-Based Strategy on Oncology Drug Development: A*
220 *Meta-analysis of Clinical Trials Leading to FDA Approval*. J Natl Cancer Inst, 2015. **107**(11).
- 221 9. Schwaederle, M., et al., *Impact of Precision Medicine in Diverse Cancers: A Meta-Analysis of*
222 *Phase II Clinical Trials*. J Clin Oncol, 2015. **33**(32): p. 3817-25.
- 223 10. Schwaederle, M., et al., *Association of Biomarker-Based Treatment Strategies With Response*
224 *Rates and Progression-Free Survival in Refractory Malignant Neoplasms: A Meta-analysis*.
225 *JAMA Oncol*, 2016. **2**(11): p. 1452-1459.
- 226 11. Mateo, J., et al., *A framework to rank genomic alterations as targets for cancer precision*
227 *medicine: the ESMO Scale for Clinical Actionability of molecular Targets (ESCAT)*. Ann Oncol,
228 2018. **29**(9): p. 1895-1902.
- 229 12. Beg, S., et al., *Integration of whole-exome and anchored PCR-based next generation*
230 *sequencing significantly increases detection of actionable alterations in precision oncology*.
231 *Transl Oncol*, 2021. **14**(1): p. 100944.
- 232 13. Koeppel, F., et al., *Standardisation of pathogenicity classification for somatic alterations in*
233 *solid tumours and haematologic malignancies*. Eur J Cancer, 2021. **159**: p. 1-15.

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243 **Tables**

244

245 **Table 1 – Clinical and pathological characteristics of the patients included in the study.**

246 **Abbreviations: MBRT: molecular-based recommended therapies**

247

	Subset of patients included in the study (N=50)
Age at diagnosis Median (range)	54.0 (21.0-81.0)
Gender	
Male	22 (44%)
Female	28 (66%)
ECOG-PS	
Missing data	5 (10%)
0	12 (24%)
1	31 (%)
≥ 2	2 (4%)
Delay from the date of diagnosis of noncurable disease to inclusion (years) Median (range)	1.0 (0-11.4)
Primary tumor site	
Breast	9 (18%)
Ovary	8 (16%)
Colorectal	6 (12%)
Sarcoma	6 (12%)
Head & Neck	5 (10%)
Other	16 (32%)

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257 **Table 2 – Frequency of molecular alterations identified with the 90-gene TGP/aCGH or**
258 **WES/RNA-Seq the classified according to ESCAT [11].** Proportion of variants in each Tier
259 of the ESCAT classification identified with TGP/aCGH versus WES/RNA-Seq was compared
260 using a Fisher's exact test ($P = 0.0154$).

261

	90-gene TGP/aCGH	WES/RNA-Seq
TIER I	3 (4%)	6 (4%)
TIER II	13 (19%)	17 (12%)
TIER III	33 (47%)	44 (30%)
TIER IV	10 (14%)	33 (22%)
TIER X	11 (16%)	48 (32%)
Total	70 (100%)	148 (100%)

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276 **Figure legend**

277

278 **Figure 1: Venn diagram of biologically relevant molecular alterations identified with**
279 **TGP/aCGH versus WES/RNA-Seq in advanced and refractory patients with no**
280 **molecular-based recommended therapy.** *TGP raw data for the 50 selected patients were
281 reanalyzed and a new report was issued. Both the TGP/aCGH and WES/RNA-Seq reports
282 were presented at the MTB.

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302 **Supplementary Material**

303

304 **Supplementary Figure:** Bioinformatic workflow to classify molecular alterations according
305 to ESCAT [11]

306

307 **Supplementary Method:** Whole exome and RNA sequencing - Bioinformatics analysis

308

309 **Supplementary Table 1:** Gene list of the targeted 90-gene panel used in the PROFILER
310 study [7]

311

312 **Supplementary Table 2:** Detailed molecular alterations identified in the 50 patients included
313 in the study based on TGP or WES/RNA-Seq

314

315

316

Figure 1

TGP*/aCGH

WES/RNA-Seq

**Biologically
relevant
molecular
alterations**

19

51

97

**Molecular-based
recommanded
therapies**

1

3

6

