FOUNDATIONONE®CDx

PATIENT	TUMOR TYPE	REPORT DATE
Chen, Shu E	Colon adenocarcinoma (CRC)	23 Jan 2023
	COUNTRY CODE	ORDERED TEST #
	TW	ORD-1541547-01

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 Colon adenocarcinoma (CRC)
NAME Chen, Shu E
DATE OF BIRTH 08 January 1956
SEX Female
MEDICAL RECORD # 5900094

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 S111-48681 B (PF23006)
SPECIMEN TYPE Slide Deck
DATE OF COLLECTION 22 November 2022
SPECIMEN RECEIVED 13 January 2023

Biomarker Findings

Microsatellite status - MS-Stable
Tumor Mutational Burden - 4 Muts/Mb

Genomic Findings

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

KRAS G12D
NRAS wildtype
APC R876*, R1450*
CDK8 amplification
FLT3 amplification
IRS2 amplification
KDM6A splice site 2702+1G>A
NBN rearrangement intron 5
TP53 R175H

2 Disease relevant genes with no reportable alterations: ***BRAF, NRAS***

Report Highlights

- Targeted therapies with **potential resistance** based on this patient's genomic findings: ⊗ **Cetuximab** (p. 10), **Panitumumab** (p. 11)
- Evidence-matched **clinical trial options** based on this patient's genomic findings: (p. 12)

BIOMARKER FINDINGS	THERAPY AND CLINICAL TRIAL IMPLICATIONS
Microsatellite status - MS-Stable	**No therapies or clinical trials.** See Biomarker Findings section
Tumor Mutational Burden - 4 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)
KRAS **-** G12D		
10 Trials see p. 13	***Cetuximab*** ⊗	none
	Panitumumab ⊗	
NRAS **-** wildtype		
0 Trials	***Cetuximab*** ⊗	none
	Panitumumab ⊗	
APC **-** R876*, R1450*		
3 Trials see p. 12	none	none

⊗ *Extensive evidence showing variant(s) in this sample may confer resistance to this therapy*

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, M.D. | 23 January 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

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 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.

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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]. For patients with chemotherapy-refractory microsatellite-stable (MSS) metastatic colorectal cancer (CRC), a Phase 3 trial reported no OS advantage from the combination of the PD-L1 inhibitor atezolizumab plus cobimetinib relative to regorafenib (8.9 vs. 8.5 months, HR=1.00); atezolizumab monotherapy similarly did not prolong OS (7.1 vs. 8.5 months, HR=1.19)[6]. For patients with MSS CRC, a Phase 2 study combining ipilimumab and nivolumab reported an overall DCR of 25% (10/40)[7]. Two Phase 1 studies for patients with MSS CRC treated with regorafenib and nivolumab reported PFSs of 7.9 months[8] and 5.7 months[9], and a patient with MSS CRC refractory to chemotherapy treated with the PD-1 inhibitor sintilimab and regorafenib reported a CR[10].

— Nontargeted Approaches —

MSI has not been found to be a predictive biomarker for combination chemotherapy regimens, including FOLFOX[11-12] and FOLFIRI[13-14]. Patients with MSS CRC are more likely to benefit from postsurgical fluorouracil (FU)-based adjuvant therapy[15-16] but less likely to benefit from irinotecan chemotherapy[17].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

MSS colorectal cancers (CRCs) make up 70-85% of CRC cases[3,18-22]. MSS colorectal cancers are molecularly heterogeneous, driven by diverse mechanisms such as extensive DNA methylation, oncogenic mutations in KRAS or BRAF, or chromosomal instability[22]. Multiple studies have shown that MSS CRCs have a worse prognosis than MSI-high tumors[18,23-29].

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[20]. 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[20,30-31]. 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[19,32-33]. MSS status indicates MMR proficiency and typically correlates with intact expression of all MMR family proteins[19-20,31,33].

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, M.D. | 23 January 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

BIOMARKER

Tumor Mutational Burden

RESULT
4 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[34-36], anti-PD-1 therapies[34-37], and combination nivolumab and ipilimumab[38-43]. In multiple pan-tumor studies, increased tissue tumor mutational burden (TMB) was associated with sensitivity to immune checkpoint inhibitors[34-37,44-48]. 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[44]; similar findings were observed in the KEYNOTE 028 and 012 trials[37]. 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)[48]. 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[49]. 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[47]. 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[50] or those with lower TMB treated with PD-1 or PD-L1-targeting agents[35]. In CRC specifically, a retrospective analysis of immune checkpoint inhibitor efficacy reported significantly improved OS for patients with tumors harboring TMB ≥9.8 Muts/MB compared with those with tumors with TMB <9.8 Muts/Mb (~ equivalency <12 Muts/Mb as measured by this assay)[34]. Another retrospective study reported that a TMB ≥12 Muts/Mb cutoff identifies >99% of MSI-High CRC cases but only 3% of MSS cases, indicating the utility of this cutoff for identification of patients with CRC likely to benefit from treatment with immune checkpoint inhibitors[51].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Elevated tumor mutational burden (TMB) has been reported in 8-25% of colorectal cancer (CRC) samples[21,52-53]. Multiple studies have reported that up to 90% of hypermutated CRC cases exhibit high levels of microsatellite instability (MSI-H) and mismatch repair deficiency (MMR-D)[21,52]. Increased TMB is significantly associated with MSI-H and MMR-D, with studies reporting that 100% of MSI-H CRCs harbor elevated TMB and conversely that 100% of tumors with low TMB harbor intact MMR[52]. A subset of CRCs that harbor increased TMB but not MSI-H are driven by mutations in POLE, which leads to an "ultramutated" phenotype with especially high TMB[21,52]. Tumors with increased TMB harbor BRAF V600E mutations more frequently than those with low TMB[21,52], whereas TMB-low tumors more frequently harbor mutations in TP53 and APC[21]. The prognostic value of tumor mutational burden (TMB) in colorectal cancer (CRC) is context- and therapy-dependent. A study of tissue TMB (tTMB) in 145 CRC samples showed longer OS in TMB-high samples compared with TMB-low ones[54]. Similarly, for patients with metastatic CRC treated with first-line chemotherapy combined with bevacizumab or cetuximab, high tissue TMB (tTMB-H) was associated with longer OS[55]. For patients treated with adjuvant chemotherapy, tTMB-H was associated with better 5-year relapse-free survival[56]. However, for patients with EGFR/BRAF-inhibitor-treated, BRAF-mutated microsatellite stable (MSS) metastatic CRC, intermediate tTMB was associated with significantly poorer PFS and OS compared with TMB-low status; patients with primary resistance to EGFR/BRAF blockage had higher TMB than those sensitive to these therapies[57]. In a study for 61 patients with metastatic, MSS CRC treated with best standard of care, plasma TMB scores ≥28 Muts/Mb (approximately 14 Muts/Mb as measured by this assay) were associated with reduced OS compared with plasma TMB scores <28 Muts/Mb (3.0 vs. 5.3 months, HR=0.76, p=0.007), whereas tTMB was not found to be prognostic in this population[58].

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[59-60] and cigarette smoke in lung cancer[61-62], treatment with temozolomide-based chemotherapy in glioma[63-64], mutations in the proofreading domains of DNA polymerases encoded by the POLE and POLD1 genes[21,65-68], and microsatellite instability (MSI)[21,65,68]. This sample harbors a TMB below levels that would be predicted to be associated with sensitivity to PD-1- or PD-L1-targeting immune checkpoint inhibitors, alone or in combination with other agents[34,44,51].

