PATIENT	**TUMOR TYPE**	**REPORT DATE**
Kao, Jui Yu	Liver angiosarcoma	07 May 2023
COUNTRY CODE		**ORDERED TEST #**
TW		ORD-1619484-01

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 Liver angiosarcoma
NAME Kao, Jui Yu
DATE OF BIRTH 27 November 1987
SEX Male
MEDICAL RECORD # 24127524

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 Liver
SPECIMEN ID S111-70820 A (PF23042
SPECIMEN TYPE Slide Deck
DATE OF COLLECTION 07 June 2022
SPECIMEN RECEIVED 28 April 2023

Sample qualified for low tumor purity. Sensitivity for detecting copy-number alterations (including in *ERBB2*), other genomic alterations, and signatures may be reduced and TMB may be underreported. Refer to the appendix for limitations statements.

Biomarker Findings
Microsatellite status - Cannot Be Determined [α]
Tumor Mutational Burden - Cannot Be Determined

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

TP53 rearrangement intron 7

α Patients with Microsatellite status of Cannot Be Determined should be re-tested with an orthogonal (alternative) method.

Report Highlights

- There are no highlights associated with this patient's genomic findings.

For more information on potential biological and clinical significance, see the Biomarker and Genomic Findings sections.

BIOMARKER FINDINGS	THERAPY AND CLINICAL TRIAL IMPLICATIONS
Microsatellite status - Cannot Be Determined	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section
Tumor Mutational Burden - Cannot Be Determined	**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)

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.

TP53 - rearrangement intron 7 .... p. 5

FOUNDATION**ONE**®**CDx**

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

COUNTRY CODE
TW

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

ORDERED TEST #
ORD-1619484-01

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 Douglas A. Mata, MD, MPH | 07 May 2023
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

PAGE 2 of 11

FOUNDATIONONE®**CDx**

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

ORDERED TEST # ORD-1619484-01

BIOMARKER
Microsatellite status

RESULT
Cannot Be Determined

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

On the basis of clinical evidence in multiple solid tumor types, microsatellite instability (MSI) and associated increased tumor mutational burden (TMB)[1-2] may predict sensitivity to immune checkpoint inhibitors, including the approved PD-1-targeting agents cemiplimab, dostarlimab, nivolumab (alone or in combination with ipilimumab), retifanlimab, and pembrolizumab[3-9], as well as PD-L1-targeting agents atezolizumab, avelumab, and durvalumab (alone or in combination with tremelimumab)[10-11]. As the MSI status of this tumor is unknown, the relevance of these therapeutic approaches is unclear.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

In a computational analysis of paired tumor and normal sarcomas in the TCGA dataset, of which 25% were liposarcomas, only 0.8% (2/255) of samples were MSI-high (MSI-H)[12]. However, reports of MSI in sarcomas in the literature are conflicting and varied due to substantial heterogeneity, lack of consensus on the markers and methods used for MSI assessment, and small sample size in most studies[13]. In these smaller studies of soft tissue sarcoma, reports of MSI at any level have been rare, with the highest incidences between 11% (2/18) to 25% (10/40) of cases[14-19]. In one study, MSI was reported to occur more frequently in high-grade soft tissue sarcomas compared with lower grade[20]. However, published data investigating the prognostic implications of MSI in sarcoma are limited (PubMed, Jan 2023).

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[21]. 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[21-23]. The level of MSI in this sample could not be determined with confidence. Depending on the clinical context, MSI testing of an alternate sample or by another methodology could be considered.

