FOUNDATIONONE®CDx

PATIENT	TUMOR TYPE	REPORT DATE
Wang, I-Ping	Ovary epithelial carcinoma (NOS)	28 Nov 2022
	COUNTRY CODE	ORDERED TEST #
	TW	ORD-1505143-01

ABOUT THE TEST FoundationOne®CDx is a next-generation sequencing (NGS) based assay that identifies genomic findings within hundreds of cancer-related genes.

PATIENT
DISEASE Ovary epithelial carcinoma (NOS)
NAME Wang, I-Ping
DATE OF BIRTH 02 March 1981
SEX Female
MEDICAL RECORD # 36728480

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 Ovary
SPECIMEN ID 2019-037157 (PF22113)
SPECIMEN TYPE Slide Deck
DATE OF COLLECTION 20 May 2019
SPECIMEN RECEIVED 16 November 2022

Biomarker Findings

Homologous Recombination status - HRD Not Detected
Loss of Heterozygosity score - 0.5%
Microsatellite status - MS-Stable
Tumor Mutational Burden - 0 Muts/Mb

Genomic Findings

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

MUTYH splice site 892-2A>G

2 Disease relevant genes with no reportable alterations: ***BRCA1, BRCA2***

Report Highlights

- Variants in select cancer susceptibility genes to consider for possible **follow-up germline testing** in the appropriate clinical context: ***MUTYH* splice site 892-2A>G** (p. 5)

PATHOLOGIST COMMENTS

Erik Williams, M.D. 29-Nov-2022

This assay is not validated to identify chromosome-level cytogenetic aberrations. However, manual review of the copy-number profile suggests loss on chromosome 1p and gain on chromosome arm 1q.

BIOMARKER FINDINGS	THERAPY AND CLINICAL TRIAL IMPLICATIONS
Homologous Recombination status - HRD Not Detected	HRD Not Detected defined as absence of deleterious *BRCA1/2* alteration and LOH score < 16% or Cannot Be Determined (Coleman et al., 2017; 28916367).
Loss of Heterozygosity score - 0.5%	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section
Microsatellite status - MS-Stable	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section
Tumor Mutational Burden - 0 Muts/Mb	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section

No therapies or clinical trials are associated with the Genomic Findings for this sample.

If you have questions or comments about this result, please contact your local Customer Service team (https://www.rochefoundationmedicine.com/home/contact-us.html)

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, 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. | www.rochefoundationmedicine.com

Sample Preparation: 150 Second St., 1st Floor, Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531
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

VARIANTS TO CONSIDER FOR FOLLOW-UP GERMLINE TESTING IN SELECT CANCER SUSCEPTIBILITY GENES

Findings below have been previously reported as pathogenic germline in the ClinVar genomic database and were detected at an allele frequency of >10%. See appendix for details.

MUTYH - splice site 892-2A>G p. 5

This report does not indicate whether variants listed above are germline or somatic in this patient. In the appropriate clinical context, follow-up germline testing would be needed to determine whether a finding is germline or somatic.

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.

MUTYH - splice site 892-2A>G p. 5

NOTE Genomic alterations detected may be associated with activity of certain approved therapies; however, the agents listed in this report may have varied clinical evidence in the patient's tumor type. Therapies and the clinical trials listed in this report may not be complete and exhaustive. 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. This report should be regarded and used as a supplementary source of information and not as the single basis for the making of a therapy decision. All treatment decisions remain the full and final responsibility of the treating physician and physicians should refer to approved prescribing information for all therapies.

Therapies contained in this report may have been approved by the US FDA.