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

Electronically signed by Erik Williams, M.D. | 23 January 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

GENE
KRAS

ALTERATION
G12D

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_004985.3

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
35G>A

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr12:25398284

VARIANT ALLELE FREQUENCY (% VAF)
12.9%

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

Preclinical evidence suggests that KRAS activation may predict sensitivity to MEK inhibitors, such as trametinib, binimetinib, cobimetinib, and selumetinib[69-74]. However, multiple clinical trials have reported lack of efficacy of trametinib and other MEK inhibitors when used as monotherapy for treatment of patients with KRAS-mutant CRC[75-79]. Both clinical[80-81] and preclinical[82-83] studies suggest that combinatorial approaches including MEK inhibitors are likely to be more effective for the treatment of CRC, including strategies such as combination of MEK inhibitors with PI3K inhibitors[81], RAF inhibitors[82], pan-ERBB inhibitors[83], or chemotherapeutic agents[80]. In a Phase 1 study evaluating the MEK-pan-RAF dual inhibitor CH5126766, 6 patients harboring KRAS mutations experienced PRs, including 3 with non-small cell lung cancer (NCSLC), 1 with low-grade serous ovarian carcinoma (LGSOC), 1 with endometrial adenocarcinoma, and 1 with multiple myeloma[84]. Combination of CH5126766 with the FAK inhibitor defactinib elicited PR rates of 50% (4/8) for patients with KRAS-mutated low-grade serous ovarian cancer and 12% (2/17) for patients with KRAS-mutated non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in a Phase 1 study[85-86] . Preclinical and clinical data suggest that KRAS mutations may predict clinical benefit from SHP2 inhibitors[87-88]. A Phase 1 study of RMC-4630 for relapsed/refractory solid tumors reported a DCR of 58% (23/40) for patients with NSCLC and KRAS mutations and a DCR of 75% (12/16) for patients with NSCLC and KRAS G12C mutations[89]. Interim results from a Phase 1/2 study of RMC-4630 plus cobimetinib reported tumor reduction in 3 of 8 patients with KRAS-mutated colorectal cancer[90]. Preclinical data suggest that KRAS mutation may confer sensitivity to SOS1 inhibitors[91-92]. Phase 1 studies of the SOS1 inhibitor BI 1701963 alone or in combination with MEK inhibitors, KRAS G12C inhibitors, or irinotecan are recruiting for patients with solid tumors harboring KRAS mutations[93-94] . Preclinical and limited clinical evidence suggest that KRAS mutation may predict sensitivity to PLK1 inhibitors[95]. A Phase 1b/2 study of PLK1 inhibitor onvansertib in combination with FOLFIRI and bevacizumab for patients with KRAS-mutated metastatic CRC previously treated with chemotherapy reported an 87.5% (7/8; 3 PR, 4 SD) clinical benefit rate, with 1 patient going on to successful curative surgery[96].

— Potential Resistance —

Activating mutations in KRAS or NRAS are associated with lack of clinical benefit from cetuximab[97-100] or panitumumab[101-103] for patients with CRC. Therefore, activating mutations in either gene indicate against the use of cetuximab and panitumumab (NCCN Colon Cancer Guidelines, v1.2022).

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Mutations in KRAS have been reported in approximately 35-50% of colorectal cancers (CRCs)[104-112]. Numerous studies have reported that KRAS mutations are associated with increased metastasis, adverse clinicopathological features, and shorter survival of patients with CRC[106-109,113-114].

FINDING SUMMARY

KRAS encodes a member of the RAS family of small GTPases. Activating mutations in RAS genes can cause uncontrolled cell proliferation and tumor formation[70,115]. KRAS alterations affecting amino acids G12, G13, Q22, P34, A59, Q61, and A146, as well as mutations G10_A11insG, G10_A11insAG (also reported as G10_A11dup and G12_G13insAG), A18D, L19F, D33E, G60_A66dup/E62_A66dup, E62K, E63K, R68S, and K117N have been characterized as activating and oncogenic[70,116-138].

GENE
NRAS

ALTERATION
wildtype

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

Lack of mutations in KRAS or NRAS is associated with clinical benefit of treatment with EGFR-targeting antibodies cetuximab[97-100] or panitumumab[101-103] for patients with CRC. Therefore, these agents are indicated to treat patients with CRC lacking such mutations (NCCN Guidelines v1.2022).

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

The majority of colorectal cancers (CRCs) (91-98%) have been reported to lack NRAS mutations[21,112,139-144]. NRAS wild-type status has been reported to be associated with decreased frequency of metastasis[112] and longer survival[144-145] of patients with CRC.

FINDING SUMMARY

NRAS encodes a member of the RAS family of small GTPases that mediate transduction of growth signals. Activation of RAS signaling causes cell growth, differentiation, and survival by activating the RAF-MAPK-ERK, PI3K, and other pathways[70]. No alterations in NRAS were identified in this case.

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

GENE
APC

ALTERATION
R876*, R1450*

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_000038.4, NM_000038.4

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
2626C>T, 4348C>T

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr5:112173917, chr5:112175639

VARIANT ALLELE FREQUENCY (% VAF)
9.3%, 8.1%

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no approved drugs targeting APC inactivation in cancer. Loss of APC function leads to accumulation of beta-catenin and upregulation of WNT pathway transcription programs[146], and potential therapeutic approaches to target this pathway include CBP/beta-catenin antagonists, which interfere with the ability of beta-catenin to interact with transcriptional co-activator CBP[147-148]. In a Phase 1 trial of the CBP/beta-catenin antagonist E7386, 1 patient with APC-mutated small bowel adenocarcinoma achieved a PR with tumor shrinkage of -69% and response duration of 165 days[149]; preclinical data support sensitivity of APC-deficient gastric or colorectal cancer models to E7386[150-151].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

APC mutations have been found in 73% of tumors in the colorectal adenocarcinoma TCGA dataset[21]. In 1 study, loss of heterozygosity (LOH) of APC was observed in 32% of colorectal cancer (CRC) samples[152]. The prognostic significance of APC mutations in sporadic CRC remains unclear[153]. Solid tumors with WNT/beta-catenin pathway alterations, as seen here, were observed to have significantly less T-cell inflammation in one study[154].

FINDING SUMMARY

APC (adenomatous polyposis coli) encodes a tumor suppressor with critical roles in regulating cell division and adhesion. APC interacts with beta-catenin and controls signaling in the WNT pathway, which regulates embryonic development and cell differentiation[155]. Alterations such as seen here may disrupt APC function or expression[156-160].

POTENTIAL GERMLINE IMPLICATIONS

One or more of the APC 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 familial adenomatous polyposis (ClinVar, Sep 2022)[161]. Follow-up germline testing would be needed to distinguish whether the finding in this patient is somatic or germline. Germline mutations in APC are found in more than 90% of patients with familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP)[162-164]. The prevalence for FAP in the general population is estimated to be 1:8,300 from birth[165], and in the appropriate clinical context germline testing of APC is recommended.

