ARTICLE

Molecular Diagnostics

BRCA1/2 in non-mucinous epithelial ovarian cancer: tumour with or without germline testing?

Robert D. Morgan ^{1,2 ⊠}, George J. Burghel³, Nicola Flaum^{1,4}, Michael Bulman³, Philip Smith³, Andrew R. Clamp^{1,2}, Jurjees Hasan¹, Claire L. Mitchell¹, Zena Salih¹, Emma R. Woodward^{4,5}, Fiona Lalloo ⁵, Emma J. Crosbie ^{2,6}, Richard J. Edmondson^{2,6}, Andrew J. Wallace³, Gordon C. Jayson^{1,2} and D. Gareth R. Evans^{4,5}

© Crown 2022

National guidelines recommend testing all cases of non-mucinous epithelial ovarian cancer (NMEOC) for germline (blood) and somatic (tumour) *BRCA1/2* pathogenic variants (PVs). We performed paired germline and somatic *BRCA1/2* testing in consecutive cases of NMEOC (n = 388) to validate guidelines. Thirty-four somatic *BRCA1/2* (*sBRCA*) PVs (9.7%) were detected in 350 cases with germline *BRCA1/2* (*gBRCA*) wild-type. All *sBRCA* PVs were detected in non-familial cases. By analysing our regional germline *BRCA1/2* database there were 92/1114 (8.3%) g*BRCA* PVs detected in non-familial cases (only 3% \geq 70 years old) and 245/641 (38.2%) in familial cases. Germline non-familial cases were dominated by *BRCA2* in older women (8/271 \geq 70 years old, all *BRCA2*). The ratio of *sBRCA*-to-g*BRCA* was \leq 1.0 in women aged <70 years old, compared to 5.2 in women aged \geq 70 years old (P = 0.005). The likelihood of missed germline *BRCA1/2* PVs (copy-number variants missed on most somatic assays) by testing only tumour DNA was 0.4% in women aged \geq 70 years old. We recommend reflex tumour *BRCA1/2* testing in all NMEOC cases, and that g*BRCA* testing is not required for women aged \geq 70 years old with no identifiable tumour *BRCA1/2* PV and/or family history of breast, ovarian, prostate and/or pancreatic cancer.

British Journal of Cancer (2022) 127:163-167; https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-022-01773-y

BACKGROUND

Ovarian cancer is the most lethal gynaecological cancer [1]. Despite significant advancements in our understanding of the genetic hallmarks of ovarian cancer histological subtypes, only poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase-1/2 inhibitors (PARPi) are used as standard therapy for genetically stratified tumours, in *BRCA1/2*-mutant (germ-line [g*BRCA*] or somatic [s*BRCA*]) high-grade serous carcinoma [2–5].

Germline *BRCA1/2* testing is now performed as standard practice following a diagnosis of high-grade serous carcinoma, where *gBRCA* pathogenic variants (PVs) account for ~15–20% of cases [6, 7]. Although the use of PARPi has expanded through oncology-led *gBRCA* testing services, additional tumour *BRCA1/2* testing maximises the utility of PARPi by identifying actionable *sBRCA* PVs [8]. National guidelines recommend testing all cases of non-mucinous epithelial ovarian cancer (NMEOC) for *gBRCA* and *sBRCA* PVs [9–11]. We assessed our experience of paired germline (blood) and somatic (tumour) *BRCA1/2* testing in consecutive NMEOC cases to validate guidelines.

METHODOLOGY

Women diagnosed with NMEOC underwent germline (September 1996 to August 2021) and more recently tumour *BRCA1/2* testing

(July 2017 to August 2021) using clinically validated assays in the Manchester Centre for Genomic Medicine. Between July 2017 and August 2021, paired germline and tumour *BRCA1/2* testing could be requested by the treating physician.

The next-generation sequencing (NGS) tumour BRCA1/2 assay has been previously reported [12, 13]. Briefly, tumour DNA was extracted from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded blocks that contained ≥20% tumour content. Bioinformatic analysis used an in-house pipeline validated to detect tumour BRCA1/2 variants down to an allele frequency of ~4%. The NGS assay detects single nucleotide variants and small duplications, deletions and/or insertions ≤40 base pairs across the whole coding sequence of BRCA1/2 + /- 15 base pairs beyond exon-intron junctions. Variant allele frequency ≥4% has a call sensitivity >95% and specificity >99% after manual review. Germline BRCA1/2 testing was performed on DNA extracted from peripheral circulating lymphocytes. The NGS and multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA) assays used to detect gBRCA PVs have also been previously reported [14, 15]. The variant interpretation was performed as per published guidelines [16].