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, 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. | www.rochefoundationmedicine.com

Sample Preparation: 150 Second St., 1st Floor, Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531
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

Loss of Heterozygosity score

RESULT
0.5%

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

On the basis of emerging clinical data in ovarian cancer, elevated genomic LOH may be associated with greater sensitivity to PARP inhibitors[1-2]. In platinum-sensitive, BRCA1/2 wild-type ovarian, peritoneal, or Fallopian tube carcinoma, rucaparib elicited significantly longer median PFS (7.2 vs. 5.0 months, HR=0.51) and improved ORR (33.3% vs. 9.6%, p=0.0003) for patients with LOH score ≥ 16%[2]. In the maintenance setting in platinum-sensitive, BRCA1/2 wild-type patients, rucaparib was superior to placebo in both the LOH score ≥ 16% (median PFS, 9.7 vs. 5.4 months; HR=0.44) and LOH score < 16% (median PFS, 6.7 vs. 5.4 months; HR=0.58) cohorts[1]. Similar results have been reported for maintenance treatment with niraparib in ovarian cancer[3] when using a different measure of HRD that includes genomic LOH[4-5]. Increased LOH has also been associated with improved sensitivity to platinum-containing chemotherapy regimens in patients with ovarian or breast cancer[6-8].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

In a study of more than 4,000 ovarian, Fallopian tube, or peritoneal cancer samples, genomic LOH score ≥ 16% was identified in 24.2% of BRCA1/2 wild-type cases, deleterious BRCA1/2 mutation was identified in an additional 17.2% of cases, and the remaining 58.7% of cases had LOH score < 16% and were BRCA1/2 wild-type[9]. Among the histological subtypes, LOH score ≥ 16% or BRCA1/2 mutation was reported in 42.4% of serous carcinomas, 37.6% of endometrioid carcinomas, 23.5% of carcinosarcomas, 20.6% of neuroendocrine carcinomas, 13.6% of clear cell carcinomas, and 8.1% of mucinous carcinomas; in BRCA1/2 wild-type samples, the median LOH score was significantly higher in serous as compared with non-serous cases[9]. In ovarian carcinoma, the median LOH score is significantly higher for BRCA1/2-mutated cases than BRCA1/2 wild-type cases (22.2% vs. 9.8%)[9], and mutation or methylation of BRCA1, BRCA2, or RAD51C has been reported to be enriched in cases with increased genomic LOH[6,10]. One study reported no association between LOH and either tumor stage or grade in ovarian serous carcinoma[11]. In patients with high-grade serous ovarian carcinoma, the frequency of LOH has been reported to increase significantly with age[12].

FINDING SUMMARY

The loss of heterozygosity (LOH) score is a profile of the percentage of the tumor genome that is under focal loss of one allele[2]; focal LOH events accumulate as genomic "scars" as a result of incorrect DNA double-strand break repair when the homologous recombination pathway is deficient (HRD)[6,10,13-14]. HRD and consequent genomic LOH occur as a result of genetic or epigenetic inactivation of one or more of the homologous recombination pathway proteins, including BRCA1, BRCA2, RAD51C, ATM, PALB2, and BRIP1[13-16]. This sample harbors a genomic LOH score below levels that have been associated with improved rates of clinical benefit from treatment with the PARP inhibitor rucaparib in patients with platinum-sensitive, BRCA1/2 wild-type ovarian, peritoneal, or Fallopian tube carcinoma[2]. However, patients with lower genomic LOH have also responded to rucaparib, and this type of LOH score does not preclude benefit from PARP inhibitors[1-2].

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[17-19], including approved therapies nivolumab and pembrolizumab[20]. 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)[21].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

MSI-high (MSI-H) has been reported in 1.6-19.7% of ovarian cancer samples[22-23], including 3.8% (1/26) of ovarian endometrioid adenocarcinomas[24], and 10.0% (3/30) of ovarian clear cell carcinomas (CCOCs)[25]. No association of MSI-H with stage or survival was found in patients with ovarian cancer[22,26].

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[27]. 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[27-29]. 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[30-32]. MSS status indicates MMR proficiency and typically correlates with intact expression of all MMR family proteins[27,29,31-32].