GENE
CDK8

ALTERATION
amplification

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no targeted therapies approved or in clinical trials that directly address genomic alterations in CDK8. Investigational inhibitors that selectively target CDK8 and the related CDK19 have shown activity against WNT-dependent tumors in preclinical assays[166-169].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

CDK8 amplification has been identified in various solid tumor types, including colorectal adenocarcinoma (3%)[21], pancreatic adenocarcinoma (3%)[170], stomach adenocarcinoma (less than 2%)[171], prostate adenocarcinoma (0-6%)[172-174], and breast carcinoma (1-2%)[175-176]. In the TCGA datasets, CDK8 mutation was observed most frequently (2%) in bladder urothelial carcinoma[177], lung adenocarcinoma[178], and lung squamous cell carcinoma[179]. In colorectal cancer, CDK8 expression has been detected in 70% of cases and correlated with beta-catenin activation; patients with CDK8-positive colon cancer experienced significantly shorter survival (hazard ratio of 2.05 by multivariate analysis), which was not seen for patients with rectal cancer[180-182]. The association of CDK8 alterations with the prognosis of other tumor types has not been firmly established[183-184].

FINDING SUMMARY

CDK8 encodes a member of the cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK) family. The CDK8 protein regulates gene expression as part of the Mediator complex, and its overexpression can dysregulate various cancer pathways, including the WNT/beta-catenin and NOTCH pathways[185-186]. CDK8 acts as oncogene in colon cancer and melanoma[187-189] but has also been described to have tumor suppressor functions[190-192]. Whereas CDK8 mutations have not been extensively characterized, amplification or overexpression of CDK8, often as a result of copy number increases in chromosomal region 13q12.13, have been reported in the scientific literature and may be associated with shorter survival for patients with colon cancer[180,187,193].

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

GENE
FLT3

ALTERATION
amplification

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

Therapies targeting FLT3 are under clinical investigation, including crenolanib, gilteritinib, luxeptinib, midostaurin, pacritinib, pexidartinib, ponatinib, quizartinib, sorafenib, and sunitinib. The TKIs midostaurin[194-197] and gilteritinib[198-200] have shown significant clinical activity for patients with relapsed/refractory acute myeloid leukemia (AML) harboring FLT3-ITD or FLT3-TKD mutations. In the Phase 1 study for the FLT3/BTK inhibitor luxeptinib, a patient with FLT3-ITD AML experienced a minimal residual disease (MRD)-negative CR[201]. A patient with FLT3-amplified and KRAS-mutated colorectal cancer (CRC) achieved significant benefit from sorafenib treatment[202]. Similarly, another patient with FLT3-amplified and KRAS-mutated CRC achieved a PR to regorafenib; two other patients with FLT3-amplified CRC treated with regorafenib experienced SD and PD, respectively[203]. However, a Phase 2 clinical trial of 10 patients with metastatic CRC and FLT3 amplification treated with sunitinib did not show significant clinical benefit[204].

— Nontargeted Approaches —

For patients with colorectal cancer, those with FLT3 amplified tumors (low and high amplified) were observed to have significantly shorter median OS from first-line chemotherapy compared with patients without FLT3 amplification (24.5-29.5 months vs. 43.6 months)[205].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

In the Colorectal Adenocarcinoma TCGA dataset, putative high-level amplification of FLT3 has been observed in 4% of cases[21]. In a study of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, FLT3 amplification was associated with significantly shorter survival time[205].

FINDING SUMMARY

FLT3 encodes a receptor tyrosine kinase that potentiates signaling through the RAS and PI3K pathways[206-208]. FLT3 has been reported to be amplified in cancer[209] and may be biologically relevant in this context[210-211].

GENE
IRS2

ALTERATION
amplification

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no therapies to directly target IRS2 amplification. However, preclinical studies using breast and CRC cell lines suggest that copy number gain and/or high levels of IRS2 may confer sensitivity to IGF1R inhibitors[212-213]. Clinical trials of IGF1R inhibitors are in progress in multiple tumor types.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

IRS2 copy number gain has been reported most commonly in colorectal cancer (CRC), with a frequency of 8-26% across several datasets[174,213-215]. IRS2 amplification has been observed less frequently in bladder urothelial carcinomas (4.7%)[177], sarcomas (3.9%)[216], stomach adenocarcinomas (3.8%)[171], and hepatocellular carcinomas (1.3%)[217]. Increased IRS2 protein expression has been reported in some tumor types, including 88% (46/53) of malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumors[218]. Several preclinical studies in breast cancer have shown that IRS2 expression is associated with metastatic behavior[219-222]; another study demonstrated that IRS2 protein levels were low in a panel of ductal carcinoma in situ but increased significantly in relation to tumor invasiveness[223]. In CRC, however, no difference was found in the prevalence of IRS2 amplification between primary and metastatic colorectal tumors[213]. Despite this finding, elevated IRS2 has been shown to correlate with CRC disease progression[215].

FINDING SUMMARY

IRS2 encodes the protein insulin receptor substrate 2, which is a cytoplasmic signaling molecule that links insulin receptor activation to downstream effectors, including the PI3K-mTOR pathway[224]. IRS2 amplification has been shown to correlate with increased mRNA expression levels[213,215].

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

GENE
KDM6A

ALTERATION
splice site 2702+1G>A

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_021140.2

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
2702+1G>A

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chrX:44929603

VARIANT ALLELE FREQUENCY (% VAF)
15.7%

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no therapies available to address KDM6A alterations in cancer.

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

KDM6A mutations have been reported in 3.9% of samples analyzed, with the highest incidence in tumors of the urinary tract (31%), liver (7.3%), endometrium (6.7%), salivary gland (6.0%), and pancreas (5.1%) (COSMIC, Jan 2023)[225]. KDM6A mutations or copy number alterations have also been identified in medulloblastoma (8.9%)[226], adenoid cystic carcinoma (6.7%)[227], and metastatic prostate cancer (10%)[228]. KDM6A inactivation has been found as a recurrent tumorigenic event in male T-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia (T-ALL), and loss of KDM6A increased the sensitivity of T-ALL cells to therapies targeting histone H3 lysine 27 methylation in preclinical assays[229]. However, KDM6A overexpression has been noted in breast cancer and renal cell carcinoma, and correlated with inferior prognosis in patients with breast cancer[230-232].

FINDING SUMMARY

KDM6A encodes a histone H3 lysine 27 demethylase UTX, which functions as a transcriptional regulator[233]. A significant number of inactivating KDM6A mutations have been found across multiple tumor types, suggesting a role as a tumor suppressor[233].

GENE
NBN

ALTERATION
rearrangement intron 5

POTENTIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES

— Targeted Therapies —

There are no approved therapies to target NBN mutation. NBN inactivation has been associated with sensitivity to PARP inhibitors in preclinical studies, although the clinical relevance of this has not been investigated[234-237]. Case studies of NBS patients with malignancies have reported hypersensitivity and adverse effects from radiation therapy and chemotherapy[238-241].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

Somatic NBN mutations occur infrequently in solid tumors and hematologic malignancies, reported in 0-6% of samples (COSMIC, 2022)[225]. A high rate of malignancy, particularly B- and T-cell lymphomas, has been observed in Nijmegen breakage syndrome (NBS) patients with biallelic NBN disruption[242-243]. Several studies have described heterozygous NBN mutation as a mild to moderate risk allele for certain cancers, such as breast cancer[244-246], prostate cancer[247], medulloblastoma[248], acute lymphoblastic leukemia[249], and non-Hodgkin lymphoma[250-251], although other studies found no such risk associations[252-254]; it is unclear if alterations other than the 657del5/K219fs*16 founder mutation are also putative risk alleles[255].

