FOUNDATIONONE®HEME

PATIENT
Chen, Chieh Min

TUMOR TYPE
Unknown primary leiomyosarcoma

COUNTRY CODE
TW

REPORT DATE
28 Nov 2022

ORDERED TEST #
ORD-1503257-01

ABOUT THE TEST FoundationOne® Heme is a comprehensive genomic profiling test designed to identify genomic alterations within hundreds of cancer-related genes in hematologic malignancies and sarcomas.

PATIENT
DISEASE Unknown primary leiomyosarcoma
NAME Chen, Chieh Min
DATE OF BIRTH 26 September 1983
SEX Female
MEDICAL RECORD # 35462818

PHYSICIAN
ORDERING PHYSICIAN Yeh, Yi-Chen
MEDICAL FACILITY Taipei Veterans General Hospital
ADDITIONAL RECIPIENT None
MEDICAL FACILITY ID 205872
PATHOLOGIST Not Provided

SPECIMEN
SPECIMEN SITE Lung
SPECIMEN ID N2218692 (PF221 26)
SPECIMEN TYPE Slide Deck
DATE OF COLLECTION 01 November 2022
SPECIMEN RECEIVED 14 November 2022

Biomarker Findings

Microsatellite status - MS-Stable
Tumor Mutational Burden - 6 Muts/Mb

Genomic Findings

For a complete list of the genes assayed, please refer to the Appendix.

RICTOR amplification
CD36 T111fs*22
MSH3 S8fs*17
RB1 rearrangement intron 1
RUNX1 amplification - equivocal†
TP53 R342P

† See About the Test in appendix for details.

Report Highlights

- Evidence-matched **clinical trial options** based on this patient's genomic findings: (p. 7)

BIOMARKER FINDINGS	THERAPY AND CLINICAL TRIAL IMPLICATIONS
Microsatellite status - MS-Stable	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section
Tumor Mutational Burden - 6 Muts/Mb	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section

GENOMIC FINDINGS	THERAPIES WITH CLINICAL RELEVANCE (IN PATIENT'S TUMOR TYPE)	THERAPIES WITH CLINICAL RELEVANCE (IN OTHER TUMOR TYPE)
***RICTOR* -** amplification	none	none
1 Trial see p. 7		

GENOMIC FINDINGS WITH NO REPORTABLE THERAPEUTIC OR CLINICAL TRIAL OPTIONS

For more information regarding biological and clinical significance, including prognostic, diagnostic, germline, and potential chemosensitivity implications, see the Genomic Findings section.

NOTE Genomic alterations detected may be associated with activity of certain FDA-approved drugs; however, the agents listed in this report may have varied clinical evidence in the patient's tumor type.

Neither the therapeutic agents nor the trials identified are ranked in order of potential or predicted efficacy for this patient, nor are they ranked in order of level of evidence for this patient's tumor type.

Electronically signed by Lena Stuart, M.D. | 28 November 2022
Julia Elvin, M.D., Ph.D., Laboratory Director CLIA: 22D2027531
Nimesh R. Patel, M.D., Laboratory Director CLIA: 34D2044309
Foundation Medicine, Inc. | 1.888.988.3639

Sample Preparation: 7010 Kit Creek Road, Morrisville, NC 27560 · CLIA: 34D2044309
Sample Analysis: 150 Second St., 1st Floor, Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531
Post-Sequencing Analysis: 150 Second St., 1st Floor. Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531

BIOMARKER

Microsatellite status

RESULT
MS-Stable

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

On the basis of clinical evidence, MSS tumors are significantly less likely than MSI-H tumors to respond to anti-PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitors[1-3], including approved therapies nivolumab and pembrolizumab[4]. In a retrospective analysis of 361 patients with solid tumors treated with pembrolizumab, 3% were MSI-H and experienced a significantly higher ORR compared with non-MSI-H cases (70% vs. 12%, p=0.001)[5].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

In a computational analysis of paired tumor and normal sarcomas in the TCGA dataset, 40% of which were leiomyosarcomas, only 0.8% (2/255) of samples were MSI-high (MSI-H)[6]. Smaller studies have reported MSI at any level in a subset of leiomyosarcoma patients[7-12], including MSI-H in two of seven cases[12-13]. The prognostic significance of MSI in leiomyosarcoma is unknown (PubMed, Jan 2022).

FINDING SUMMARY

Microsatellite instability (MSI) is a condition of genetic hypermutability that generates excessive amounts of short insertion/deletion mutations in the genome; it generally occurs at microsatellite DNA sequences and is caused by a deficiency in DNA mismatch repair (MMR) in the tumor[14]. Defective MMR and consequent MSI occur as a result of genetic or epigenetic inactivation of one of the MMR pathway proteins, primarily MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, or PMS2[14-16]. This sample is microsatellite-stable (MSS), equivalent to the clinical definition of an MSS tumor: one with mutations in none of the tested microsatellite markers[17-19]. MSS status indicates MMR proficiency and typically correlates with intact expression of all MMR family proteins[14,16,18-19].

BIOMARKER

Tumor Mutational Burden

RESULT
6 Muts/Mb

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

On the basis of clinical evidence in solid tumors, increased TMB may be associated with greater sensitivity to immunotherapeutic agents, including anti-PD-L1[20-22], anti-PD-1 therapies[20-23], and combination nivolumab and ipilimumab[24-29]. In multiple pan-tumor studies, increased tissue tumor mutational burden (TMB) was associated with sensitivity to immune checkpoint inhibitors[20-23,30-34]. In the KEYNOTE 158 trial of pembrolizumab monotherapy for patients with solid tumors, significant improvement in ORR was observed for patients with TMB ≥10 Muts/Mb (as measured by this assay) compared with those with TMB <10 Muts/Mb in a large cohort that included multiple tumor types[30]; similar findings were observed in the KEYNOTE 028 and 012 trials[23]. At the same TMB cutpoint, retrospective analysis of patients with solid tumors treated with any checkpoint inhibitor identified that tissue TMB scores ≥ 10 Muts/Mb were associated with prolonged time to treatment failure compared with scores <10 muts/Mb (HR=0.68)[34]. For patients with solid tumors treated with nivolumab plus ipilimumab in the CheckMate 848 trial, improved responses were observed in patients with a tissue TMB ≥ 10 Muts/Mb independent of blood TMB at any cutpoint in matched samples[35]. However, support for higher TMB thresholds and efficacy was observed in the prospective Phase 2 MyPathway trial of atezolizumab for patients with pan-solid tumors, where improved ORR and DCR was seen in patients with TMB ≥ 16 Muts/Mb than those with TMB ≥ 10 and <16 Muts/Mb[33]. Similarly, analyses across several solid tumor types reported that patients with higher TMB (defined as ≥16-20 Muts/Mb) achieved greater clinical benefit from PD-1 or PD-L1-targeting monotherapy compared with patients with higher TMB treated with chemotherapy[36] or those with lower TMB treated with PD-1 or PD-L1-targeting agents[21].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Leiomyosarcoma harbors a median TMB of 2.5 mutations per megabase (muts/Mb), and <1% of cases have high TMB (>20 muts/Mb)[37]. Sarcomas in general also harbor a median TMB of 2.5 muts/Mb, with angiosarcoma (13.4%) and malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor (MPNST) (8.2%) having the highest percentage of cases with high TMB (>20 muts/Mb)[37]. Published data investigating the prognostic implications of tissue TMB in sarcoma are conflicting (PubMed, Feb 2022). High tissue TMB was associated with improved PFS and metastasis-free survival in a study of undifferentiated sarcomas[38], but with reduced survival in a study of patients with rhabdomyosarcoma[39].

FINDING SUMMARY

Tumor mutation burden (TMB, also known as mutation load) is a measure of the number of somatic protein-coding base substitution and insertion/deletion mutations occurring in a tumor specimen. TMB is affected by a variety of causes, including exposure to mutagens such as ultraviolet light in melanoma[40-41] and cigarette smoke in lung cancer[42-43], treatment with temozolomide-based chemotherapy in glioma[44-45], mutations in the proofreading domains of DNA polymerases encoded by the POLE and POLD1 genes[46-50], and microsatellite instability (MSI)[46,49-50]. This sample harbors a TMB level associated with lower rates of clinical benefit from treatment with PD-1- or PD-L1-targeting immune checkpoint inhibitors compared with patients with tumors harboring higher TMB levels, based on several studies in multiple solid tumor types[21-22,30].