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, 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. | www.rochefoundationmedicine.com

Sample Preparation: 150 Second St., 1st Floor, Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531
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

Tumor Mutational Burden

RESULT
0 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[33-35], anti-PD-1 therapies[33-36], and combination nivolumab and ipilimumab[37-42]. In multiple pan-tumor studies, increased tissue tumor mutational burden (TMB) was associated with sensitivity to immune checkpoint inhibitors[33-36,43-47]. 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[43]; similar findings were observed in the KEYNOTE 028 and 012 trials[36]. 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)[47]. 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[48]. 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[46]. 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[49] or those with lower TMB treated with PD-1 or PD-L1-targeting agents[34].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Ovarian carcinomas, including peritoneal and Fallopian tube carcinomas, harbor a median TMB of 2.7-3.6 mutations per megabase (muts/Mb) depending upon subtype, and up to 2.1% of cases have high TMB (>20 muts/Mb)[50]. In a study of high grade serous ovarian cancer, homologous recombination (HR)-deficient tumors, which comprised ~50% of all samples, harbored a higher neoantigen load compared to HR-proficient tumors; higher neoantigen load was associated with longer OS but not disease free survival[51].

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[52-53] and cigarette smoke in lung cancer[54-55], treatment with temozolomide-based chemotherapy in glioma[56-57], mutations in the proofreading domains of DNA polymerases encoded by the POLE and POLD1 genes[58-62], and microsatellite instability (MSI)[58,61-62]. 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[34-35,43].

GENE
MUTYH

ALTERATION
splice site 892-2A>G

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_001048171.1

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
892-2A>G

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr1:45797760

VARIANT ALLELE FREQUENCY (% VAF)
22.7%

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no therapies or clinical trials available to address MUTYH alterations in cancer.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

In general, somatic MUTYH mutations are infrequently reported across cancer types (COSMIC, 2022)[63]. Monoallelic MUTYH mutation occurs in 1-2% of the general population[64-65]. There is conflicting data regarding the impact of monoallelic mutations on the risk of developing CRC[66-68]. Patients with MUTYH-mutant CRC were reported to have significantly improved overall survival compared to patients without MUTYH mutation[69].

FINDING SUMMARY

MUTYH (also known as MYH) encodes an enzyme involved in DNA base excision repair, and loss of function mutations in MUTYH result in increased rates of mutagenesis and promotion of tumorigenesis[70]. The two most frequently reported MUTYH loss of function mutations are G382D (also referred to as G396D) and Y165C (also referred to as Y179C)[64-65,71-73]. Numerous other MUTYH mutations have also been shown to result in loss of function[71-74].

POTENTIAL GERMLINE IMPLICATIONS

One or more of the MUTYH 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 MUTYH-associated polyposis (ClinVar, Sep 2022)[75]. Follow-up germline testing would be needed to distinguish whether the finding in this patient is somatic or germline. Germline biallelic MUTYH mutation causes MUTYH-associated polyposis (also known as MYH-associated polyposis or MAP), an autosomal recessive condition characterized by multiple colorectal adenomas and increased lifetime risk of colorectal cancer (CRC)[64,76-78]. MAP accounts for approximately 0.7% of all CRC cases and 2% of early-onset CRC cases[64]. In contrast to CRC, the role of MUTYH mutation in the context of other cancer types is not well established[79-83]. Estimates for the prevalence of MAP in the general population range from 1:5,000-1:10,000[65]. Therefore, in the appropriate clinical context, germline testing of MUTYH is recommended.

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.

BRIP1
D563G

P2RY8
E323G

FoundationOne CDx is designed to include genes known to be somatically altered in human solid tumors 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 interrogates 324 genes as well as introns of 36 genes involved in rearrangements. The assay will be updated periodically to reflect new knowledge about cancer biology.