FINDING SUMMARY

NBN (also known as NBS1, p95) encodes nibrin, a component of a DNA double-strand break repair complex containing MRE11A and RAD50[256]. Germline NBN mutations, most frequently the K219fs*16 (657del5) founder mutation, are associated with Nijmegen breakage syndrome (NBS), a chromosomal instability syndrome with similarity to ataxia-telangiectasia, characterized by microcephaly, intrauterine growth restriction, immunodeficiency, and predisposition to certain cancers[256-257]. Limited data suggest that NBN overexpression may also be associated with cell transformation[258].

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

GENE
TP53

ALTERATION
R175H

TRANSCRIPT ID
NM_000546.4

CODING SEQUENCE EFFECT
524G>A

VARIANT CHROMOSOMAL POSITION
chr17:7578406

VARIANT ALLELE FREQUENCY (% VAF)
20.2%

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[259-262] or p53 gene therapy such as SGT53[263-267]. 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[268]. 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[269]. 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[270]. 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[271]. 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[272]. 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[273]. 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[274]. 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[267]. 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[275]. A Phase 1 trial of eprenetapopt with pembrolizumab for patients with solid tumors reported an ORR of 10% (3/29)[276].

FREQUENCY & PROGNOSIS

TP53 mutations have been reported in up to 75% of colorectal cancer cases[21,277-282]. A study reported p53 expression in 49% of analyzed colorectal cancer cases[283]. TP53 mutation has not been consistently demonstrated to be a significant independent prognostic marker in the context of CRC[284].

FINDING SUMMARY

Functional loss of the tumor suppressor p53, which is encoded by the TP53 gene, is common in aggressive advanced cancers[285]. Alterations such as seen here may disrupt TP53 function or expression[286-290].

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)[161]. 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[291-293], including sarcomas[294-295]. Estimates for the prevalence of germline TP53 mutations in the general population range from 1:5,000[296] to 1:20,000[295]. 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[297]. 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[298-303]. 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[298-299]. Clinical management of patients with CH in this gene may include monitoring for hematologic changes and reduction of controllable risk factors for cardiovascular disease[304]. Comprehensive genomic profiling of solid tumors detects nontumor alterations that are due to CH[302,305-306]. Patient-matched peripheral blood mononuclear cell sequencing is required to conclusively determine if this alteration is present in tumor or is secondary to CH.

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

Cetuximab

Resistance of variant(s) to associated therapy is likely

Assay findings association

KRAS
G12D

NRAS
wildtype

AREAS OF THERAPEUTIC USE

Cetuximab is a monoclonal antibody that targets EGFR. It is FDA approved for the treatment of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC) and KRAS-wild-type, EGFR-expressing metastatic colorectal cancer (CRC). Please see the drug label for full prescribing information.

GENE ASSOCIATION

Therapies targeting EGFR, including cetuximab, have been shown to have significant clinical activity for patients with CRC[97-100,307-308] ; wild-type KRAS and NRAS are predictive biomarkers for the efficacy of cetuximab in metastatic CRC (NCCN Colon Cancer Guidelines v1.2022). Activating mutations in either KRAS[97-100] or NRAS[142,282] , which function downstream of EGFR, are associated with lack of benefit of cetuximab for patients with CRC and indicate against the use of cetuximab (NCCN Guidelines v1.2022).

SUPPORTING DATA

Cetuximab has been shown to improve OS, PFS, and response rate for patients with KRAS-wildtype colorectal cancer (CRC), both in combination with FOLFIRI, FOLFOX4, or irinotecan[97-98,307-309] and as monotherapy for chemotherapy-refractory patients[100,310] . The Phase 3 study STRATEGIC-1 reported a similar duration of disease control (DDC) for patients with unresectable metastatic CRC (mCRC) and KRAS-, NRAS-, and BRAF-wildtype status treated with mFOLFOX-bevacizumab alternated with a cetuximab regimen in first or second line, respectively (overall DDC 22.5 vs. 23.5 months); in addition, the study reported similar OS (37.8 vs. 34.4 months) and higher numerical ORR for patients treated with cetuximab in the first line followed by mFOLFOX-bevacizumab compared with those receiving EGFR-directed antibodies in the second or third line[311]. A prospective study of cetuximab monotherapy for patients with KRAS-, NRAS-, and BRAF-wildtype mCRC reported 11% (2/19) PRs and 58% (11/19) SDs[312]. The Phase 2 AVETUX trial of cetuximab combined with avelumab and mFOLFOX6 for patients with RAS- and BRAF-wildtype mCRC resulted in an ORR of 81% (4 CR and 27 PRs, n=37) and a DCR of 89%[313]. In the Phase 3 ASPECCT study, panitumumab was found to be non-inferior to cetuximab with respect to median OS (10.4 vs. 10.0 months, HR=0.97) for patients with previously treated KRAS exon 2 wildtype metastatic colorectal cancer; median PFS was also similar between the two treatment groups (4.4 vs. 4.1 months, HR=1.00)[314]. In a similar patient population, a Phase 2 study of combination panitumumab and irinotecan versus combination cetuximab and irinotecan also demonstrated non-inferiority with respect to median PFS (5.4 vs. 4.3 months, HR = 0.64) and median OS (14.9 vs. 11.5 months, HR=0.66)[315].

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

Panitumumab

Resistance of variant(s) to associated therapy is likely

Assay findings association

KRAS
G12D

NRAS
wildtype

AREAS OF THERAPEUTIC USE

Panitumumab is a monoclonal antibody that targets EGFR. It is FDA approved to treat KRAS wild-type and NRAS wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer (CRC) combined with chemotherapy or as monotherapy for patients who have progressed on prior chemotherapy. Please see the drug label for full prescribing information.

GENE ASSOCIATION

Therapies targeting EGFR, including panitumumab, have been shown to have significant clinical activity for patients with CRC[101,314,316] ; wild-type KRAS and NRAS are predictive biomarkers for the efficacy of panitumumab in metastatic CRC (NCCN Colon Cancer Guidelines v1.2022). Activating mutations in either KRAS[101-103] or NRAS[102,280] , which function downstream of EGFR, are associated with lack of benefit of panitumumab for patients with CRC and indicate against the use of panitumumab (NCCN Colon Cancer Guidelines v1.2022, NCCN Rectal Cancer Guidelines v1.2022).

SUPPORTING DATA

Panitumumab has been shown to improve OS, PFS, and ORR for patients with KRAS-wildtype colorectal cancer (CRC), both in combination with FOLFOX4, FOLFIRI, irinotecan, or best supportive care[101,317-320] , and as monotherapy for chemotherapy-refractory patients[280,314,316] . The Phase 3 PARADIGM trial comparing panitumumab plus mFOLFOX6 versus bevacizumab plus mFOLFOX6 as first-line treatment for patients with RAS-wildtype left-sided metastatic CRC demonstrated that treatment with panitumumab significantly improved median OS (mOS; 36.2 months vs. 31.3 months) compared with bevacizumab[321]. A Phase 2 trial reported that, for patients with unresectable RAS-wildtype colorectal adenocarcinoma treated with panitumumab plus FOLFOX4, maintenance with a combination of panitumumab plus fluorouracil and leucovorin was superior to panitumumab monotherapy (10-month PFS OF 59% vs. 49%)[322]. In the Phase 3 ASPECCT study, panitumumab was found to be non-inferior to cetuximab with respect to median OS (10.4 vs. 10.0 months, HR=0.97) for patients with previously treated KRAS exon 2 wildtype metastatic colorectal cancer; median PFS was also similar between the two treatment groups (4.4 vs. 4.1 months, HR=1.00)[314]. In a similar patient population, a Phase 2 study of combination panitumumab and irinotecan versus combination cetuximab and irinotecan also demonstrated non-inferiority with respect to median PFS (5.4 vs. 4.3 months, HR = 0.64) and median OS (14.9 vs. 11.5 months, HR=0.66)[315].

