POLE mutation Meta-Analysis

Derek Chiu, Aline Talhouk

June 29, 2015

# Introduction

We are interested in assessing the prognostic effect of Polymerase (*POLE*) proofreading mutations on the survival outcome of patients diagnosed with endometrial cancer (EC). Many studies have shown that patients with *POLE* mutations improved outcomes compared to those with *POLE* wild type. Since *POLE* is only mutated in a small percentage of EC patients (8-10% of the cases), individual studies generally lack power to measure the prognostic effect of *POLE* as a prognostic biomarker. Furthermore, low power is exacerbated by the small number of events in the mutated group. To address this issue, we conduct a series of meta-analyses to measure the aggregate prognostic effect from different studies and compute an overall pooled measure. The purpose of the meta-analyses is to consider patterns across different studies and arrive at a measure that represents an overall direction and magnitude of the prognostic effect.

In this study the measures of interest are multivariable hazard ratios and 5-year survival rates.

We consider the following studies: Church1, Billingsley2, Meng3, TCGA4, Leuven5, Basel/Zurich6, and Stelloo7. The inclusion criteria is that the studies must have *POLE* mutation as a predictor in a survival model. Studies without either measure of interest are excluded.

In addition, we also include data from our own VGH cohort.

In total we have considered a total of 8 different studies from 8 different cohorts. The cohorts all originated from North America and Europe, and are followed from as early as 1990 until 2015. Median follow-up time differ substantially, ranging from 2.38 to 13.3 years. Sample size was also very different. An excel spreadsheet outlining more details on the cohorts is attached.


# Hazard Ratio Extraction

All of the hazard ratios are extracted from available publications or computed from available data. Where possible, hazard ratios from multivariable models that include *POLE* mutation status and other predictors were used. Firth's penalized maximum likelihood bias reduction method was needed in the Cox regression analysis for all studies because of the small number of events in the *POLE* mutated group.

The meta-analyses are conducted for three survival outcomes: recurrence-free survival, disease-specific survival, overall survival, as well as a five year overall survival rate. Each of the meta-analyses only contains those studies for which the measure of interest is available.

* In the PORTEC 1-2 cohort (Church et al.), multivariable hazard ratios account for age, tumor type, grade, LVSI, depth of myometrial invasion, and treatment as covariates.
* Billingsley et al. report multivariable hazard ratios adjusted for age (>= 60), stage (I/II vs. III/IV), grade (1 vs. 2), grade (1 vs. 3), LVSI, deep myometrial invasion (>= 50%), any kind of adjuvant therapy, and BMI (>= 30) as covariates. Since *POLE* mutation was not significant at 10% level in univariable analysis for progression-free survival, it was not included in the multivariable model. Therefore, the hazard ratio we use in the meta-analysis is from the univariable model with only *POLE*
* Hazard ratios from Meng et al. were calculated from clinical data provided to us. Covariates included in the Cox model to compute the hazard ratio are age at surgery, whether they had any treatment (chemotherapy or radiation therapy), and stage (include how you have dichotomized stage and relate that they were all grade 3s).
* For the TCGA data, we are able to compute an overall survival hazard ratio. The Cox model includes age, grade, stage, and histological subtype as covariates. Church et al. reports the recurrence-free survival hazard ratio from TCGA.
* The Leuven Endometrial Cancer Study and Zurich/Basel series used the same predictors in the Cox regression as the PORTEC cohort, except that stage was included, and LVSI, myometrial invasion, and treatment were excluded due to lack of data
* The PORTEC 3 cohort (Stelloo et al.) did not report any hazard ratios, and was not used in the meta-analysis of hazard ratios
* Our own VGH cohort is the last study considered in the meta-analysis for hazard ratios. The statistics were extracted from the *POLE* Remark report, calculated from data we have access to. In the multivariable Cox regression, the covariates considered were age at surgery, stage(I vs. II/III/IV), grade(1/2 vs. 3), histological subtype (endometrioid vs. non-endometrioid), lymphovascular invasion, positive nodes (0 vs. >0), and initial adjuvant treatment(no treatment vs. treatment).