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

ABL1	*ACVR1B*	*AKT1*	*AKT2*	*AKT3*	*ALK*	*ALOX12B*	*AMER1 (FAM123B or WTX)*	
APC	*AR*	*ARAF*	*ARFRP1*	*ARID1A*	*ASXL1*	*ATM*	*ATR*	*ATRX*
AURKA	*AURKB*	*AXIN1*	*AXL*	*BAP1*	*BARD1*	*BCL2*	*BCL2L1*	*BCL2L2*
BCL6	*BCOR*	*BCORL1*	*BRAF*	*BRCA1*	*BRCA2*	*BRD4*	*BRIP1*	*BTG1*
BTG2	*BTK*	*CALR*	*CARD11*	*CASP8*	*CBFB*	*CBL*	*CCND1*	*CCND2*
CCND3	*CCNE1*	*CD22*	*CD274 (PD-L1)*	*CD70*	*CD79A*	*CD79B*	*CDC73*	*CDH1*
CDK12	*CDK4*	*CDK6*	*CDK8*	*CDKN1A*	*CDKN1B*	*CDKN2A*	*CDKN2B*	*CDKN2C*
CEBPA	*CHEK1*	*CHEK2*	*CIC*	*CREBBP*	*CRKL*	*CSF1R*	*CSF3R*	*CTCF*
CTNNA1	*CTNNB1*	*CUL3*	*CUL4A*	*CXCR4*	*CYP17A1*	*DAXX*	*DDR1*	*DDR2*
DIS3	*DNMT3A*	*DOT1L*	*EED*	*EGFR*	*EMSY (C11orf30)*	*EP300*	*EPHA3*	*EPHB1*
EPHB4	*ERBB2*	*ERBB3*	*ERBB4*	*ERCC4*	*ERG*	*ERRFI1*	*ESR1*	*EZH2*
FANCA	*FANCC*	*FANCG*	*FANCL*	*FAS*	*FBXW7*	*FGF10*	*FGF12*	*FGF14*
FGF19	*FGF23*	*FGF3*	*FGF4*	*FGF6*	*FGFR1*	*FGFR2*	*FGFR3*	*FGFR4*
FH	*FLCN*	*FLT1*	*FLT3*	*FOXL2*	*FUBP1*	*GABRA6*	*GATA3*	*GATA4*
GATA6	*GID4 (C17orf39)*	*GNA11*	*GNA13*	*GNAQ*	*GNAS*	*GRM3*	*GSK3B*	*H3-3A (H3F3A)*
HDAC1	*HGF*	*HNF1A*	*HRAS*	*HSD3B1*	*ID3*	*IDH1*	*IDH2*	*IGF1R*
IKBKE	*IKZF1*	*INPP4B*	*IRF2*	*IRF4*	*IRS2*	*JAK1*	*JAK2*	*JAK3*
JUN	*KDM5A*	*KDM5C*	*KDM6A*	*KDR*	*KEAP1*	*KEL*	*KIT*	*KLHL6*
KMT2A (MLL)	*KMT2D (MLL2)*	*KRAS*	*LTK*	*LYN*	*MAF*	*MAP2K1 (MEK1)*	*MAP2K2 (MEK2)*	*MAP2K4*
MAP3K1	*MAP3K13*	*MAPK1*	*MCL1*	*MDM2*	*MDM4*	*MED12*	*MEF2B*	*MEN1*
MERTK	*MET*	*MITF*	*MKNK1*	*MLH1*	*MPL*	*MRE11 (MRE11A)*	*MSH2*	*MSH3*
MSH6	*MST1R*	*MTAP*	*MTOR*	*MUTYH*	*MYC*	*MYCL (MYCL1)*	*MYCN*	*MYD88*
NBN	*NF1*	*NF2*	*NFE2L2*	*NFKBIA*	*NKX2-1*	*NOTCH1*	*NOTCH2*	*NOTCH3*
NPM1	*NRAS*	*NSD2 (WHSC1 or MMSET)*		*NSD3 (WHSC1L1)*	*NT5C2*	*NTRK1*	*NTRK2*	*NTRK3*
P2RY8	*PALB2*	*PARP1*	*PARP2*	*PARP3*	*PAX5*	*PBRM1*	*PDCD1 (PD-1)*	*PDCD1LG2 (PD-L2)*
PDGFRA	*PDGFRB*	*PDK1*	*PIK3C2B*	*PIK3C2G*	*PIK3CA*	*PIK3CB*	*PIK3R1*	*PIM1*
PMS2	*POLD1*	*POLE*	*PPARG*	*PPP2R1A*	*PPP2R2A*	*PRDM1*	*PRKAR1A*	*PRKCI*
PRKN (PARK2)	*PTCH1*	*PTEN*	*PTPN11*	*PTPRO*	*QKI*	*RAC1*	*RAD21*	*RAD51*
RAD51B	*RAD51C*	*RAD51D*	*RAD52*	*RAD54L*	*RAF1*	*RARA*	*RB1*	*RBM10*
REL	*RET*	*RICTOR*	*RNF43*	*ROS1*	*RPTOR*	*SDHA*	*SDHB*	*SDHC*
SDHD	*SETD2*	*SF3B1*	*SGK1*	*SMAD2*	*SMAD4*	*SMARCA4*	*SMARCB1*	*SMO*
SNCAIP	*SOCS1*	*SOX2*	*SOX9*	*SPEN*	*SPOP*	*SRC*	*STAG2*	*STAT3*
STK11	*SUFU*	*SYK*	*TBX3*	*TEK*	*TENT5C (FAM46C)*		*TET2*	*TGFBR2*
TIPARP	*TNFAIP3*	*TNFRSF14*	*TP53*	*TSC1*	*TSC2*	*TYRO3*	*U2AF1*	*VEGFA*
VHL	*WT1*	*XPO1*	*XRCC2*	*ZNF217*	*ZNF703*			