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

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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
APC

ALTERATION
R876*, R1450*

RATIONALE
Based on preclinical and limited clinical data, APC inactivation may be associated with sensitivity to CBP/beta-catenin interaction inhibitors.

NCT05091346

PHASE 1/2

A Study of E7386 in Combination With Pembrolizumab in Previously Treated Participants With Selected Solid Tumors

TARGETS
CBP, Beta-catenin, PD-1

LOCATIONS: Fukuoka (Japan), Osaka (Japan), Shizouka (Japan), Tokyo (Japan), Chiba-shi (Japan), Kashiwa (Japan), Sapporo shi (Japan), Glasgow (United Kingdom), Manchester (United Kingdom), London (United Kingdom)

NCT04008797

PHASE 1

A Study of E7386 in Combination With Other Anticancer Drug in Participants With Solid Tumor

TARGETS
CBP, Beta-catenin, FGFRs, RET, PDGFRA, VEGFRs, KIT

LOCATIONS: Kurume (Japan), Matsuyama (Japan), Seodaemun (Korea, Republic of), Osakasayama (Japan), Nagoya (Japan), Chuo-Ku (Japan), Koto-ku (Japan), Chiba (Japan), Kashiwa (Japan), Hidaka (Japan)

NCT03264664

PHASE 1

Study of E7386 in Participants With Selected Advanced Neoplasms

TARGETS
CBP, Beta-catenin

LOCATIONS: Glasgow (United Kingdom), Manchester (United Kingdom), Sutton (United Kingdom)

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

GENE
KRAS

ALTERATION
G12D

RATIONALE
KRAS activating mutations or amplification may predict sensitivity to inhibitors of MAPK pathway components, including MEK inhibitors. KRAS mutation may predict sensitivity to PLK1 inhibitors. Limited clinical and preclinical studies indicate KRAS mutations may predict sensitivity to MEK-pan-RAF dual inhibitors. Multiple clinical studies have reported lack of efficacy of MEK inhibitors as monotherapy for treatment of KRAS-mutant colorectal cancer; combination therapies may be more effective.

NCT04985604

PHASE 1/2

DAY101 Monotherapy or in Combination With Other Therapies for Patients With Solid Tumors

TARGETS
BRAF, MEK

LOCATIONS: Busan (Korea, Republic of), Seoul (Korea, Republic of), Clayton (Australia), Edegem (Belgium), Oregon, Barcelona (Spain), Madrid (Spain), California, Colorado

NCT04803318

PHASE 2

Trametinib Combined With Everolimus and Lenvatinib for Recurrent/Refractory Advanced Solid Tumors

TARGETS
mTOR, FGFRs, RET, PDGFRA, VEGFRs, KIT, MEK

LOCATIONS: Guangzhou (China)

NCT03284502

PHASE 1

Cobimetinib and HM95573 in Patients With Locally Advanced or Metastatic Solid Tumors

TARGETS
MEK, RAFs, NRAS

LOCATIONS: Hwasun (Korea, Republic of), Pusan (Korea, Republic of), Seongnam (Korea, Republic of), Seoul (Korea, Republic of), Goyang-si (Korea, Republic of)

NCT04303403

PHASE 1

Study of Trametinib and Ruxolitinib in Colorectal Cancer and Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma

TARGETS
JAK2, JAK1, MEK

LOCATIONS: Singapore (Singapore)

NCT04870034

PHASE NULL

Binimetinib and Palbociclib Before Surgery for the Treatment of Operable KRAS-Positive Lung, Colorectal, or Pancreatic Cancer

TARGETS
MEK, CDK4, CDK6

LOCATIONS: New York

NCT04801966

PHASE NULL

Safety and Oversight of the Individually Tailored Treatment Approach: A Novel Pilot Study

TARGETS
CDK4, CDK6, PI3K-alpha, PD-L1, MEK, PARP, PD-1, BRAF

LOCATIONS: Melbourne (Australia)

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

NCT04551521

PHASE 2

CRAFT: The NCT-PMO-1602 Phase II Trial

TARGETS
PD-L1, AKTs, MEK, BRAF, ALK, RET, ERBB2

LOCATIONS: Würzburg (Germany), Mainz (Germany), Heidelberg (Germany), Tübingen (Germany)

NCT04892017

PHASE 1/2

A Safety, Tolerability and PK Study of DCC-3116 in Patients With RAS or RAF Mutant Advanced or Metastatic Solid Tumors.

TARGETS
ULK1, ULK2, MEK

LOCATIONS: Massachusetts, Texas, Pennsylvania

NCT03905148

PHASE 1/2

Study of the Safety and Pharmacokinetics of BGB-283 and PD-0325901 in Patients With Advanced or Refractory Solid Tumors

TARGETS
RAFs, EGFR, MEK

LOCATIONS: Nedlands (Australia), Blacktown (Australia), Randwick (Australia), Melbourne (Australia), California, Texas

NCT04817956

PHASE 2

Improving Public Cancer Care by Implementing Precision Medicine in Norway

TARGETS
PD-L1, VEGFA, ERBB2, ALK, RET, PARP, SMO, TRKB, TRKC, ROS1, TRKA, MEK, BRAF, PI3K-alpha, FGFR1, FGFR2, FGFR3, MET, KIT, ABL

LOCATIONS: Tromsø (Norway), Bodø (Norway), Hamar (Norway), Oslo (Norway), Fredrikstad (Norway), Drammen (Norway), Trondheim (Norway), Skien (Norway), Førde (Norway), Bergen (Norway)

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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.

ALOX12B
H674Q

BRCA2
E2476P

FLT1
amplification

GNAS
A280T

MAP2K4
A215S

NOTCH1
E1563D

NOTCH3
A2223V and R544C

PIM1
E135K

SPEN
S2306del

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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)

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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) 7.4.0