GENE
RICTOR

ALTERATION
amplification

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

RICTOR amplification may indicate sensitivity to mTORC1/2 inhibitors[51] or dual PI3K/mTOR inhibitors[52]. A patient with RICTOR-amplified lung adenocarcinoma experienced SD for >18 months upon treatment with the dual mTORC1/2 inhibitor CC-223[51], and a patient with RICTOR-amplified metastatic thymic carcinoma achieved a PR upon treatment with a pan-PI3K/mTORC1/2 inhibitor PQR309[52]. In contrast, no clinical benefit was reported for 4 patients with RICTOR-amplified small cell lung cancer treated with the mTORC1/2 inhibitor vistusertib[53] and additional trials of this compound were terminated due to lack of efficacy[54].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

In the Sarcoma Genome Project dataset, putative high-level amplification of RICTOR has been reported in 7% (2/27) of leiomyosarcomas[55]. RICTOR overexpression has been observed particularly in well-differentiated leiomyosarcoma[56]. Published data investigating the prognostic implications of RICTOR amplification in leiomyosarcoma are limited (PubMed, Jan 2022).

FINDING SUMMARY

RICTOR encodes an mTOR-binding protein that forms part of the rapamycin-insensitive mTORC2 complex, a regulator of cell metabolism and the cytoskeleton[57-59]. RICTOR amplification has been reported in cancer[60] and has been associated with clinical response to mTORC1/2 inhibition[61-62] .

GENE
CD36

ALTERATION
T111fs*22

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_000072.3

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
332_333delCA

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr7:80290425-80290427

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no therapies to target genomic alterations in CD36.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Somatic mutations of CD36 are generally rare in cancer, reported in 0-2.5% of various tumor types (COSMIC, Jan 2022)[63]. Published data investigating the prognostic implications of CD36 alterations in cancer are generally limited (PubMed, 2022). In acute myeloid leukemia, high CD36 gene expression has been associated with poor outcomes and observed in chemotherapy-resistant leukemic cells[64].

FINDING SUMMARY

CD36 encodes the thrombospondin receptor which is involved in cell adhesion. Preclinical studies have shown that decrease in CD36 expression in breast cancer is modulated by estradiol[65].

Electronically signed by Lena Stuart, M.D. | 28 November 2022
Julia Elvin, M.D., Ph.D., Laboratory Director CLIA: 22D2027531
Nimesh R. Patel, M.D., Laboratory Director CLIA: 34D2044309
Foundation Medicine, Inc. | 1.888.988.3639

Sample Preparation: 7010 Kit Creek Road, Morrisville, NC 27560 · CLIA: 34D2044309
Sample Analysis: 150 Second St., 1st Floor, Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531
Post-Sequencing Analysis: 150 Second St., 1st Floor. Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531

GENE
MSH3

ALTERATION
S8fs*17

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_002439.3

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
22delT

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr5:79950567-79950568

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no targeted approaches to address MSH3 mutation or loss. However, preclinical studies in the context of MSH3-deficient cancer cells have demonstrated antitumor efficacy of DNA-PKcs inhibitors[66] and PARP inhibitors such as olaparib[67] and have shown increased chemosensitivity to cisplatin, oxaliplatin, and SN-38[67-68]. However, these remain to be tested clinically.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

MSH3 mutations have been reported with the highest incidence in endometrial (9.0%), stomach (3.6%), skin (3.4%), and CRC (1.9%) (cBioPortal, 2022)[69-70]. MSH3 loss has been reported with the highest incidence in ovarian serous cystadenocarcinoma (3.3%), prostate adenocarcinoma (2.6%), and esophageal adenocarcinoma (1.1%) (cBioPortal, 2022)[69-70]. MSH3 loss has been correlated with the late development and progression of a variety of sporadic cancers including lung, ovarian, bladder, breast, and colorectal tumors[71-76]. Consistent with this observation, studies have suggested that MSH3 loss increases chromosomal instability in p53-driven tumor models[77]. Certain germline polymorphisms in MSH3 have been associated with poor prognosis in CRC[76], HNSCC[78], non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)[79], and pancreatic cancer[80]. However, in one study of patients with MLH1-deficient CRC, MSH3 loss was associated with improved post-surgery outcome[81].

FINDING SUMMARY

MSH3 encodes a DNA mismatch repair protein. Two MutS homolog (MSH) complexes, MSH2-MSH6 (MutS-alpha) and MSH2-MSH3 (MutS-beta), are responsible for recognition of mismatched bases[77]. MSH3 and MutS-beta has also been shown to participate in double-strand break repair by homologous recombination[66,77]. MSH3 loss of function has been linked to the production of tetranucleotide microsatellite frameshift mutations termed EMAST (elevated microsatellite alterations at selected tetranucleotide repeats)[82-83]. The presence of EMAST has been recognized as a biomarker in multiple solid cancers with microsatellite instability (MSI)[84]. Inactivating MSH3 mutations found in cancer tend to be frameshift, missense, or allelic loss[76,81,85-86]. Certain germline polymorphisms in MSH3 have been reported to increase the risk of various cancers including colorectal (CRC)[87-91], breast[87,92], esophageal[93], prostate[87,94-95], gastric[86], and head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC)[78]. Inactivating germline polymorphisms have been associated with hereditary colorectal adenomatous polyposis[96].

GENE
RB1

ALTERATION
rearrangement intron 1

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

On the basis of limited clinical data[97] and strong preclinical data[98-101], RB1 inactivation may be associated with sensitivity to inhibitors of Aurora kinase A, particularly in small cell lung cancer (SCLC). A clinical study evaluating the Aurora kinase A inhibitor alisertib for patients with prostate cancer did not find an association between RB1 deletion and clinical benefit[102]. Other approaches to target RB1 inactivation under investigation in preclinical studies include inhibitors of BCL-2 family members[103] and activation of the NOTCH pathway[104].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

RB1 mutations have been reported in up to 53% of leiomyosarcomas[105-106]. RB1 loss appears to play a role in the development of leiomyosarcoma; one study reported alterations in the Rb-cyclin D pathway in 90% of 23 leiomyosarcoma cases examined[107]. RB1 gene loss has been reported in leiomyosarcoma of the urinary bladder and loss of the RB1 locus on chromosome 13q14 occurs frequently in leiomyosarcoma[108-110]. Published data investigating the prognostic implications of RB1 mutations in leiomyosarcoma are limited (PubMed, Feb 2022).

FINDING SUMMARY

RB1 encodes the retinoblastoma protein (Rb), a tumor suppressor and negative regulator of the cell cycle[111-112]. Alterations such as seen here may disrupt RB1 function or expression[113-119].

POTENTIAL GERMLINE IMPLICATIONS

Mutations in RB1 underlie the development of retinoblastoma (RB), a rare tumor that arises at a rate of approximately 1:20,000 live births, with nearly 5,000 new cases worldwide per year[120]. Germline mutations in RB1 account for approximately 40% of RB tumors[121] and are associated with an increased risk of developing secondary malignancies that include soft tissue and bone sarcoma and malignant melanoma[122-123]. In the appropriate clinical context, germline testing of RB1 is recommended.

GENE
RUNX1

ALTERATION
amplification - equivocal

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no therapies available to directly target inactivating alterations in RUNX1. Limited clinical[124-125] and preclinical[126] data suggest that RUNX1 alterations, rearrangements in particular, may be associated with sensitivity to DNMT inhibitors, such as the approved agents azacitidine and decitabine, and the BCL-2 inhibitor, venetoclax, in AML[127]. However, multiple clinical studies have reported that RUNX1 is not a significant biomarker for efficacy of these therapies[124,128-130]. Similarly, based on limited clinical[131] and preclinical[132-134] evidence, RUNX1 rearrangements may predict sensitivity to HDAC inhibitors. However, further studies are required to establish clinical significance. There are no approved therapies that directly target RUNX1 amplification[135].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

RUNX1 alterations were not found in any of the leiomyosarcoma samples analyzed in COSMIC nor 27 samples analyzed in the MSKCC Sarcoma dataset (COSMIC, cBioPortal, Aug 2021)[63,69-70]. The frequency of RUNX1 rearrangement in solid tumors has not been evaluated (cBioPortal, COSMIC, PubMed, Oct 2022)[63,69-70]. Published data investigating the prognostic implications of RUNX1 alterations in solid tumors are generally limited (PubMed, Jun 2022).