DNA GENE LIST: FOR THE DETECTION OF SELECT REARRANGEMENTS

ALK	*BCL2*	*BCR*	*BRAF*	*BRCA1*	*BRCA2*	*CD74*	*EGFR*	*ETV4*
ETV5	*ETV6*	*EWSR1*	*EZR*	*FGFR1*	*FGFR2*	*FGFR3*	*KIT*	*KMT2A (MLL)*
MSH2	*MYB*	*MYC*	*NOTCH2*	*NTRK1*	*NTRK2*	*NUTM1*	*PDGFRA*	*RAF1*
RARA	*RET*	*ROS1*	*RSPO2*	*SDC4*	*SLC34A2*	*TERC**	*TERT***	*TMPRSS2*

*TERC is an NCRNA

**Promoter region of TERT is interrogated

ADDITIONAL ASSAYS: FOR THE DETECTION OF SELECT CANCER BIOMARKERS

Homologous Recombination status
Loss of Heterozygosity (LOH) score
Microsatellite (MS) status
Tumor Mutational Burden (TMB)

FoundationOne CDx 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

ABOUT FOUNDATIONONE CDX

FoundationOne CDx was developed and its performance characteristics determined by Foundation Medicine, Inc. (Foundation Medicine). FoundationOne CDx may be used for clinical purposes and should not be regarded as purely investigational or for research only. Foundation Medicine's clinical reference laboratories are qualified to perform high-complexity clinical testing.

Please refer to technical information for performance specification details: www.rochefoundationmedicine.com/f1cdxtech.

INTENDED USE

FoundationOne®CDx (F1CDx) is a next generation sequencing based in vitro diagnostic device for detection of substitutions, insertion and deletion alterations (indels), and copy number alterations (CNAs) in 324 genes and select gene rearrangements, as well as genomic signatures including microsatellite instability (MSI), tumor mutational burden (TMB), and for selected forms of ovarian cancer, loss of heterozygosity (LOH) score, using DNA isolated from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tumor tissue specimens. The test is intended as a companion diagnostic to identify patients who may benefit from treatment with therapies in accordance with approved therapeutic product labeling. Additionally, F1CDx is intended to provide tumor mutation profiling to be used by qualified health care professionals in accordance with professional guidelines in oncology for patients with solid malignant neoplasms.