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

The median exon coverage for this sample is 923x

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

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. Ciardiello et al., 2018; ESMO Abstract LBA-004
7. Parikh et al., 2021; DOI: 10.1038/s43018-021-00269-7
8. Fukuoka S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2020) pmid: 32343640
9. Kim et al., 2020; DOI: 10.1016/j.annonc.2020.04.073
10. Zhang Y, et al. BMC Gastroenterol (2021) pmid: 34688262
11. Sinicrope FA, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2013) pmid: 24019539
12. Gavin PG, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2012) pmid: 23045248
13. Bertagnolli MM, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2009) pmid: 19273709
14. Van Cutsem E, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2009) pmid: 19451425
15. Ribic CM, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2003) pmid: 12867608
16. Sargent DJ, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2010) pmid: 20498393
17. Fallik D, et al. Cancer Res. (2003) pmid: 14522894
18. Guastadisegni C, et al. Eur. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 20627535
19. Pawlik TM, et al. Dis. Markers (2004) pmid: 15528785
20. Kocarnik JM, et al. Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf) (2015) pmid: 26337942
21. Nature (2012) pmid: 22810696
22. Histopathology (2007) pmid: 17204026
23. Samowitz WS, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2001) pmid: 11535541
24. Elsaleh H, et al. Clin Colorectal Cancer (2001) pmid: 12445368
25. Brueckl WM, et al. Anticancer Res. () pmid: 12820457
26. Guidoboni M, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (2001) pmid: 11438476
27. Gryfe R, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2000) pmid: 10631274
28. Sinicrope FA, et al. Gastroenterology (2006) pmid: 16952542
29. Laghi L, et al. Dig Dis (2012) pmid: 22722556
30. You JF, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 21081928
31. Bairwa NK, et al. Methods Mol. Biol. (2014) pmid: 24623249
32. Boland CR, et al. Cancer Res. (1998) pmid: 9823339
33. Boland CR, et al. Gastroenterology (2010) pmid: 20420947
34. Samstein RM, et al. Nat. Genet. (2019) pmid: 30643254
35. Goodman AM, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2017) pmid: 28835386
36. Goodman AM, et al. Cancer Immunol Res (2019) pmid: 31405947
37. Cristescu R, et al. Science (2018) pmid: 30309915
38. Ready N, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30785829
39. Hellmann MD, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2018) pmid: 29658845
40. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29657128
41. Hellmann MD, et al. Cancer Cell (2018) pmid: 29731394
42. Rozeman EA, et al. Nat Med (2021) pmid: 33558721
43. Sharma P, et al. Cancer Cell (2020) pmid: 32916128
44. Marabelle A, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2020) pmid: 32919526
45. Ott PA, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 30557521
46. Cristescu R, et al. J Immunother Cancer (2022) pmid: 35101941
47. Friedman CF, et al. Cancer Discov (2022) pmid: 34876409
48. Sturgill EG, et al. Oncologist (2022) pmid: 35274716
49. Schenker at al., 2022; AACR Abstract 7845
50. Legrand et al., 2018; ASCO Abstract 12000
51. Fabrizio DA, et al. J Gastrointest Oncol (2018) pmid: 30151257
52. Stadler ZK, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27022117
53. Shao C, et al. JAMA Netw Open (2020) pmid: 33119110
54. Schwartz et al., 2018; ASCO Abstract 572
55. Innocenti F, et al. J Clin Oncol (2019) pmid: 30865548
56. Lee DW, et al. Clin Cancer Res (2019) pmid: 31285374
57. Randon G, et al. Eur J Cancer (2022) pmid: 34933155
58. Chen EX, et al. JAMA Oncol (2020) pmid: 32379280
59. Pfeifer GP, et al. Mutat. Res. (2005) pmid: 15748635
60. Hill VK, et al. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet (2013) pmid: 23875803
61. Pfeifer GP, et al. Oncogene (2002) pmid: 12379884
62. Rizvi NA, et al. Science (2015) pmid: 25765070
63. Johnson BE, et al. Science (2014) pmid: 24336570
64. Choi S, et al. Neuro-oncology (2018) pmid: 29452419
65. Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, et al. Nature (2013) pmid: 23636398
66. Briggs S, et al. J. Pathol. (2013) pmid: 23447401
67. Heitzer E, et al. Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev. (2014) pmid: 24583393
68. Roberts SA, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2014) pmid: 25568919
69. Nakano H, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (1984) pmid: 6320174
70. Pylayeva-Gupta Y, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2011) pmid: 21993244
71. Yamaguchi T, et al. Int. J. Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21523318
72. Watanabe M, et al. Cancer Sci. (2013) pmid: 23438367
73. Gilmartin AG, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21245089
74. Yeh JJ, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2009) pmid: 19372556
75. Tsimberidou et al., 2013; ASCO Abstract e22086
76. Infante JR, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2012) pmid: 22805291
77. Zimmer L, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 24947927
78. Bennouna J, et al. Invest New Drugs (2011) pmid: 20127139
79. Weekes CD, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2013) pmid: 23434733
80. Hochster et al., 2013; ASCO GI Abstract 380
81. Juric et al., 2014; ASCO Abstract 9051
82. Lamba S, et al. Cell Rep (2014) pmid: 25199829
83. Sun C, et al. Cell Rep (2014) pmid: 24685132
84. Guo C, et al. Lancet Oncol (2020) pmid: 33128873
85. Krebs et al., 2021; AACR Abstract CT019
86. Shinde et al., 2020; AACR Abstract CT143
87. Lu H, et al. Mol Cancer Ther (2019) pmid: 31068384
88. Mainardi S, et al. Nat Med (2018) pmid: 29808006
89. Koczywas et al., 2021; AACR Abstract LB001
90. Bendell et al., 2020; EORTC-NCI-AACR Abstract 5
91. Hillig RC, et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A (2019) pmid: 30683722
92. Hofmann MH, et al. Cancer Discov (2021) pmid: 32816843
93. Hofmann et al., 2021; AACR Abstract CT210
94. Gort et al., 2020; ASCO Abstract TPS3651
95. Luo J, et al. Cell (2009) pmid: 19490893
96. Barzi et al., 2020; AACR Abstract CT235
97. Van Cutsem E, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21502544
98. Bokemeyer C, et al. Ann. Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21228335
99. Karapetis CS, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2008) pmid: 18946061
100. De Roock W, et al. Ann. Oncol. (2008) pmid: 17998284
101. Douillard JY, et al. Ann. Oncol. (2014) pmid: 24718886
102. Douillard JY, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2013) pmid: 24024839
103. Amado RG, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2008) pmid: 18316791
104. Lièvre A, et al. Cancer Res. (2006) pmid: 16618717
105. De Roock W, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21163703
106. Chen J, et al. BMC Cancer (2014) pmid: 25367198
107. Li W, et al. BMC Cancer (2015) pmid: 25929517
108. Hu J, et al. Medicine (Baltimore) (2016) pmid: 27977612
109. Zekri J, et al. Genet. Mol. Res. (2017) pmid: 28218784
110. Staudacher JJ, et al. Clin Transl Gastroenterol (2017) pmid: 29048416
111. Wang Y, et al. Virchows Arch. (2018) pmid: 29705968
112. Guo F, et al. Sci Rep (2018) pmid: 29666387
113. Mármol I, et al. Int J Mol Sci (2017) pmid: 28106826
114. Kwak MS, et al. Medicine (Baltimore) (2017) pmid: 28858102
115. Kahn S, et al. Anticancer Res. () pmid: 3310850
116. Akagi K, et al. Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. (2007) pmid: 17150185
117. Bollag G, et al. J. Biol. Chem. (1996) pmid: 8955068
118. Buhrman G, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (2010) pmid: 20194776
119. Sci. STKE (2004) pmid: 15367757
120. Edkins S, et al. Cancer Biol. Ther. (2006) pmid: 16969076
121. Feig LA, et al. Mol. Cell. Biol. (1988) pmid: 3043178
122. Gremer L, et al. Hum. Mutat. (2011) pmid: 20949621
123. Janakiraman M, et al. Cancer Res. (2010) pmid: 20570890
124. Kim E, et al. Cancer Discov (2016) pmid: 27147599
125. Lukman S, et al. PLoS Comput. Biol. (2010) pmid: 20838576
126. Naguib A, et al. J Mol Signal (2011) pmid: 21371307
127. Prior IA, et al. Cancer Res. (2012) pmid: 22589270
128. Privé GG, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (1992) pmid: 1565661
129. Scheffzek K, et al. Science (1997) pmid: 9219684
130. Scholl C, et al. Cell (2009) pmid: 19490892
131. Smith G, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 20147967
132. Tyner JW, et al. Blood (2009) pmid: 19075190
133. Valencia A, et al. Biochemistry (1991) pmid: 2029511
134. White Y, et al. Nat Commun (2016) pmid: 26854029
135. Wiest JS, et al. Oncogene (1994) pmid: 8058307
136. Angeles AKJ, et al. Oncol Lett (2019) pmid: 31289513
137. Tong JH, et al. Cancer Biol. Ther. (2014) pmid: 24642870
138. Loree JM, et al. Clin Cancer Res (2021) pmid: 34117033
139. Pentheroudakis G, et al. BMC Cancer (2013) pmid: 23374602
140. Vaughn CP, et al. Genes Chromosomes Cancer (2011) pmid: 21305640
141. Janku F, et al. Target Oncol (2013) pmid: 23400451
142. De Roock W, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2010) pmid: 20619739
143. Irahara N, et al. Diagn. Mol. Pathol. (2010) pmid: 20736745
144. Schirripa M, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2015) pmid: 24806288
145. Cercek A, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2017) pmid: 28446505
146. Zhan T, et al. Oncogene (2017) pmid: 27617575
147. Jung YS, et al. Exp Mol Med (2020) pmid: 32037398
148. Krishnamurthy N, et al. Cancer Treat Rev (2018) pmid: 29169144
149. Kawazoe et al., 2021; ESMO Abstract 473P
150. Yamada K, et al. Cancer Res (2021) pmid: 33408116