FINDING SUMMARY

RUNX1 encodes a transcription factor that is involved in developmental gene expression programs and hematopoiesis. It is a frequent site of translocation and mutation in myeloid cancers, and it functions as a tumor suppressor in this context[136-137]. Reports of RUNX1 translocations and mutations in myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS) and acute myeloid leukemia (AML) are common. RUNX1 plays a context-dependent role in epithelial cells and has been implicated as both a tumor suppressor and oncogene in different types of solid tumors[138]. RUNX1 amplification has been reported in B-lymphoblastic leukemia[139-143].

GENE
TP53

ALTERATION
R342P

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_000546.4

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
1025G>C

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr17:7574002

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no approved therapies to address TP53 mutation or loss. However, tumors with TP53 loss of function alterations may be sensitive to the WEE1 inhibitor adavosertib[144-147] or p53 gene therapy such as SGT53[148-152]. In a Phase 1 study, adavosertib in combination with gemcitabine, cisplatin, or carboplatin elicited PRs in 9.7% and SDs in 53% of patients with solid tumors; the response rate was 21% (4/19) for patients with TP53 mutations versus 12% (4/33) for patients who were TP53 wildtype[153]. A Phase 2 trial of adavosertib in combination with chemotherapy (gemcitabine, carboplatin, paclitaxel, or doxorubicin) reported a 32% (30/94, 3 CR) ORR and a 73% (69/94) DCR for patients with platinum-refractory TP53-mutated ovarian, Fallopian tube, or peritoneal cancer[154]. A smaller Phase 2 trial of adavosertib in combination with carboplatin achieved a 43% (9/21, 1 CR) ORR and a 76% (16/21) DCR for patients with platinum-refractory TP53-mutated ovarian cancer[155]. The combination of adavosertib with paclitaxel and carboplatin for patients with TP53-mutated ovarian cancer also significantly increased PFS compared with paclitaxel and carboplatin alone[156]. In the Phase 2 VIKTORY trial, patients with TP53-mutated metastatic and/or recurrent gastric cancer experienced a 24% (6/25) ORR with adavosertib combined with paclitaxel[54]. A Phase 1 trial of neoadjuvant adavosertib in combination with cisplatin and docetaxel for head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC) elicited a 71% (5/7) response rate for patients with TP53 alterations[157]. The Phase 2 FOCUS4-C trial for patients with TP53- and RAS-mutated colorectal cancer reported improvement in PFS (3.61 vs. 1.87 months, HR=0.35, p=0.0022), but not OS (14.0 vs 12.8 months, p=0.93), following adavosertib treatment compared with active monitoring[158]. In a Phase 1b clinical trial of SGT-53 in combination with docetaxel for patients with solid tumors, 75% (9/12) of evaluable patients experienced clinical benefit, including 2 confirmed and 1 unconfirmed PRs and 2 instances of SD with significant tumor shrinkage[152]. Missense mutations leading to TP53 inactivation may be sensitive to therapies that reactivate mutated p53 such as eprenetapopt. In a Phase 1b trial for patients with p53-positive high-grade serous ovarian cancer, eprenetapopt combined with carboplatin and pegylated liposomal doxorubicin achieved a 52% (11/21) response rate and 100% DCR[159]. A Phase 1 trial of eprenetapopt with pembrolizumab for patients with solid tumors reported an ORR of 10% (3/29)[160].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

TP53 alterations have been reported in 59% of leiomyosarcoma cases[161]. In the Sarcoma Genome Project dataset, putative homozygous deletion of TP53 has been found in 10.6% of cases, including 3.7% (1/27) of leiomyosarcoma cases[55]. Mutations in TP53 are associated with poor prognosis for patients with leiomyosarcoma[162].

FINDING SUMMARY

Functional loss of the tumor suppressor p53, which is encoded by the TP53 gene, is common in aggressive advanced cancers[163]. Alterations such as seen here may disrupt TP53 function or expression[164-168].

POTENTIAL GERMLINE IMPLICATIONS

One or more of the TP53 variants observed here has been described in the ClinVar database as a likely pathogenic or pathogenic germline mutation (by an expert panel or multiple submitters) associated with Li-Fraumeni syndrome (ClinVar, Sep 2022)[169]. Follow-up germline testing would be needed to distinguish whether the finding in this patient is somatic or germline. Germline mutations in TP53 are associated with the very rare autosomal dominant disorder Li-Fraumeni syndrome and the early onset of many cancers[170-172], including sarcomas[173-174]. Estimates for the prevalence of germline TP53 mutations in the general population range from 1:5,000[175] to 1:20,000[174]. For pathogenic TP53 mutations identified during tumor sequencing, the rate of germline mutations was 1% in the overall population and 6% in tumors arising before age 30[176]. In the appropriate clinical context, germline testing of TP53 is recommended.

POTENTIAL CLONAL HEMATOPOIESIS IMPLICATIONS

Variants seen in this gene have been reported to occur in clonal hematopoiesis (CH), an age-related process in which hematopoietic stem cells acquire somatic mutations that allow for clonal expansion[177-182]. CH in this gene has been associated with increased mortality, risk of coronary heart disease, risk of ischemic stroke, and risk of secondary hematologic malignancy[177-178]. Clinical management of patients with CH in this gene may include monitoring for hematologic changes and reduction of controllable risk factors for cardiovascular disease[183]. Comprehensive genomic profiling of solid tumors detects nontumor alterations that are due to CH[181,184-185]. Patient-matched peripheral blood mononuclear cell sequencing is required to conclusively determine if this alteration is present in tumor or is secondary to CH.

NOTE Clinical trials are ordered by gene and prioritized by: age range inclusion criteria for pediatric patients, proximity to ordering medical facility, later trial phase, and verification of trial information within the last two months. While every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the information contained below, the information available in the public domain is continually updated and should be investigated by the physician or research staff. This is not a comprehensive list of all available clinical trials. Foundation Medicine displays a subset of trial options and ranks them in this order of descending priority: Qualification for pediatric trial → Geographical proximity → Later trial phase. Clinical trials listed here may have additional enrollment criteria that may require medical screening to determine final eligibility. For additional information about listed clinical trials or to conduct a search for additional trials, please see clinicaltrials.gov. Or visit https://www.foundationmedicine.com/genomic-testing#support-services.

GENE
RICTOR

ALTERATION
amplification

RATIONALE
RICTOR amplification may predict sensitivity to dual mTORC1/mTORC2 inhibitors, as well as dual PI3K/mTOR inhibitors.

NCT04337463

PHASE NULL

ATG-008 Combined With Toripalimab in Advanced Solid Tumors

TARGETS
mTORC1, mTORC2, PD-1

LOCATIONS: Chongqing (China), Chengdu (China)

NOTE One or more variants of unknown significance (VUS) were detected in this patient's tumor. These variants may not have been adequately characterized in the scientific literature at the time this report was issued, and/or the genomic context of these alterations makes their significance unclear. We choose to include them here in the event that they become clinically meaningful in the future. Please note that some VUS rearrangements between targeted genes and unknown fusion partners or intergenic regions detected by RNA sequencing may not be reported.

ASMTL
T280I

CIC
S734L

CREBBP
Q278P

EPHB1
E605K

ERG
amplification

ETV5
rearrangement, rearrangement and rearrangement

GRIN2A
I876T

IL7R
amplification

MYCN
A184S

NF1
rearrangement

PDGFRA
T440M

STAG2
amplification

TLL2
R343G

U2AF1
amplification

FoundationOne Heme is designed to include genes known to be somatically altered in human hematologic malignancies and sarcomas that are validated targets for therapy, either approved or in clinical trials, and/or that are unambiguous drivers of oncogenesis based on current knowledge. The current assay utilizes DNA sequencing to interrogate 406 genes as well as selected introns of 31 genes involved in rearrangements, in addition to RNA sequencing of 265 genes. The assay will be updated periodically to reflect new knowledge about cancer biology.