Electronically signed by Douglas A. Mata, MD, MPH | 07 May 2023
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

PAGE 3 of 11

FOUNDATIONONE®CDx

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

BIOMARKER FINDINGS

BIOMARKER

Tumor Mutational Burden

RESULT
Cannot Be Determined

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[24-26], anti-PD-1 therapies[24-27], and combination nivolumab and ipilimumab[28-33]. In multiple pan-tumor studies, increased tissue tumor mutational burden (TMB) was associated with sensitivity to immune checkpoint inhibitors[24-27,34-38]. 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[34]; similar findings were observed in the KEYNOTE 028 and 012 trials[27]. 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)[38]. 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[39]. 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[37]. 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[40] or those with lower TMB treated with PD-1 or PD-L1-targeting agents[25]. As the TMB status of this tumor cannot be determined with confidence, the benefit of these therapeutic approaches is unclear.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Angiosarcomas of the head, neck, face, or scalp were associated with a high TMB (median of 20.7 Muts/Mb, >10 Muts/Mb in 9/12 samples) and a dominant ultraviolet light exposure mutational signature in one study[41]. In contrast, angiosarcomas of other sites, including cutaneous radiation-associated or breast angiosarcomas (median TMB of 3.7 and 1.7 Muts/Mb, respectively) had lower TMB[41]. Soft tissue sarcomas harbor a median tumor mutational burden (TMB) of 2.4-2.5 mutations per megabase (muts/Mb), with angiosarcoma (up to 15%) and malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor (up to 11%) having the highest

percentage of cases with high TMB[42-43]. In a study, 3.9% of soft tissue sarcoma samples analyzed harbor TMB ≥10 muts/Mb[42]; in addition, increased mutational burden has been reported in undifferentiated pleomorphic sarcomas as compared with Ewing sarcomas or rhabdomyosarcomas[44-46]. Published data investigating the prognostic implications of tissue TMB in sarcoma are conflicting (PubMed, Feb 2023). High tissue TMB was associated with improved PFS and metastasis-free survival in a study of undifferentiated sarcomas[47], but with reduced survival in a study of patients with rhabdomyosarcoma[48].

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[49-50] and cigarette smoke in lung cancer[8,51], treatment with temozolomide-based chemotherapy in glioma[52-53], mutations in the proofreading domains of DNA polymerases encoded by the POLE and POLD1 genes[54-58], and microsatellite instability (MSI)[54,57-58]. Elevated TMB has been reported to be associated with sensitivity to PD-1- or PD-L1-targeting immune checkpoint inhibitors in multiple solid tumor types[25-27,34]. However, the TMB level in this sample could not be determined with confidence.

FOUNDATIONONE®CDx

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

GENOMIC FINDINGS

ORDERED TEST # ORD-1619484-01

GENE
TP53

ALTERATION
rearrangement intron 7

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[59-62] or p53 gene therapy such as SGT53[63-67]. 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[68]. 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[69]. 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[70]. 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[71]. 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[72]. 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[73]. 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[74]. 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[67].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

TP53 mutation has been cited at various incidences

in studies of angiosarcoma, which may reflect small sample sizes or differences in tumor site examined[41,75-79]. Expression of p53, which is typically associated with non-functional p53, has been reported in 49%-100% of patients with angiosarcoma, and has been correlated with poor prognosis[77,80].

FINDING SUMMARY

Functional loss of the tumor suppressor p53, which is encoded by the TP53 gene, is common in aggressive advanced cancers[81]. Alterations such as seen here may disrupt TP53 function or expression[82-86].

POTENTIAL GERMLINE IMPLICATIONS

Germline mutations in TP53 are associated with the very rare autosomal dominant disorder Li-Fraumeni syndrome and the early onset of many cancers[87-89], including sarcomas[90-91]. Estimates for the prevalence of germline TP53 mutations in the general population range from 1:5,000[92] to 1:20,000[91]. 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[93]. In the appropriate clinical context, germline testing of TP53 is recommended.

Electronically signed by Douglas A. Mata, MD, MPH | 07 May 2023
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

PAGE 5 of 11

FOUNDATIONONE®CDx

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

ORDERED TEST # ORD-1619484-01

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.