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

151. Kanda Y, et al. Biochem Biophys Res Commun (2022) pmid: 34837838
152. Christie M, et al. Oncogene (2013) pmid: 23085758
153. Quyn AJ, et al. Surgeon (2008) pmid: 19110823
154. Luke JJ, et al. Clin Cancer Res (2019) pmid: 30635339
155. Logan CY, et al. Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol. (2004) pmid: 15473860
156. Eklof Spink K, et al. EMBO J. (2001) pmid: 11707392
157. Liu J, et al. J. Mol. Biol. (2006) pmid: 16753179
158. Dikovskaya D, et al. J. Cell. Sci. (2010) pmid: 20144988
159. Murphy SJ, et al. Dig. Dis. Sci. (2007) pmid: 17410430
160. Aretz S, et al. Hum. Mutat. (2004) pmid: 15459959
161. Landrum MJ, et al. Nucleic Acids Res. (2018) pmid: 29165669
162. Kerr SE, et al. J Mol Diagn (2013) pmid: 23159591
163. Annu Rev Pathol (2011) pmid: 21090969
164. Kastritis E, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2009) pmid: 18844223
165. Half E, et al. Orphanet J Rare Dis (2009) pmid: 19822006
166. Dale T, et al. Nat. Chem. Biol. (2015) pmid: 26502155
167. Mallinger A, et al. ACS Med Chem Lett (2016) pmid: 27326329
168. Koehler MF, et al. ACS Med Chem Lett (2016) pmid: 26985305
169. Schiemann K, et al. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. (2016) pmid: 26852363
170. Witkiewicz AK, et al. Nat Commun (2015) pmid: 25855536
171. Nature (2014) pmid: 25079317
172. Barbieri CE, et al. Nat. Genet. (2012) pmid: 22610119
173. Cell (2015) pmid: 26544944
174. Kumar A, et al. Nat. Med. (2016) pmid: 26928463
175. Ciriello G, et al. Cell (2015) pmid: 26451490
176. Nature (2012) pmid: 23000897
177. Nature (2014) pmid: 24476821
178. Nature (2014) pmid: 25079552
179. Nature (2012) pmid: 22960745
180. Firestein R, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2010) pmid: 19790197
181. Seo JO, et al. Oncol. Rep. (2010) pmid: 20514474
182. He SB, et al. J. Exp. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 22104393
183. Porter DC, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (2012) pmid: 22869755
184. Kim MY, et al. Int. J. Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21344156
185. Galbraith MD, et al. Transcription () pmid: 21327159
186. Rzymski T, et al. Biochim. Biophys. Acta (2015) pmid: 26006748
187. Firestein R, et al. Nature (2008) pmid: 18794900
188. Morris EJ, et al. Nature (2008) pmid: 18794899
189. Adler AS, et al. Cancer Res. (2012) pmid: 22345154
190. McCleland ML, et al. J. Pathol. (2015) pmid: 26235356
191. Li N, et al. Nat. Cell Biol. (2014) pmid: 25344755
192. Gu W, et al. Cell Cycle (2013) pmid: 23454913
193. Xu W, et al. J Genet Genomics (2011) pmid: 22035865
194. Cooper BW, et al. Clin Lymphoma Myeloma Leuk (2015) pmid: 25776192
195. Williams CB, et al. Pharmacotherapy (2013) pmid: 23798029
196. Heidel F, et al. Blood (2006) pmid: 16150941
197. Stone RM, et al. Blood (2005) pmid: 15345597
198. Perl AE, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2019) pmid: 31665578
199. Perl AE, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2017) pmid: 28645776
200. Usuki K, et al. Cancer Sci. (2018) pmid: 30039554
201. et al., 2021; ASH Abstract 1272
202. Moreira RB, et al. Case Rep Oncol () pmid: 25848357
203. Lim SH, et al. Oncotarget (2017) pmid: 27906677
204. Alvarez et al., 2019; AACR Abstract CT146/12
205. Hasegawa H, et al. Cancer Sci (2021) pmid: 33075166
206. Zhang S, et al. J. Leukoc. Biol. (1999) pmid: 10080542
207. Mizuki M, et al. Blood (2000) pmid: 11090077
208. Chen W, et al. Mol. Cancer (2010) pmid: 21067588
209. Gao J, et al. Sci Signal (2013) pmid: 23550210
210. Zack TI, et al. Nat. Genet. (2013) pmid: 24071852
211. Beroukhim R, et al. Nature (2010) pmid: 20164920
212. Zha J, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2009) pmid: 19671761
213. Huang F, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2015) pmid: 25527633
214. Robinson D, et al. Cell (2015) pmid: 26000489
215. Day E, et al. Int J Exp Pathol (2013) pmid: 23594372
216. Barretina J, et al. Nat. Genet. (2010) pmid: 20601955
217. Ahn SM, et al. Hepatology (2014) pmid: 24798001
218. Shaw CM, et al. Anticancer Res. (2012) pmid: 22287730
219. Becker MA, et al. PLoS ONE (2016) pmid: 26991655
220. de Blaquière GE, et al. Endocr. Relat. Cancer (2009) pmid: 19261680
221. Gibson SL, et al. Cell Cycle (2007) pmid: 17361103
222. Future Oncol (2009) pmid: 19243297
223. Porter HA, et al. Cancer Lett. (2013) pmid: 23562473
224. Am. J. Physiol. Endocrinol. Metab. (2002) pmid: 12169433
225. Tate JG, et al. Nucleic Acids Res. (2019) pmid: 30371878
226. Robinson G, et al. Nature (2012) pmid: 22722829
227. Ho AS, et al. Nat. Genet. (2013) pmid: 23685749
228. Grasso CS, et al. Nature (2012) pmid: 22722839
229. Van der Meulen J, et al. Blood (2015) pmid: 25320243
230. Wang L, et al. Nat Commun (2013) pmid: 23792809
231. Kim JH, et al. Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 24491801
232. Shen Y, et al. BMC Cancer (2012) pmid: 23057811
233. van Haaften G, et al. Nat. Genet. (2009) pmid: 19330029
234. Oplustilova L, et al. Cell Cycle (2012) pmid: 22983061
235. Yamamoto Y, et al. Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 24830725
236. McCabe N, et al. Cancer Res. (2006) pmid: 16912188
237. Krenzlin H, et al. PLoS Genet. (2012) pmid: 22396666
238. Bakhshi S, et al. J. Pediatr. Hematol. Oncol. (2003) pmid: 12621246
239. Distel L, et al. Med. Pediatr. Oncol. (2003) pmid: 12764742
240. Meyer S, et al. Cancer Genet. Cytogenet. (2004) pmid: 15474156
241. Pastorczak A, et al. Eur J Med Genet (2016) pmid: 26826318
242. Gładkowska-Dura M, et al. J. Pathol. (2008) pmid: 18788073
243. Wolska-Kuśnierz B, et al. J. Clin. Immunol. (2015) pmid: 26271390