HEMATOLOGICAL MALIGNANCY DNA GENE LIST: ENTIRE CODING SEQUENCE FOR THE DETECTION OF BASE SUBSTITUTIONS, INSERTION/DELETIONS, AND COPY NUMBER ALTERATIONS

ABL1	*ACTB*	*ADGRA2 (GPR124)*	*AKT1*	*AKT2*	*AKT3*	*ALK*	*AMER1 (FAM123B or WTX)*	
APC	*APH1A*	*AR*	*ARAF*	*ARFRP1*	*ARHGAP26 (GRAF)*		*ARID1A*	*ARID2*
ASMTL	*ASXL1*	*ATM*	*ATR*	*ATRX*	*AURKA*	*AURKB*	*AXIN1*	*AXL*
B2M	*BAP1*	*BARD1*	*BCL10*	*BCL11B*	*BCL2*	*BCL2L2*	*BCL6*	*BCL7A*
BCOR	*BCORL1*	*BIRC3*	*BLM*	*BRAF*	*BRCA1*	*BRCA2*	*BRD4*	*BRIP1*
BRSK1	*BTG2*	*BTK*	*BTLA*	*CAD*	*CALR**	*CARD11*	*CBFB*	*CBL*
CCN6 (WISP3)	*CCND1*	*CCND2*	*CCND3*	*CCNE1*	*CCT6B*	*CD22*	*CD274 (PD-L1)*	*CD36*
CD58	*CD70*	*CD79A*	*CD79B*	*CDC73*	*CDH1*	*CDK12*	*CDK4*	*CDK6*
CDK8	*CDKN1B*	*CDKN2A*	*CDKN2B*	*CDKN2C*	*CEBPA*	*CHD2*	*CHEK1*	*CHEK2*
CIC	*CIITA*	*CKS1B*	*CPS1*	*CREBBP*	*CRKL*	*CRLF2*	*CSF1R*	*CSF3R*
CTCF	*CTNNA1*	*CTNNB1*	*CUX1*	*CXCR4*	*DAXX*	*DDR2*	*DDX3X*	*DNM2*
DNMT3A	*DOT1L*	*DTX1*	*DUSP2*	*DUSP9*	*EBF1*	*ECT2L*	*EED*	*EGFR*
ELP2	*EMSY (C11orf30)*	*EP300*	*EPHA3*	*EPHA5*	*EPHA7*	*EPHB1*	*ERBB2*	*ERBB3*
ERBB4	*ERG*	*ESR1*	*ETS1*	*ETV6*	*EXOSC6*	*EZH2*	*FAF1*	*FANCA*
FANCC	*FANCD2*	*FANCE*	*FANCF*	*FANCG*	*FANCL*	*FAS (TNFRSF6)*	*FBXO11*	*FBXO31*
FBXW7	*FGF10*	*FGF14*	*FGF19*	*FGF23*	*FGF3*	*FGF4*	*FGF6*	*FGFR1*
FGFR2	*FGFR3*	*FGFR4*	*FHIT*	*FLCN*	*FLT1*	*FLT3*	*FLT4*	*FLYWCH1*
FOXL2	*FOXO1*	*FOXO3*	*FOXP1*	*FRS2*	*GADD45B*	*GATA1*	*GATA2*	*GATA3*
GID4 (C17orf39)	*GNA11*	*GNA12*	*GNA13*	*GNAQ*	*GNAS*	*GRIN2A*	*GSK3B*	*GTSE1*
HDAC1	*HDAC4*	*HDAC7*	*HGF*	*H1-2 (HIST1H1C)*		*H1-3 (HIST1H1D)*		
H1-4 (HIST1H1E)		*H2AC6 (HIST1H2AC)*		*H2AC11 (HIST1H2AG)*		*H2AC16 (HIST1H2AL)*		
H2AC17 (HIST1H2AM)		*H2BC4 (HIST1H2BC)*		*H2BC11 (HIST1H2BJ)*		*H2BC12 (HIST1H2BK)*		
H2BC17 (HIST1H2BO)		*H3C2 (HIST1H3B)*		*HNF1A*	*HRAS*	*HSP90AA1*	*ICK*	*ID3*
IDH1	*IDH2*	*IGF1R*	*IKBKE*	*IKZF1*	*IKZF2*	*IKZF3*	*IL7R*	*INHBA*
INPP4B	*INPP5D (SHIP)*	*IRF1*	*IRF4*	*IRF8*	*IRS2*	*JAK1*	*JAK2*	*JAK3*
JARID2	*JUN*	*KAT6A (MYST3)*	*KDM2B*	*KDM4C*	*KDM5A*	*KDM5C*	*KDM6A*	*KDR*
KEAP1	*KIT*	*KLHL6*	*KMT2A (MLL)*	*KMT2C (MLL3)*	*KMT2D (MLL2)*	*KRAS*	*LEF1*	*LRP1B*
LRRK2	*MAF*	*MAFB*	*MAGED1*	*MALT1*	*MAP2K1*	*MAP2K2*	*MAP2K4*	*MAP3K1*
MAP3K14	*MAP3K6*	*MAP3K7*	*MAPK1*	*MCL1*	*MDM2*	*MDM4*	*MED12*	*MEF2B*
MEF2C	*MEN1*	*MET*	*MIB1*	*MITF*	*MKI67*	*MLH1*	*MPL*	*MRE11 (MRE11A)*
MSH2	*MSH3*	*MSH6*	*MTOR*	*MUTYH*	*MYC*	*MYCL (MYCL1)*	*MYCN*	*MYD88*
MYO18A	*NCOR2*	*NCSTN*	*NF1*	*NF2*	*NFE2L2*	*NFKBIA*	*NKX2-1*	*NOD1*
NOTCH1	*NOTCH2*	*NPM1*	*NRAS*	*NSD2 (WHSC1 or MMSET)*		*NT5C2*	*NTRK1*	*NTRK2*
NTRK3	*NUP93*	*NUP98*	*P2RY8*	*PAG1*	*PAK3*	*PALB2*	*PASK*	*PAX5*
PBRM1	*PC*	*PCBP1*	*PCLO*	*PDCD1*	*PDCD11*	*PDCD1LG2 (PD-L2)*		*PDGFRA*
PDGFRB	*PDK1*	*PHF6*	*PIK3CA*	*PIK3CG*	*PIK3R1*	*PIK3R2*	*PIM1*	*PLCG2*
POT1	*PPP2R1A*	*PRDM1*	*PRKAR1A*	*PRKDC*	*PRSS8*	*PTCH1*	*PTEN*	*PTPN11*
PTPN2	*PTPN6 (SHP-1)*	*PTPRO*	*RAD21*	*RAD50*	*RAD51*	*RAF1*	*RARA*	*RASGEF1A*
RB1	*RELN*	*RET*	*RHOA*	*RICTOR*	*RNF43*	*ROS1*	*RPTOR*	*RUNX1*
S1PR2	*SDHA*	*SDHB*	*SDHC*	*SDHD*	*SERP2*	*SETBP1*	*SETD2*	*SF3B1*
SGK1	*SMAD2*	*SMAD4*	*SMARCA1*	*SMARCA4*	*SMARCB1*	*SMC1A*	*SMC3*	*SMO*
SOCS1	*SOCS2*	*SOCS3*	*SOX10*	*SOX2*	*SPEN*	*SPOP*	*SRC*	*SRSF2*
STAG2	*STAT3*	*STAT4*	*STAT5A*	*STAT5B*	*STAT6*	*STK11*	*SUFU*	*SUZ12*
TAF1	*TBL1XR1*	*TCF3 (E2A)*	*TCL1A (TCL1)*	*TENT5C (FAM46C)*	*TET2*	*TGFBR2*	*TLL2*	*TMEM30A*
TMSB4XP8 (TMSL3)		*TNFAIP3*	*TNFRSF11A*	*TNFRSF14*	*TNFRSF17*	*TOP1*	*TP53*	*TP63*
TRAF2	*TRAF3*	*TRAF5*	*TSC1*	*TSC2*	*TSHR*	*TUSC3*	*TYK2*	*U2AF1*