TEST PRINCIPLE

FoundationOne CDx will be performed exclusively as a laboratory service using DNA extracted from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tumor samples. The proposed assay will employ a single DNA extraction method from routine FFPE biopsy or surgical resection specimens, 50-1000 ng of which will undergo whole-genome shotgun library construction and hybridization-based capture of all coding exons from 309 cancer-related genes, one promoter region, one non-coding (ncRNA), and select intronic regions from 34 commonly rearranged genes, 21 of which also include the coding exons. The assay therefore includes detection of alterations in a total of 324 genes.

Using an Illumina® HiSeq platform, hybrid capture–selected libraries will be sequenced to high uniform depth (targeting >500X median coverage with >99% of exons at coverage >100X). Sequence data will be processed using a customized analysis pipeline designed to accurately detect all classes of genomic alterations, including base substitutions, indels, focal copy number amplifications, homozygous gene deletions, and selected genomic rearrangements (e.g.,gene fusions). Additionally, genomic signatures including loss of heterozygosity (LOH), microsatellite instability (MSI) and tumor mutational burden (TMB) will be reported.

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. The F1CDx report may be used as an aid to inform molecular eligibility for clinical trials. 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 CDx 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 the FoundationOne CDx assay 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 CDx for identifying a copy number amplification is four (4) for *ERBB2* and six (6) for all other genes. Conversely, an alteration denoted as "loss – equivocal" implies that the FoundationOne CDx assay data provide some, but not unambiguous, evidence for homozygous deletion of the gene in question. An alteration denoted as "subclonal" is one that the FoundationOne CDx 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.

Limitations

1. 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 F1CDx 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 FFPE tissue 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.

2. TMB by F1CDx is determined by counting all synonymous and non-synonymous variants present at 5% allele frequency or greater (after filtering) and the total number is reported as mutations per megabase (mut/Mb) unit. Observed TMB is dependent on characteristics of the specific tumor focus tested for a patient (e.g., primary vs. metastatic, tumor content) and the testing platform used for the detection; therefore, observed TMB results may vary between different specimens for the same patient and between detection methodologies employed on the same sample. The TMB calculation may differ from TMB calculations used by other assays depending on variables such as the amount of genome interrogated, percentage of tumor, assay limit of detection (LoD), filtering of alterations included in the score, and the read depth and other bioinformatic test specifications. Refer to the SSED for a detailed description of these variables in FMI's TMB calculation https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/P170019B.pdf. The clinical validity of TMB defined by this panel has been established for TMB as a qualitative output for a cut-off of 10 mutations per megabase but has not been established for TMB as a quantitative score.
3. Homologous Recombination status may be reported for epithelial ovarian, peritoneal, or Fallopian tube carcinomas (Coleman et al., 2017; 28916367). Samples with deleterious *BRCA1/2* alteration and/or Loss of Heterozygosity (LOH) score ≥ 16% will be reported as "HRD Positive" and samples with absence of these findings will be reported as "HRD Not Detected," agnostic of potential secondary *BRCA1/2* reversion alterations. Certain potentially deleterious missense or small in-frame deletions in *BRCA1/2* may not be classified as deleterious and, in the absence of an elevated LOH profile, samples with such mutations may be classified as "HRD Not Detected." A result of "HRD Not Detected" does not rule out the presence of a *BRCA1/2* alteration or an elevated LOH profile outside the assay performance characteristic limitations.
4. The LOH score is determined by analyzing SNPs spaced at 1Mb intervals across the genome on the FoundationOne CDx test and extrapolating an LOH profile, excluding arm- and chromosome-wide LOH segments. Detection of LOH has been verified only for ovarian cancer patients, and the LOH score result may be reported for epithelial ovarian, peritoneal, or Fallopian tube carcinomas. The LOH score will be reported as "Cannot Be Determined" if the sample is not of sufficient quality to confidently determine LOH. Performance of the LOH classification has not been established for samples below 35% tumor content. There may be potential interference of ethanol with LOH detection. The interfering effects of xylene, hemoglobin, and triglycerides on the LOH score have not been demonstrated.
5. Alterations reported may include somatic (not inherited) or germline (inherited) alterations; however, the test does not distinguish between germline and somatic alterations. The test does not provide information about susceptibility.
6. Biopsy may pose a risk to the patient when archival tissue is not available for use with the assay. The patient's physician should determine whether the patient is a candidate for biopsy.
7. Reflex testing to an alternative FDA approved companion diagnostic should be performed for patients who have an *ERBB2* amplification result detected with copy number equal to 4 (baseline ploidy of tumor +2) for confirmatory testing. While this result is considered negative by FoundationOne®CDx (F1CDx), in a clinical concordance study with an FDA approved FISH test, 70% (7 out of 10 samples) were positive, and 30% (3 out of 10 samples) were negative by the FISH test with an average ratio of 2.3. The frequency of *ERBB2* copy number 4 in breast cancer is estimated to be approximately 2%. Multiple references listed in https://www.mycancergenome.org/content/disease/breast-cancer/ERBB2/238/ report the frequency of HER2 overexpression as 20% in breast cancer. Based on the F1CDx HER2 CDx concordance study, approximately 10% of HER2 amplified samples had copy number 4. Thus, total frequency is conservatively estimated to be approximately 2%.