244. Zhang B, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2011) pmid: 21514219
245. Bogdanova N, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2008) pmid: 17957789
246. Damiola F, et al. Breast Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 24894818
247. Cybulski C, et al. Br. J. Cancer (2013) pmid: 23149842
248. Ciara E, et al. Acta Neuropathol. (2010) pmid: 19908051
249. Mosor M, et al. Leukemia (2006) pmid: 16810201
250. Chrzanowska KH, et al. Int. J. Cancer (2006) pmid: 16152606
251. Varon R, et al. Cancer Res. (2001) pmid: 11325820
252. Li J, et al. J. Med. Genet. (2016) pmid: 26534844
253. Couch FJ, et al. JAMA Oncol (2017) pmid: 28418444
254. Taylor GM, et al. Cancer Res. (2003) pmid: 14559852
255. Seemanová E, et al. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. (2007) pmid: 18073374
256. Carney JP, et al. Cell (1998) pmid: 9590181
257. Varon R, et al. Cell (1998) pmid: 9590180
258. Chen YC, et al. J. Biol. Chem. (2005) pmid: 16036916
259. Hirai H, et al. Cancer Biol. Ther. (2010) pmid: 20107315
260. Bridges KA, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21799033
261. Rajeshkumar NV, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2011) pmid: 21389100
262. Osman AA, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2015) pmid: 25504633
263. Xu L, et al. Mol. Cancer Ther. (2002) pmid: 12489850
264. Xu L, et al. Mol. Med. (2001) pmid: 11713371
265. Camp ER, et al. Cancer Gene Ther. (2013) pmid: 23470564
266. Kim SS, et al. Nanomedicine (2015) pmid: 25240597
267. Pirollo KF, et al. Mol. Ther. (2016) pmid: 27357628
268. Leijen S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27601554
269. Moore et al., 2019; ASCO Abstract 5513
270. Leijen S, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2016) pmid: 27998224
271. Oza et al., 2015; ASCO Abstract 5506
272. Lee J, et al. Cancer Discov (2019) pmid: 31315834
273. Méndez E, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2018) pmid: 29535125
274. Seligmann JF, et al. J Clin Oncol (2021) pmid: 34538072
275. Gourley et al., 2016; ASCO Abstract 5571
276. Park H, et al. ESMO Open (2022) pmid: 36084396
277. Goh HS, et al. Cancer Res. (1995) pmid: 7585578
278. Berg M, et al. PLoS ONE (2010) pmid: 21103049
279. Han SW, et al. PLoS ONE (2013) pmid: 23700467
280. Peeters M, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2013) pmid: 23325582
281. Malhotra P, et al. Tumour Biol. (2013) pmid: 23526092
282. Di Bartolomeo M, et al. Target Oncol (2014) pmid: 23821376
283. Wangefjord S, et al. Diagn Pathol (2013) pmid: 23337059
284. Russo A, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2005) pmid: 16172461
285. Brown CJ, et al. Nat. Rev. Cancer (2009) pmid: 19935675
286. Joerger AC, et al. Annu. Rev. Biochem. (2008) pmid: 18410249
287. Kato S, et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. (2003) pmid: 12826609
288. Kamada R, et al. J. Biol. Chem. (2011) pmid: 20978130
289. Zerdoumi Y, et al. Hum. Mol. Genet. (2017) pmid: 28472496
290. Yamada H, et al. Carcinogenesis (2007) pmid: 17690113
291. Bougeard G, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2015) pmid: 26014290
292. Sorrell AD, et al. Mol Diagn Ther (2013) pmid: 23355100
293. Nichols KE, et al. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. (2001) pmid: 11219776
294. Kleihues P, et al. Am. J. Pathol. (1997) pmid: 9006316
295. Gonzalez KD, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2009) pmid: 19204208
296. Lalloo F, et al. Lancet (2003) pmid: 12672316
297. Mandelker D, et al. Ann. Oncol. (2019) pmid: 31050713
298. Jaiswal S, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2014) pmid: 25426837
299. Genovese G, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2014) pmid: 25426838
300. Xie M, et al. Nat. Med. (2014) pmid: 25326804
301. Acuna-Hidalgo R, et al. Am. J. Hum. Genet. (2017) pmid: 28669404
302. Severson EA, et al. Blood (2018) pmid: 29678827
303. Fuster JJ, et al. Circ. Res. (2018) pmid: 29420212
304. Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program (2018) pmid: 30504320

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.

305. Chabon JJ, et al. Nature (2020) pmid: 32269342
306. Razavi P, et al. Nat. Med. (2019) pmid: 31768066
307. Cunningham D, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2004) pmid: 15269313
308. Jonker DJ, et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (2007) pmid: 18003960
309. Papamichael D, et al. Eur J Cancer (2022) pmid: 35033994
310. Karapetis CS, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2014) pmid: 24218517
311. Chibaudel et al., 2022; ASCO Abstract 3504
312. Moiseyenko VM, et al. Clin Drug Investig (2018) pmid: 29470838
313. Stein A, et al. J Immunother Cancer (2021) pmid: 34315821
314. Price TJ, et al. Lancet Oncol. (2014) pmid: 24739896
315. Sakai D, et al. Eur J Cancer (2020) pmid: 32526634
316. Van Cutsem E, et al. J. Clin. Oncol. (2007) pmid: 17470858
317. Peeters M, et al. Clin. Cancer Res. (2015) pmid: 26341920
318. Watanabe J, et al. Int J Cancer (2022) pmid: 35723084
319. Kim TW, et al. Clin Colorectal Cancer (2018) pmid: 29703606
320. Shitara K, et al. Cancer Sci (2016) pmid: 27712015
321. Yoshino et al., 2022; ASCO Abstract LBA1
322. Pietrantonio F, et al. JAMA Oncol (2019) pmid: 31268481

Disclaimer: Foundation Medicine Inc. only provides PDF report as an official issuance of the test result. Any other transformed format is not an "official / formal solution" and not guarantee the accuracy of this conversion. It is suggested the hospital to verify the outputs and validate the suitability of use.

© 2023 Foundation Medicine, Inc. All rights reserved.