U2AF2	*VHL*	*WDR90*	*WT1*	*XBP1*	*XPO1*	*YY1AP1*	*ZMYM3*	*ZNF217*
ZNF24 (ZSCAN3)	*ZNF703*	*ZRSR2*						

*Note: the assay was updated on 11/8/2016 to include the detection of alterations in CALR

HEMATOLOGICAL MALIGNANCY DNA GENE LIST: FOR THE DETECTION OF SELECT REARRANGEMENTS

ALK	*BCL2*	*BCL6*	*BCR*	*BRAF*	*CCND1*	*CRLF2*	*EGFR*	*EPOR*
ETV1	*ETV4*	*ETV5*	*ETV6*	*EWSR1*	*FGFR2*	*IGH*	*IGK*	*IGL*
JAK1	*JAK2*	*KMT2A (MLL)*	*MYC*	*NTRK1*	*PDGFRA*	*PDGFRB*	*RAF1*	*RARA*
RET	*ROS1*	*TMPRSS2*	*TRG*					

HEMATOLOGICAL MALIGNANCY RNA GENE LIST: FOR THE DETECTION OF SELECT REARRANGEMENTS*

ABI1	*ABL1*	*ABL2*	*ACSL6*	*AFDN (MLLT4 or AF6)*		*AFF1*	*AFF4*	*ALK*
ARHGAP26 (GRAF)		*ARHGEF12*	*ARID1A*	*ARNT*	*ASXL1*	*ATF1*	*ATG5*	*ATIC*
BCL10	*BCL11A*	*BCL11B*	*BCL2*	*BCL3*	*BCL6*	*BCL7A*	*BCL9*	*BCOR*
BCR	*BIRC3*	*BRAF*	*BTG1*	*CAMTA1*	*CARS1 (CARS)*	*CBFA2T3*	*CBFB*	*CBL*
CCND1	*CCND2*	*CCND3*	*CD274 (PD-L1)*	*CDK6*	*CDX2*	*CEP43 (FGFR1OP)*	*CHIC2*	*CHN1*
CIC	*CIITA*	*CLP1*	*CLTC*	*CLTCL1*	*CNTRL (CEP110)*	*COL1A1*	*CREB3L1*	*CREB3L2*
CREBBP	*CRLF2*	*CSF1*	*CTNNB1*	*DDIT3*	*DDX10*	*DDX6*	*DEK*	*DUSP22*
EGFR	*EIF4A2*	*ELF4*	*ELL*	*ELN*	*EML4*	*EP300*	*EPOR*	*EPS15*
ERBB2	*ERG*	*ETS1*	*ETV1*	*ETV4*	*ETV5*	*ETV6*	*EWSR1*	*FCGR2B*
FCRL4	*FEV*	*FGFR1*	*FGFR2*	*FGFR3*	*FLI1*	*FNBP1*	*FOXO1*	*FOXO3*
FOXO4	*FOXP1*	*FSTL3*	*FUS*	*GAS7*	*GLI1*	*GMPS*	*GPHN*	*H4C9 (HIST1H4I)*
HERPUD1	*HEY1*	*HIP1*	*HLF*	*HMGA1*	*HMGA2*	*HOXA11*	*HOXA13*	*HOXA3*
HOXA9	*HOXC11*	*HOXC13*	*HOXD11*	*HOXD13*	*HSP90AA1*	*HSP90AB1*	*IGH*	*IGK*
IGL	*IKZF1*	*IL21R*	*IL3*	*IRF4*	*ITK*	*JAK1*	*JAK2*	*JAK3*
JAZF1	*KAT6A (MYST3)*	*KDSR*	*KIF5B*	*KMT2A (MLL)*	*LASP1*	*LCP1*	*LMO1*	*LMO2*
LPP	*LYL1*	*MAF*	*MAFB*	*MALT1*	*MDS2*	*MECOM*	*MLF1*	*MLLT1 (ENL)*
MLLT10 (AF10)	*MLLT3*	*MLLT6*	*MN1*	*MNX1*	*MRTFA (MKL1)*	*MSI2*	*MSN*	*MUC1*
MYB	*MYC*	*MYH11*	*MYH9*	*NACA*	*NBEAP1 (BCL8)*	*NCOA2*	*NDRG1*	*NF1*
NF2	*NFKB2*	*NIN*	*NOTCH1*	*NPM1*	*NR4A3*	*NSD1*	*NSD2 (WHSC1 or MMSET)*	
NSD3 (WHSC1L1)	*NTRK1*	*NTRK2*	*NTRK3*	*NUMA1*	*NUP214*	*NUP98*	*NUTM2A*	*OMD*
P2RY8	*PAFAH1B2*	*PAX3*	*PAX5*	*PAX7*	*PBX1*	*PCM1*	*PCSK7*	*PDCD1LG2 (PD-L2)*
PDE4DIP	*PDGFB*	*PDGFRA*	*PDGFRB*	*PER1*	*PHF1*	*PICALM*	*PIM1*	*PLAG1*
PML	*POU2AF1*	*PPP1CB*	*PRDM1*	*PRDM16*	*PRRX1*	*PSIP1*	*PTCH1*	*PTK7*
RABEP1	*RAF1*	*RALGDS*	*RAP1GDS1*	*RARA*	*RBM15*	*RET*	*RHOH*	*RNF213*
RNF217-AS1 (STL)		*ROS1*	*RPL22*	*RPN1*	*RUNX1*	*RUNX1T1 (ETO)*	*RUNX2*	*SEC31A*
SEPTIN5 (SEPT5)	*SEPTIN6 (SEPT6)*	*SEPTIN9 (SEPT9)*	*SET*	*SH3GL1*	*SLC1A2*	*SNX29 (RUNDC2A)*		*SRSF3*
SS18	*SSX1*	*SSX2*	*SSX4*	*STAT6*	*SYK*	*TAF15*	*TAL1*	*TAL2*
TBL1XR1	*TCF3 (E2A)*	*TCL1A (TCL1)*	*TEC*	*TET1*	*TFE3*	*TFG*	*TFPT*	*TFRC*
TLX1	*TLX3*	*TMPRSS2*	*TNFRSF11A*	*TOP1*	*TP63*	*TPM3*	*TPM4*	*TRIM24*
TRIP11	*TTL*	*TYK2*	*USP6*		*YPEL5*	*ZBTB16*	*ZMYM2*	*ZNF384*
ZNF521								

*Note: some VUS rearrangements between targeted genes and unknown fusion partners or intergenic regions detected by RNA sequencing may not be reported.

ADDITIONAL ASSAYS: FOR THE DETECTION OF SELECT CANCER BIOMARKERS

Microsatellite (MS) status
Tumor Mutational Burden (TMB)

The median exon coverage for this sample is 794x

ACCURACY		
Sensitivity: Base Substitutions	At ≥5% Minor Allele Frequency	>99.0%
Sensitivity: Insertions/Deletions (1-40bp)	At ≥10% Minor Allele Frequency	98.0%
Sensitivity: Focal Copy Number Alterations (Homozygous Deletions or Amplifications)	At ≥8 copies	>95.0%
Sensitivity: Microsatellite Instability-High (MSI-H) status	Positive Predictive Agreement (PPA)	100.0% (87.54%-100.00%)*
Sensitivity: Microsatellite Stable (MSS) status	Positive Predictive Agreement (PPA)	89.66% (81.50%, 94.46%)*
Sensitivity: Known Gene Fusions	>95.0%	
Specificity: Base Substitutions, Insertions/Deletions, and Focal Copy Number Alterations	Positive Predictive Value (PPV)	>99.0%
Specificity: Known Gene Fusions	Positive Predictive Value (PPV)	>95.0%
Specificity: Microsatellite Instability-High (MSI-H) status	Negative Predictive Agreement (NPA)	97.44% (91.12%-99.29%)*
Specificity: Microsatellite Stable (MSS) status	Negative Predictive Agreement (NPA)	94.44% (86.57%, 97.82%)*
Accuracy: Tumor Mutation Burden	At ≥20% tumor nuclei	>90.0%
Reproducibility (average concordance between replicates)	97.0% inter-batch precision 97.0% intra-batch precision 95.0% microsatellite status precision 96.0% tumor mutation burden precision	

*95% Confidence Interval

Assay specifications were determined for typical median exon coverage of approximately 500X. For additional information regarding the validation of FoundationOne®Heme, please refer to the article He, J. et al. Integrated genomic DNA/RNA profiling of hematologic malignancies in the clinical setting, Blood (2016 Jun. 16).