Women were considered as 'non-familial' (low familial risk) if they had no more than a single breast cancer themselves or in

Received: 22 September 2021 Revised: 4 February 2022 Accepted: 22 February 2022 Published online: 8 March 2022

¹Department of Medical Oncology, The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK. ²Division of Cancer Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, Manchester, UK. ³Manchester Centre for Genomic Medicine, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK. ⁴Division of Evolution & Genomic Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, UK. ⁵Department of Clinical Genetics, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK. ⁶Department of Gynaecological Surgery, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK. ⁶Memail: robert.morgan7@nhs.net

their family diagnosed \geq 50 years old. Familial cases included those with more extensive personal and/or family histories of breast, ovarian, prostate and/or pancreatic cancer.

The data included in this study were collected as part of a continuous clinical audit. Clinical data were gathered at the time that the germline and/or tumour *BRCA1/2* status was reported. All patients provided informed consent for blood (germline) and tumour (somatic) *BRCA1/2* testing. Statistical tests used Fisher exact test (two-sided).

RESULTS

Population

One-thousand-seven-hundred-fifty-five women underwent germline testing and 337 were diagnosed with a gBRCA PV (gBRCA1 = 200, gBRCA2 = 137; prevalence 19.2%); not exclusively in highgrade serous carcinoma (Table 1). Three-hundred eighty-eight women (out of 409; 94.9%) had successful germline and tumour BRCA1/2 testing (n = 21 insufficient material and/or sample failed) (Fig. 1). Initially, samples were tested sequentially with germline BRCA1/2 testing first (n = 209; no tumour testing reported if a gBRCA PV was detected) and then testing was carried out either simultaneously or tumour first (n = 200).

Thirty-four sBRCA PVs were identified in tumour DNA from 350 patients with germline BRCA1/2 wild-type (sBRCA1 = 18, sBRCA2 = 16; prevalence 9.7%; Table 1). All 34 sBRCA PVs were detected in non-familial cases (Fig. 1).

Thirty-six gBRCA PVs were confirmed in tumour DNA, but two copy-number variants (CNVs) found using MLPA were not identified in tumour DNA, including BRCA1 Exon 13 duplication (n = 1) and BRCA2 Exons 1–2 deletion (n = 1; Table 1). Fifteen (out of 38; 39.4%) gBRCA PVs were found in non-familial cases (Fig. 1).

Somatic versus germline BRCA1/2 pathogenic variants

We used the full germline (n = 1755) and tumour (n = 388) *BRCA1/* 2 testing databases to compare the age-specific prevalence of *sBRCA* versus *gBRCA* PVs (Table 1). The most striking difference was found in women aged \geq 70 years old, where 17/111 (15.3%) had a *sBRCA* PV (*sBRCA1* = 6, *sBRCA2* = 11) but only 8/271 (3.0%) had a *gBRCA* PV (all *gBRCA2*; Table 1). The *sBRCA*-to-*gBRCA* ratio of 5.2 in women diagnosed with non-familial NMEOC aged \geq 70 years old contrasted all other ratios (\leq 1.0) in women aged <70 years old (P = 0.005; Table 1).

Interestingly, there was also a reversal of the gBRCA2-to-gBRCA1 ratio in non-familial NMEOC of 0.8 (25:31) aged <60 years old to 3.0 (27:9) aged \geq 60 years old (P = 0.005; Table 1).

Miss rate by upfront tumour BRCA1/2 testing

To assess the potential miss rate of not universally testing all NMEOC cases for germline *BRCA1/2* PVs, we used the full g*BRCA* testing database (n = 1755), which included all familial cases. Forty (out of 200; 20%) g*BRCA1* PVs were CNVs, compared to only 5/137 (3.6%) g*BRCA2* PVs. The data suggested only 0.4% of non-familial g*BRCA*-positive CNVs would be missed by testing only tumour DNA in women diagnosed with NMEOC aged >70 years old, but would result in a 1.3% miss rate in those aged <60 years old and 5.0% miss rate in familial cases (Table 1).

DISCUSSION

Tumour *BRCA1/2* analysis of NMEOC cases generally results in gBRCA and sBRCA PV rates of 15–20% and 5–7%, respectively [6, 15, 17–19]. However, germline rates in non-familial NMEOC, even in high-grade serous carcinoma, are much lower, particularly in those diagnosed >60 years old [14, 20]. Indeed, age \geq 70 years old in one study found only 1/86 of unselected cases of NMEOC had a gBRCA PV [20]. Our rate of 3% (8/271) in women diagnosed

 \geq 70 years old was made up entirely of gBRCA2 PVs, which contrasted with the age of onset with gBRCA1 PVs [21].