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.

VARIANT ALLELE FREQUENCY

Variant Allele Frequency (VAF) represents the fraction of sequencing reads in which the variant is observed. This attribute is not taken into account for therapy inclusion, clinical trial matching, or interpretive content. Caution is recommended in interpreting VAF to indicate the potential germline or somatic origin of an alteration, recognizing that tumor fraction and tumor ploidy of samples may vary.

Precision of VAF for base substitutions and indels

BASE SUBSTITUTIONS	%CV*
Repeatability	5.11 - 10.40
Reproducibility	5.95 - 12.31
INDELS	**%CV***
Repeatability	6.29 - 10.00
Reproducibility	7.33 - 11.71

**Interquartile Range = 1st Quartile to 3rd Quartile*

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, FH, FLCN, MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, MUTYH, PALB2, PMS2, POLE, RAD51C, RAD51D, 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.

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 CDx.

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. FoundationOne CDx is performed using DNA derived from tumor, and as such germline events may not be reported.

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

The median exon coverage for this sample is 1,048x

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, 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. | www.rochefoundationmedicine.com

Sample Preparation: 150 Second St., 1st Floor, Cambridge, MA 02141 · CLIA: 22D2027531
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

1. Coleman RL, et al. Lancet (2017) pmid: 28916367
2. Swisher EM, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2017) pmid: 27908594
3. Mirza MR, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2016) pmid: 27717299
4. Telli ML, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2016) pmid: 26957554
5. Timms KM, et al. Breast Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 25475740
6. Wang ZC, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2012) pmid: 22912389
7. Telli ML, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2015) pmid: 25847929
8. Isakoff SJ, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2015) pmid: 25847936
9. Elvin et al., 2017; ASCO Abstract 5512
10. Abkevich V, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2012) pmid: 23047548
11. Marquard AM, et al. Biomark Res (2015) pmid: 26015868
12. Pedersen BS, et al. Genes Chromosomes Cancer (2013) pmid: 23716468
13. Watkins JA, et al. Breast Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 25093514
14. Vanderstichele A, et al. Eur. J. Cancer (2017) pmid: 28950147
15. Nature (2011) pmid: 21720365
16. N. Engl. J. Med. (2003) pmid: 12736286
17. Gatalica Z, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2014) pmid: 25392179
18. Kroemer G, et al. Oncoimmunology (2015) pmid: 26140250
19. Lal N, et al. Oncoimmunology (2015) pmid: 25949894
20. Le DT, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2015) pmid: 26028255
21. Ayers et al., 2016; ASCO-SITC Abstract P60
22. Segev Y, et al. Eur. J. Gynaecol. Oncol. (2015) pmid: 26775351
23. Plisiecka-Hałasa J, et al. Anticancer Res. () pmid: 18507046
24. Huang HN, et al. Histopathology (2015) pmid: 25195947
25. Strickland et al., 2016; ASCO Abstract 5514
26. Aysal A, et al. Am. J. Surg. Pathol. (2012) pmid: 22189970
27. Kocarnik JM, et al. Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf) (2015) pmid: 26337942
28. You JF, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 21081928