In the fraction-based MSI algorithm, a tumor specimen will be categorized as MSI-H, MSS, or MS-Equivocal according to the fraction of microsatellite loci determined to be altered or unstable (i.e., the fraction unstable loci score). In the FoundationOne Heme assay, MSI is evaluated based on a genome-wide analysis across >2000 microsatellite loci. For a given microsatellite locus, non-somatic alleles are discarded, and the microsatellite is categorized as unstable if remaining alleles differ from the reference genome. The final fraction unstable loci score is calculated as the number of unstable microsatellite loci divided by the number of evaluable microsatellite loci. The MSI-H and MSS cut-off thresholds were determined by analytical concordance to a PCR comparator assay using a pan-tumor sample set. Patients with results categorized as "MS-Stable" with median exon coverage <300X, "MS-Equivocal," or "Cannot Be Determined" should receive confirmatory testing using a validated orthogonal (alternative) method.

Tumor Mutational Burden (TMB) is determined by measuring the number of somatic mutations in sequenced genes on the FoundationOne Heme test and extrapolating to the genome as a whole. TMB is assayed for all FoundationOne Heme samples and is reported as the number of mutations per megabase (Muts/Mb). Tumor Mutational Burden is reported as "Cannot Be Determined" if the sample is not of sufficient quality to confidently determine Tumor Mutational Burden.

ABOUT FOUNDATIONONE HEME

FoundationOne®Heme is a comprehensive genomic profiling test for hematologic malignancies and sarcomas. The test is designed to provide physicians with clinically actionable information to help with diagnostic sub-classification, prognosis assessment, and targeted therapeutic selection. Test results provide information about clinically significant alterations, potential targeted therapies, available clinical trials, and quantitative markers that may support immunotherapy clinical trial enrollment. FoundationOne Heme is analytically validated to detect all classes of genomic alterations in more than 400 cancer-related genes. In addition to DNA sequencing, FoundationOne Heme employs RNA sequencing across 265 genes to capture a broad range of gene fusions, common drivers of hematologic malignancies and sarcomas.

FoundationOne Heme was developed and its performance characteristics determined by Foundation Medicine, Inc. (Foundation Medicine). FoundationOne Heme has not been cleared or approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The FDA has determined that such clearance or approval is not necessary. FoundationOne Heme may be used for clinical purposes and should not be regarded as purely investigational or for research only. Foundation Medicine's clinical reference laboratory is certified under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA) as qualified to perform high-complexity clinical testing.

THE REPORT

Incorporates analyses of peer-reviewed studies and other publicly available information identified by Foundation Medicine; these analyses and information may include associations between a molecular alteration (or lack of alteration) and one or more drugs with potential clinical benefit (or potential lack of clinical benefit), including drug candidates that are being studied in clinical research. Note: A finding of biomarker alteration does not necessarily indicate pharmacologic effectiveness (or lack thereof) of any drug or treatment regimen; a finding of no biomarker alteration does not necessarily indicate lack of pharmacologic effectiveness (or effectiveness) of any drug or treatment regimen.

Diagnostic Significance

FoundationOne Heme identifies alterations to select cancer-associated genes or portions of genes (biomarkers). In some cases, the Report also highlights selected negative test results regarding biomarkers of clinical significance.

Qualified Alteration Calls (Equivocal and Subclonal)

An alteration denoted as "amplification – equivocal" implies that FoundationOne Heme data provide some, but not unambiguous, evidence that the copy number of a gene exceeds the threshold for identifying copy number amplification. The threshold used in FoundationOne Heme for identifying a copy number amplification is five (5) for *ERBB2* and six (6) for all other genes. Conversely, an alteration denoted as "loss – equivocal" implies that FoundationOne Heme data provide some, but not unambiguous, evidence for homozygous deletion of the gene in question. An alteration denoted as "subclonal" is one that FoundationOne Heme analytical methodology has identified as being present in <10% of the assayed tumor DNA.

Ranking of Therapies and Clinical Trials

Ranking of Therapies in Summary Table
Therapies are ranked based on the following criteria: Therapies with clinical benefit (ranked alphabetically within each evidence category), followed by therapies associated with resistance (when applicable).

Ranking of Clinical Trials
Pediatric trial qualification → Geographical proximity → Later trial phase.

NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CANCER NETWORK® (NCCN®) CATEGORIZATION

Biomarker and genomic findings detected may be associated with certain entries within the NCCN Drugs & Biologics Compendium® (NCCN Compendium®) (www.nccn.org). The NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus indicated reflect the highest possible category for a given therapy in association with each biomarker or genomic finding. Please note, however, that the accuracy and applicability of these NCCN categories within a report may be impacted by the patient's clinical history, additional biomarker information, age, and/or co-occurring alterations. For additional information on the NCCN categories, please refer to the NCCN Compendium®. Referenced with permission from the NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines®). © National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Inc. 2022. All rights reserved. To view the most recent and complete version of the guidelines, go online to NCCN.org. NCCN makes no warranties of any kind whatsoever regarding their content, use or application and disclaims any responsibility for their application or use in any way.

LEVEL OF EVIDENCE NOT PROVIDED

Drugs with potential clinical benefit (or potential lack of clinical benefit) are not evaluated for source or level of published evidence.

NO GUARANTEE OF CLINICAL BENEFIT

This Report makes no promises or guarantees that a particular drug will be effective in the treatment of disease in any patient. This Report also makes no promises or guarantees that a drug with potential lack of clinical benefit will in fact provide no clinical benefit.

NO GUARANTEE OF REIMBURSEMENT

Foundation Medicine makes no promises or guarantees that a healthcare provider, insurer or other third party payor, whether private or governmental, will reimburse a patient for the cost of FoundationOne Heme.

TREATMENT DECISIONS ARE RESPONSIBILITY OF PHYSICIAN

Drugs referenced in this Report may not be suitable for a particular patient. The selection of any, all or none of the drugs associated with potential clinical benefit (or potential lack of clinical benefit) resides entirely within the discretion of the treating physician. Indeed, the information in this Report must be considered in conjunction with all other relevant information regarding a particular patient, before the patient's treating physician recommends a course of treatment. Decisions on patient care and treatment must be based on the independent medical judgment of the treating physician, taking into consideration all applicable information concerning the patient's condition, such as patient and family history, physical examinations, information from other diagnostic tests, and patient preferences, in accordance with the standard of care in a given community. A treating physician's decisions should not be based on a single test, such as this Test, or the information contained in this Report. Certain sample or variant characteristics may result in reduced sensitivity. These include: subclonal alterations in heterogeneous samples, low sample quality or with homozygous losses of <3 exons; and deletions and insertions >40bp, or in repetitive/high homology sequences. FoundationOne Heme is performed using DNA and RNA derived from tumor, and as such germline events may not be reported.

The following targets typically have low coverage resulting in a reduction in sensitivity: SDHD exon 4, TNFRSF11A exon1, and TP53 exon 1.

FoundationOne Heme fulfills the requirements of the European Directive 98/79 EC for in vitro

diagnostic medical devices and is registered as a CE-IVD product by Foundation Medicine's EU Authorized Representative, Qarad b.v.b.a, Cipalstraat 3, 2440 Geel, Belgium.