ALK
NM_004304.4: c.3958T>C
(p.W1320R)
chr2:29420523

ERBB4
rearrangement

MAP3K1
NM_005921.1: c.152G>A
(p.G51D)
chr5:56111552

MSH3
NM_002439.3: c.173C>T
(p.A58V)
chr5:79950719

ROS1
NM_002944.2: c.1610T>A
(p.I537K)
chr6:117710662

SPEN
NM_015001.2:
c.6915_6917del (p.S2306del)
chr1:16259647-16259650

TSC1
NM_000368.4: c.1960C>G
(p.Q654E)
chr9:135781005

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)

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

ORDERED TEST # ORD-1619484-01

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. 2023. 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

FOUNDATION**ONE**®CDx

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

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

	PATIENT	TUMOR TYPE	REPORT DATE
FOUNDATIONONE®CDx	Kao, Jui Yu	Liver angiosarcoma	07 May 2023

ORDERED TEST # ORD-1619484-01

APPENDIX | About FoundationOne®CDx

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) 7.8.0

The median exon coverage for this sample is 424x

Electronically signed by Douglas A. Mata, MD, MPH | 07 May 2023
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

FOUNDATIONONE®CDx

PATIENT
Kao, Jui Yu

TUMOR TYPE
Liver angiosarcoma

REPORT DATE
07 May 2023

APPENDIX   References

ORDERED TEST #   ORD-1619484-01

1. Histopathology (2007) pmid: 17204026
2. Lal N, et al. Oncoimmunology (2015) pmid: 25949894
3. Overman MJ, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2017) pmid: 28734759
4. Overman MJ, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2018) pmid: 29355075
5. Shitara K, et al. Nature (2022) pmid: 35322232
6. Lipson EJ, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2013) pmid: 23169436
7. Le DT, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2015) pmid: 26028255
8. Rizvi NA, et al. Science (2015) pmid: 25765070
9. Oaknin A, et al. JAMA Oncol (2020) pmid: 33001143
10. Rubinstein MM, et al. Gynecol Oncol (2022) pmid: 36512912
11. Kanikarla Marie P, et al. Clin Cancer Res (2021) pmid: 33811152
12. Bonneville R, et al. JCO Precis Oncol (2017) pmid: 29850653
13. Monument MJ, et al. ISRN Oncol (2012) pmid: 23401795
14. Wooster R, et al. Nat. Genet. (1994) pmid: 8162069
15. Kawaguchi K, et al. Oncol. Rep. (2005) pmid: 15643505
16. Saito T, et al. Hum. Pathol. (2003) pmid: 14562278
17. Suwa K, et al. J Orthop Sci (1999) pmid: 10370164
18. Garcia JJ, et al. Mod. Pathol. (2006) pmid: 16619000
19. Aue G, et al. Cancer Genet. Cytogenet. (1998) pmid: 9689926
20. Rucińska M, et al. Med. Sci. Monit. (2005) pmid: 15668629
21. Kocarnik JM, et al. Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf) (2015) pmid: 26337942
22. You JF, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 21081928
23. Bairwa NK, et al. Methods Mol. Biol. (2014) pmid: 24623249
24. Samstein RM, et al. Nat. Genet. (2019) pmid: 30643254
25. Goodman AM, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2017) pmid: 28835386
26. Goodman AM, et al. Cancer Immunol Res (2019) pmid: 31405947
27. Cristescu R, et al. Science (2018) pmid: 30309915
28. Ready N, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30785829
29. Hellmann MD, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2018) pmid: 29658845
30. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29657128
31. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29731394
32. Rozeman EA, et al. Nat Med (2021) pmid: 33558721
33. Sharma P, et al. Cancer Cell (2020) pmid: 32916128
34. Marabelle A, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2020) pmid: 32919526
35. Ott PA, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30557521
36. Cristescu R, et al. J Immunother Cancer (2022) pmid: 35101941
37. Friedman CF, et al. Cancer Discov (2022) pmid: 34876409
38. Sturgill EG, et al. Oncologist (2022) pmid: 35274716