## Progression or Recurrence-Free Survival




Church defines progression or recurrence-free survival as "time from random assignment to relapse, with censoring at last contact or death in case of no recurrence".

The above figure is a forest plot that summarizes the results of the meta-analysis of progression-free survival. Each study has a reported hazard ratio and a 95% confidence interval, shown as a notch on a horizontal line, respectively. The weights (W) show how much a study contributes to the calculation of the overall pooled hazard ratio, and is illustrated by the size of the square. Note that the weights are slightly different between the fixed and random effects models. The hazard ratio, pooled over all studies, is marked by a vertical dashed line with a diamond at the end. The width of the diamond represents the pooled confidence interval. Also note that the confidence intervals are plotted on the normal scale but the axis labels are on the log scale.

From the forest plot, we see that the overall hazard ratio for progression-free survival is 0.295 (p < 0.05) and is in a direction that indicates a protective effect of *POLE* mutation (smaller than 1).

The test for heterogeneity is a test used to verify whether effect sizes from different studies are similar to one another. A small p-value indicates that the studies are not homogeneous and that a random effects model that accounts for both the variability within and between studies should be used. Otherwise, a fixed effects model is adequate. The Sidik-Jonkman estimator is used to estimate the between-study variance. In the above forest plot, the heterogeneity test is not significant, which also explains why the weights are so similar.


## Disease-Specific Survival



From the above forest plot, we see that the pooled hazard ratio for disease-specific survival is 0.335 (p < 0.05), and again the direction is indicative of a protective effect of *POLE* mutations. Compared to the pooled hazard ratio for recurrence-free survival, the pooled hazard ratio of disease-specific survival is slightly less protective.

Again, the heterogeneity test is not significant, so a fixed effects model is adequate.

## Overall Survival




From the forest plot, we see that the pooled hazard ratio for overall survival is 0.896 (p > 0.05), showing a moderate protective effect for overall survival. The heterogeneity test is not significant, indicating a fixed effect model to be adequate.

# Five-Year Survival Rate

Stelloo et. al did not report hazard ratios in their paper, but did report 5-year survival rates. We decided to perform a meta-analysis on 5-year survival rates based on this measure. The problem is that the other papers did not report these rates, but they did have Kaplan-Meier curves including up to five years. To extract the survival rates, we printed out the curves, and estimated the rates by finding where the curve intersects with the five year follow-up time point.

To obtain standard errors for these survival rates, we used the equation for the standard deviation of a sample proportion.



The five-year percent survival is very high for *POLE* mutations pooled at 95.7%. Note that in the TCGA and Meng, there were no events reported in the *POLE* mutated group.

The overall trend is that for all survival outcomes, *POLE* mutation appears to have a protective effect.

# References

1. Church, David N., et al. "Prognostic significance of POLE proofreading mutations in endometrial cancer." Journal of the National Cancer Institute 107.1 (2015): dju402.
2. Billingsley, Caroline C., et al. "Polymerase ɛ (POLE) mutations in endometrial cancer: clinical outcomes and implications for Lynch syndrome testing." Cancer 121.3 (2015): 386-394.
3. Meng, Bo, et al. "POLE exonuclease domain mutation predicts long progression-free survival in grade 3 endometrioid carcinoma of the endometrium." Gynecologic oncology 134.1 (2014): 15-19.
4. Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network. "Integrated genomic characterization of endometrial carcinoma." Nature 497.7447 (2013): 67-73.
5. Garcia-Dios, Diego A., et al. "High-throughput interrogation of PIK3CA, PTEN, KRAS, FBXW7 and TP53 mutations in primary endometrial carcinoma." Gynecologic oncology 128.2 (2013): 327-334.
6. Wild, Peter J., et al. "p53 suppresses type II endometrial carcinomas in mice and governs endometrial tumour aggressiveness in humans." EMBO molecular medicine 4.8 (2012): 808-824.
7. Stelloo, Ellen, et al. "Refining prognosis and identifying targetable pathways for high-risk endometrial cancer; a TransPORTEC initiative." Modern Pathology (2015).