CE

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

The Report Highlights includes select genomic and therapeutic information with potential impact on patient care and treatment that is specific to the genomics and tumor type of the sample analyzed. This section may highlight information including targeted therapies with potential sensitivity or resistance; evidence-matched clinical trials; and variants with potential diagnostic, prognostic, nontargeted treatment, germline, or clonal hematopoiesis implications. Information included in the Report Highlights is expected to evolve with advances in scientific and clinical research. Findings included in the Report Highlights should be considered in the context of all other information in this report and other relevant patient information. Decisions on patient care and treatment are the responsibility of the treating physician.

VARIANTS TO CONSIDER FOR FOLLOW-UP GERMLINE TESTING

The variants indicated for consideration of follow-up germline testing are 1) limited to reportable short variants with a protein effect listed in the ClinVar genomic database (Landrum et al., 2018; 29165669) as Pathogenic, Pathogenic/Likely Pathogenic, or Likely Pathogenic (by an expert panel or multiple submitters), 2) associated with hereditary cancer-predisposing disorder(s), 3) detected at an allele frequency of >10%, and 4) in select genes reported by the ESMO Precision Medicine Working Group (Mandelker et al., 2019; 31050713) to have a greater than 10% probability of germline origin if identified during tumor sequencing. The selected genes are *ATM, BAP1, BRCA1, BRCA2, BRIP1, CHEK2, FLCN, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, MUTYH, PALB2, RET, SDHA, SDHB, SDHC, SDHD, TSC2,* and *VHL*, and are not inclusive of all cancer susceptibility genes. The content in this report should not substitute for genetic counseling or follow-up germline testing, which is needed to distinguish whether a finding in this patient's tumor sequencing is germline or somatic. Interpretation should be based on clinical context.

VARIANTS THAT MAY REPRESENT CLONAL HEMATOPOIESIS

Variants that may represent clonal hematopoiesis (CH) are limited to select reportable short variants in defined genes identified in solid tumors only. Variant selection was determined based on gene tumor-suppressor or oncogene status, known role in solid tumors versus hematological malignancies, and literature prevalence. The defined genes are *ASXL1, CBL, DNMT3A, IDH2, JAK2, KMT2D (MLL2), MPL, MYD88, SF3B1, TET2,* and *U2AF1* and are not inclusive of all CH genes. The content in this report should not substitute for dedicated hematological workup. Comprehensive genomic profiling of solid tumors detects nontumor alterations that are due to CH. Patient-matched peripheral blood mononuclear cell sequencing is required to conclusively determine if this alteration is present in tumor or is secondary to CH. Interpretation should be based on clinical context.

SELECT ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
CR	Complete response
DCR	Disease control rate
DNMT	DNA methyltransferase
HR	Hazard ratio
ITD	Internal tandem duplication
MMR	Mismatch repair
muts/Mb	Mutations per megabase
NOS	Not otherwise specified
ORR	Objective response rate
OS	Overall survival
PD	Progressive disease
PFS	Progression-free survival
PR	Partial response
SD	Stable disease
TKI	Tyrosine kinase inhibitor

REFERENCE SEQUENCE INFORMATION

Sequence data is mapped to the human genome, Genome Reference Consortium Human Build 37 (GRCh37), also known as hg19.