29. Bairwa NK, et al. Methods Mol. Biol. (2014) pmid: 24623249
30. Boland CR, et al. Cancer Res. (1998) pmid: 9823339
31. Pawlik TM, et al. Dis. Markers (2004) pmid: 15528785
32. Boland CR, et al. Gastroenterology (2010) pmid: 20420947
33. Samstein RM, et al. Nat. Genet. (2019) pmid: 30643254
34. Goodman AM, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2017) pmid: 28835386
35. Goodman AM, et al. Cancer Immunol Res (2019) pmid: 31405947
36. Cristescu R, et al. Science (2018) pmid: 30309915
37. Ready N, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30785829
38. Hellmann MD, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2018) pmid: 29658845
39. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29657128
40. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29731394
41. Rozeman EA, et al. Nat Med (2021) pmid: 33558721
42. Sharma P, et al. Cancer Cell (2020) pmid: 32916128
43. Marabelle A, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2020) pmid: 32919526
44. Ott PA, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30557521
45. Cristescu R, et al. J Immunother Cancer (2022) pmid: 35101941
46. Friedman CF, et al. Cancer Discov (2022) pmid: 34876409
47. Sturgill EG, et al. Oncologist (2022) pmid: 35274716
48. Schenker at al., 2022; AACR Abstract 7845
49. Legrand et al., 2018; ASCO Abstract 12000
50. Chalmers ZR, et al. Genome Med (2017) pmid: 28420421
51. Strickland KC, et al. Oncotarget (2016) pmid: 26871470
52. Pfeifer GP, et al. Mutat. Res. (2005) pmid: 15748635
53. Hill VK, et al. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet (2013) pmid: 23875803
54. Pfeifer GP, et al. Oncogene (2002) pmid: 12379884
55. Rizvi NA, et al. Science (2015) pmid: 25765070
56. Johnson BE, et al. Science (2014) pmid: 24336570
57. Choi S, et al. Neuro-oncology (2018) pmid: 29452419
58. Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, et al. Nature (2013) pmid: 23636398
59. Briggs S, et al. J. Pathol. (2013) pmid: 23447401
60. Heitzer E, et al. Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev. (2014) pmid: 24583393
61. Nature (2012) pmid: 22810696
62. Roberts SA, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2014) pmid: 25568919
63. Tate JG, et al. Nucleic Acids Res. (2019) pmid: 30371878
64. Hegde M, et al. Genet. Med. (2014) pmid: 24310308
65. Aretz S, et al. Eur. J. Hum. Genet. (2013) pmid: 22872101
66. Win AK, et al. Gastroenterology (2014) pmid: 24444654
67. Lubbe SJ, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2009) pmid: 19620482
68. Jones N, et al. Gastroenterology (2009) pmid: 19394335
69. Nielsen M, et al. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. (2010) pmid: 21044966
70. David SS, et al. Nature (2007) pmid: 17581577
71. Molatore S, et al. Hum. Mutat. (2010) pmid: 19953527
72. Kundu S, et al. DNA Repair (Amst.) (2009) pmid: 19836313
73. D'Agostino VG, et al. DNA Repair (Amst.) (2010) pmid: 20418187
74. Ali M, et al. Gastroenterology (2008) pmid: 18534194
75. Landrum MJ, et al. Nucleic Acids Res. (2018) pmid: 29165669
76. Sampson JR, et al. Lancet (2003) pmid: 12853198
77. Sieber OM, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2003) pmid: 12606733
78. Al-Tassan N, et al. Nat. Genet. (2002) pmid: 11818965
79. Rennert G, et al. Cancer (2012) pmid: 21952991
80. Zhang Y, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2006) pmid: 16492928
81. von der Thüsen JH, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21189386
82. Casper M, et al. Fam. Cancer (2014) pmid: 24420788
83. Smith LM, et al. Pancreatology (2009) pmid: 20110747