39. Schenker at al., 2022; AACR Abstract 7845
40. Legrand et al., 2018; ASCO Abstract 12000
41. Painter CA, et al. Nat. Med. (2020) pmid: 32042194
42. Gounder MM, et al. Nat Commun (2022) pmid: 35705558
43. Chalmers ZR, et al. Genome Med (2017) pmid: 28420421
44. Lim J, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2015) pmid: 26330427
45. Brohl AS, et al. PLoS Genet. (2014) pmid: 25010205
46. Chen X, et al. Cancer Cell (2013) pmid: 24332040
47. Steele CD, et al. Cancer Cell (2019) pmid: 30889380
48. Casey DL, et al. Clin Cancer Res (2019) pmid: 31699828
49. Pfeifer GP, et al. Mutat. Res. (2005) pmid: 15748635
50. Hill VK, et al. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet (2013) pmid: 23875803
51. Pfeifer GP, et al. Oncogene (2002) pmid: 12379884
52. Johnson BE, et al. Science (2014) pmid: 24336570
53. Choi S, et al. Neuro-oncology (2018) pmid: 29452419
54. Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, et al. Nature (2013) pmid: 23636398
55. Briggs S, et al. J. Pathol. (2013) pmid: 23447401
56. Heitzer E, et al. Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev. (2014) pmid: 24583393
57. Nature (2012) pmid: 22810696
58. Roberts SA, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2014) pmid: 25568919
59. Hirai H, et al. Cancer Biol. Ther. (2010) pmid: 20107315
60. Bridges KA, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21799033
61. Rajeshkumar NV, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21389100
62. Osman AA, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2015) pmid: 25504633
63. Xu L, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2002) pmid: 12489850
64. Xu L, et al. Mol. Med. (2001) pmid: 11713371
65. Camp ER, et al. Cancer Gene Ther. (2013) pmid: 23470564
66. Kim SS, et al. Nanomedicine (2015) pmid: 25240597
67. Pirollo KF, et al. Mol. Ther. (2016) pmid: 27357628
68. Leijen S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27601554
69. Moore et al., 2019; ASCO Abstract 5513
70. Leijen S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27998224
71. Oza et al., 2015; ASCO Abstract 5506
72. Lee J, et al. Cancer Discov (2019) pmid: 31315834
73. Méndez E, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2018) pmid: 29535125
74. Seligmann JF, et al. J Clin Oncol (2021) pmid: 34538072
75. Naka N, et al. Int. J. Cancer (1997) pmid: 9185695
76. Santi R, et al. Histopathology (2011) pmid: 21323968
77. Italiano A, et al. Cancer (2012) pmid: 22648906
78. Zietz C, et al. Am J Pathol (1998) pmid: 9811333
79. Soini Y, et al. Carcinogenesis (1995) pmid: 7586214
80. Chen SY, et al. J. Cutan. Pathol. (2008) pmid: 18700251
81. Brown CJ, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2009) pmid: 19935675
82. Joerger AC, et al. Annu. Rev. Biochem. (2008) pmid: 18410249
83. Kato S, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (2003) pmid: 12826609
84. Kamada R, et al. J. Biol. Chem. (2011) pmid: 20978130
85. Zerdoumi Y, et al. Hum. Mol. Genet. (2017) pmid: 28472496
86. Yamada H, et al. Carcinogenesis (2007) pmid: 17690113
87. Bougeard G, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2015) pmid: 26014290
88. Sorrell AD, et al. Mol Diagn Ther (2013) pmid: 23355100
89. Nichols KE, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2001) pmid: 11219776
90. Kleihues P, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (1997) pmid: 9006316
91. Gonzalez KD, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2009) pmid: 19204208
92. Lalloo F, et al. Lancet (2003) pmid: 12672316
93. Mandelker D, et al. Ann. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 31050713

Electronically signed by Douglas A. Mata, MD, MPH | 07 May 2023
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

APPENDIX - PAGE 11 of 11