MR Suite Version (RG) 7.3.0

1. Gatalica Z, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2014) pmid: 25392179
2. Kroemer G, et al. Oncoimmunology (2015) pmid: 26140250
3. Lal N, et al. Oncoimmunology (2015) pmid: 25949894
4. Le DT, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2015) pmid: 26028255
5. Ayers et al., 2016; ASCO-SITC Abstract P60
6. Bonneville R, et al. JCO Precis Oncol (2017) pmid: 29850653
7. Suwa K, et al. J Orthop Sci (1999) pmid: 10370164
8. Verelst SJ, et al. Hum. Pathol. (2004) pmid: 15668899
9. Urso E, et al. Mol. Biol. Rep. (2012) pmid: 22782591
10. Amant F, et al. Int. J. Gynecol. Cancer () pmid: 11437928
11. Quade BJ, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (1999) pmid: 10079273
12. Risinger JI, et al. Cancer Res. (1995) pmid: 7585651
13. Nilbert M, et al. Fam. Cancer (2009) pmid: 19130300
14. Kocarnik JM, et al. Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf) (2015) pmid: 26337942
15. You JF, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 21081928
16. Bairwa NK, et al. Methods Mol. Biol. (2014) pmid: 24623249
17. Boland CR, et al. Cancer Res. (1998) pmid: 9823339
18. Pawlik TM, et al. Dis. Markers (2004) pmid: 15528785
19. Boland CR, et al. Gastroenterology (2010) pmid: 20420947
20. Samstein RM, et al. Nat. Genet. (2019) pmid: 30643254
21. Goodman AM, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2017) pmid: 28835386
22. Goodman AM, et al. Cancer Immunol Res (2019) pmid: 31405947
23. Cristescu R, et al. Science (2018) pmid: 30309915
24. Ready N, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30785829
25. Hellmann MD, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2018) pmid: 29658845
26. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29657128
27. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29731394
28. Rozeman EA, et al. Nat Med (2021) pmid: 33558721
29. Sharma P, et al. Cancer Cell (2020) pmid: 32916128
30. Marabelle A, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2020) pmid: 32919526
31. Ott PA, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30557521
32. Cristescu R, et al. J Immunother Cancer (2022) pmid: 35101941
33. Friedman CF, et al. Cancer Discov (2022) pmid: 34876409
34. Sturgill EG, et al. Oncologist (2022) pmid: 35274716
35. Schenker at al., 2022; AACR Abstract 7845
36. Legrand et al., 2018; ASCO Abstract 12000
37. Chalmers ZR, et al. Genome Med (2017) pmid: 28420421
38. Steele CD, et al. Cancer Cell (2019) pmid: 30889380
39. Casey DL, et al. Clin Cancer Res (2020) pmid: 31699828
40. Pfeifer GP, et al. Mutat. Res. (2005) pmid: 15748635
41. Hill VK, et al. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet (2013) pmid: 23875803
42. Pfeifer GP, et al. Oncogene (2002) pmid: 12379884
43. Rizvi NA, et al. Science (2015) pmid: 25765070
44. Johnson BE, et al. Science (2014) pmid: 24336570
45. Choi S, et al. Neuro-oncology (2018) pmid: 29452419
46. Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, et al. Nature (2013) pmid: 23636398
47. Briggs S, et al. J. Pathol. (2013) pmid: 23447401
48. Heitzer E, et al. Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev. (2014) pmid: 24583393
49. Nature (2012) pmid: 22810696
50. Roberts SA, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2014) pmid: 25568919
51. Cheng H, et al. Cancer Discov (2015) pmid: 26370156
52. Wicki A, et al. Eur. J. Cancer (2018) pmid: 29660598
53. Park S, et al. Cancer (2020) pmid: 32584426
54. Lee J, et al. Cancer Discov (2019) pmid: 31315834
55. Barretina J, et al. Nat. Genet. (2010) pmid: 20601955
56. Gibault L, et al. Mod. Pathol. (2012) pmid: 22080063
57. Sarbassov DD, et al. Curr. Biol. (2004) pmid: 15268862
58. Jacinto E, et al. Nat. Cell Biol. (2004) pmid: 15467718
59. Pearce LR, et al. Biochem. J. (2007) pmid: 17461779
60. Ross JS, et al. J. Clin. Pathol. (2014) pmid: 24978188
61. Cheng et al., 2014; ASCO Abstract 8027
62. Kristeleit et al., 2015; ASCO Abstract 2592
63. Tate JG, et al. Nucleic Acids Res. (2019) pmid: 30371878
64. Farge T, et al. Cancer Discov (2017) pmid: 28416471
65. Uray IP, et al. Cancer Lett. (2004) pmid: 15050739
66. Dietlein F, et al. Cancer Discov (2014) pmid: 24556366
67. Takahashi M, et al. J. Biol. Chem. (2011) pmid: 21285347
68. Park JM, et al. PLoS ONE (2013) pmid: 23724141
69. Cerami E, et al. Cancer Discov (2012) pmid: 22588877
70. Gao J, et al. Sci Signal (2013) pmid: 23550210
71. Edelmann W, et al. Cancer Res. (2000) pmid: 10706084
72. Plaschke J, et al. Int J Colorectal Dis (2012) pmid: 22249440
73. Benachenhou N, et al. Int. J. Cancer (1998) pmid: 9650548
74. Kawakami T, et al. Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. (2004) pmid: 15541380
75. Benachenhou N, et al. Br. J. Cancer (1999) pmid: 10098729
76. Plaschke J, et al. Cancer Res. (2004) pmid: 14871813
77. van Oers JM, et al. Oncogene (2014) pmid: 24013230
78. Nogueira GA, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2015) pmid: 25598504
79. Xu XL, et al. Genet. Mol. Res. (2015) pmid: 25966119
80. Dong X, et al. Oncologist (2011) pmid: 21212431
81. Laghi L, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2012) pmid: 22496206
82. Haugen AC, et al. Cancer Res. (2008) pmid: 18922920
83. Lee SY, et al. Gastroenterology (2010) pmid: 20708618
84. Watson MM, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2014) pmid: 24691426
85. Kim TM, et al. Cell (2013) pmid: 24209623
86. Ohmiya N, et al. Gene (2001) pmid: 11470537
87. Miao HK, et al. Int J Clin Exp Pathol (2015) pmid: 26617824
88. Morak M, et al. Fam. Cancer (2017) pmid: 28528517
89. Duraturo F, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2011) pmid: 21128252
90. Reeves SG, et al. Cancer Epidemiol (2012) pmid: 21974800
91. Berndt SI, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2007) pmid: 17205513
92. Yang X, et al. PLoS ONE (2015) pmid: 25927356
93. Vogelsang M, et al. PLoS ONE (2012) pmid: 22623965
94. Jafary F, et al. Asian Pac. J. Cancer Prev. (2012) pmid: 23464402
95. Hirata H, et al. J. Urol. (2008) pmid: 18355840
96. Adam R, et al. Am. J. Hum. Genet. (2016) pmid: 27476653
97. Owonikoko et al., 2016; ESMO Abstract 14230
98. Hook KE, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2012) pmid: 22222631
99. Gong X, et al. Cancer Discov (2019) pmid: 30373917
100. Oser MG, et al. Cancer Discov (2019) pmid: 30373918
101. Yang W, et al. Kaohsiung J Med Sci (2022) pmid: 34741392
102. Beltran H, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2019) pmid: 30232224
103. Allaman-Pillet N, et al. Ophthalmic Genet. () pmid: 21955141
104. Viatour P, et al. J. Exp. Med. (2011) pmid: 21875955
105. Elvin JA, et al. Oncologist (2017) pmid: 28283584
106. Williams EA, et al. JCO Precis Oncol (2020) pmid: 33015533
107. Dei Tos AP, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (1996) pmid: 8644845
108. Svajdler M, et al. Cesk Patol (2012) pmid: 22716012
109. Derré J, et al. Lab. Invest. (2001) pmid: 11232643
110. Gibault L, et al. J. Pathol. (2011) pmid: 21125665
111. Burkhart DL, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2008) pmid: 18650841
112. Knudsen ES, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2008) pmid: 19143056
113. Berge EO, et al. Mol. Cancer (2010) pmid: 20594292
114. Giacinti C, et al. Oncogene (2006) pmid: 16936740
115. Otterson GA, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (1997) pmid: 9342358
116. Otterson GA, et al. Am. J. Hum. Genet. (1999) pmid: 10486322
117. Qin XQ, et al. Genes Dev. (1992) pmid: 1534305
118. Rubin SM, et al. Cell (2005) pmid: 16360038
119. Sun H, et al. Mol. Cell. Biol. (2006) pmid: 16449662
120. Chen Z, et al. Hum. Mutat. (2014) pmid: 24282159
121. Yun J, et al. Int J Ophthalmol (2011) pmid: 22553621
122. Houston SK, et al. Int Ophthalmol Clin (2011) pmid: 21139478
123. Ng AK, et al. Semin Radiat Oncol (2010) pmid: 19959033
124. Kuendgen et al., 2013; ASH Abstract 2757
125. Inoue A, et al. J. Pediatr. Hematol. Oncol. (2014) pmid: 24608072
126. Buchi F, et al. Epigenetics (2014) pmid: 24300456
127. Wei et al., 2018; ASH Abstract 333
128. Guadagnuolo et al., 2014; ASH Abstract 1030
129. Braun T, et al. Blood (2011) pmid: 21828134
130. Tobiasson M, et al. Oncotarget (2016) pmid: 26959885
131. Odenike OM, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2008) pmid: 18981008
132. Barbetti V, et al. Oncogene (2008) pmid: 17891169
133. Hu Z, et al. Blood (2011) pmid: 21518930
134. Bots M, et al. Blood (2014) pmid: 24415537
135. Blood (2015) pmid: 25608562
136. Rio-Machín A, et al. Haematologica (2012) pmid: 22102704
137. Silva FP, et al. Oncogene (2003) pmid: 12555067
138. Scheitz CJ, et al. J. Cell. Biochem. (2013) pmid: 23150456
139. Harewood L, et al. Leukemia (2003) pmid: 12646943
140. Soulier J, et al. Leukemia (2003) pmid: 12886264
141. Reichard KK, et al. Mod Pathol (2011) pmid: 21822204
142. Boucher MO, et al. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol (2016) pmid: 26907657
143. De Braekeleer E, et al. Leuk Lymphoma (2010) pmid: 20001241
144. Hirai H, et al. Cancer Biol. Ther. (2010) pmid: 20107315
145. Bridges KA, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21799033
146. Rajeshkumar NV, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21389100
147. Osman AA, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2015) pmid: 25504633
148. Xu L, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2002) pmid: 12489850
149. Xu L, et al. Mol. Med. (2001) pmid: 11713371
150. Camp ER, et al. Cancer Gene Ther. (2013) pmid: 23470564
151. Kim SS, et al. Nanomedicine (2015) pmid: 25240597

152. Pirollo KF, et al. Mol. Ther. (2016) pmid: 27357628
153. Leijen S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27601554
154. Moore et al., 2019; ASCO Abstract 5513
155. Leijen S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27998224
156. Oza et al., 2015; ASCO Abstract 5506
157. Méndez E, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2018) pmid: 29535125
158. Seligmann JF, et al. J Clin Oncol (2021) pmid: 34538072
159. Gourley et al., 2016; ASCO Abstract 5571
160. Park H, et al. ESMO Open (2022) pmid: 36084396
161. Pérot G, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (2010) pmid: 20884963
162. Yang CY, et al. Am J Transl Res (2015) pmid: 26692951
163. Brown CJ, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2009) pmid: 19935675
164. Joerger AC, et al. Annu. Rev. Biochem. (2008) pmid: 18410249
165. Kato S, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (2003) pmid: 12826609
166. Kamada R, et al. J. Biol. Chem. (2011) pmid: 20978130
167. Zerdoumi Y, et al. Hum. Mol. Genet. (2017) pmid: 28472496
168. Yamada H, et al. Carcinogenesis (2007) pmid: 17690113
169. Landrum MJ, et al. Nucleic Acids Res. (2018) pmid: 29165669
170. Bougeard G, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2015) pmid: 26014290
171. Sorrell AD, et al. Mol Diagn Ther (2013) pmid: 23355100
172. Nichols KE, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2001) pmid: 11219776
173. Kleihues P, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (1997) pmid: 9006316
174. Gonzalez KD, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2009) pmid: 19204208
175. Lalloo F, et al. Lancet (2003) pmid: 12672316
176. Mandelker D, et al. Ann. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 31050713
177. Jaiswal S, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2014) pmid: 25426837
178. Genovese G, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2014) pmid: 25426838
179. Xie M, et al. Nat. Med. (2014) pmid: 25326804
180. Acuna-Hidalgo R, et al. Am. J. Hum. Genet. (2017) pmid: 28669404
181. Severson EA, et al. Blood (2018) pmid: 29678827
182. Fuster JJ, et al. Circ. Res. (2018) pmid: 29420212
183. Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program (2018) pmid: 30504320
184. Chabon JJ, et al. Nature (2020) pmid: 32269342
185. Razavi P, et al. Nat. Med. (2019) pmid: 31768066