Thus far, the age of onset of sBRCA has not been correlated, but we found an almost double rate of somatic BRCA1/2 PVs diagnosed \geq 70 years old. This means that only one in six BRCA1/ 2 PVs found on tumour analysis in non-familial NMEOC cases \geq 70 years old will be germline. Whilst national guidelines recommend initial gBRCA testing, a more practical approach would be to start with reflex tumour BRCA1/2 testing (by pathologists) of all cases of NMEOC, particularly in those women diagnosed \geq 70 years old. This would enable a timely result to facilitate PARPi maintenance therapy, thereby avoiding the delays/misses/refused cases with aermline BRCA1/2 testing. Indeed, the tumour BRCA1/2 testing assay described in this study has a turnaround time of 21 to 28 days, and testing can be requested immediately following histological diagnosis. Moreover, tumour BRCA1/2 testing may not require specific consent, and even if consent is required this should not entail a detailed discussion about personal and/or familial risks. In practice, discussions about inherited risk can be particularly worrying for women who are simultaneously trying to deal with the diagnosis and treatment of ovarian cancer.

The high ratio of sBRCA-to-gBRCA PVs in non-familial cases aged >70 years old is an interesting finding from our study. The likelihood of somatic variants in oncogenes and/or tumour suppressor genes increases with age, potentially due to faltering DNA repair mechanisms. Therefore, more sBRCA PVs are likely to be detected in older age groups. Moreover, the increase in sBRCA1/2 PVs is offset by a lower prevalence of gBRCA1/2 PVs. Indeed, the risk of hereditary ovarian cancer does not increase with age >50 years old, and cases of gBRCA-mutant NMEOC aged >70 years are reduced by the competing mortality from breast cancer and/or risk-reducing bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy in younger heterozygotes.

Given the extremely low chance of missing a gBRCA PV on tumour BRCA1/2 testing in women diagnosed \geq 70 years old (0.4%; in UK costs approximately £500,000 per CNV) it is arguable whether a germline (blood) sample is required unless a tumour BRCA1/2 PV is detected and/or tumour testing fails. However, in younger women and especially those with a family history, miss rates could be as high as 5.0% if CNVs are not reliably detected through tumour BRCA1/2 testing [8, 19, 22–24]. It is therefore essential that germline BRCA1/2 testing is carried out on all familial cases and those diagnosed <60 years old. Rates of germline BRCA1/2 CNVs vary from 3–5% in BRCA2 to 10–20% in BRCA1, reflecting the sensitivity of detection.

It is notable that our study only reports the incidence of *BRCA1/* 2 PVs in NMEOC cases. Indeed, consideration should be given for extended panel testing to detect germline PVs in moderate-to-low penetrance genes associated with hereditary ovarian cancer (e.g., *RAD51C/D*, *BRIP1*, *PALB2*) in *BRCA1/2* wild-type cases with a family history of cancer. Although we are not recommending extended panel testing for all NMEOC cases with *BRCA1/2* wild-type, we do recommend referral to Clinical Genetics for those women who have a first-degree or second-degree relative with ovarian cancer.

It is also noteworthy that there may be a degree of selection bias in our study. Firstly, for those women in whom a gBRCA PV was detected prior to completion of tumour testing (i.e., sequential or simultaneous germline/tumour testing versus tumour first), if a germline PV was reported first, it would halt additional unnecessary reporting of tumour variants. Therefore, it is likely that more than 409 cases of NMEOC had paired germline/ tumour testing requested. This factor explains the relatively low prevalence of gBRCA PV detected in the paired testing cohort (9.3%; 38/409) versus the full germline database (19.2%; 337/ 1755). Secondly, if tumour tissue was not available; for example, due to cytological diagnosis and/or low tumour cell content following diagnostic workup, then only germline BRCA1/2 testing could take place, meaning the somatic status of some gBRCA wild-

	Non-fa	amilial OC	(low fam	ilial risk)			Familial OC	Combined total	HGSC	с С	EOC	Carcinosarcoma	Other
	Age ()	rears)				Total							
	<30	30–49	50-59	69-09	70 +								
Full germline BRCA1/2 testing database (N	= 1755)												
Germline BRCA1/2 tested (no.)	18	199	319	325	271	1114	641	1755	1512	61	108	23	51 ^d
gBRCA1/2 wild-type (no.)	18	177	285	297	263	1022	396	1418	1197	55	97	18	51 ^d
gBRCA1 PV (no.)	0	12	19	6	0	40	160	200	188	4	7	-	0
e%	0.0%	6.0%	6.0%	2.8%	0.0%	3.6%	25.0%	11.4%	12.4%	6.6%	6.5%	4.3%	0.0%
gBRCA2 PV (no.)	0	10	15	19	8	52	85	137	127	2	4	4	0
e%	%0.0	5.6%	5.3%	6.4%	3.0%	5.1%	21.5%	9.7%	10.6%	3.6%	4.1%	22.2%	0.0%
Combined gBRCA1/2 PV (no.)	0	22	34	28	8	92	245	337	315	9	11	5	0
% Combined gBRCA1/2 PV ^a	0.0%	11.1%	10.7%	8.6%	3.0%	8.3%	38.2%	19.2%	20.8%	9.8%	10.2%	21.7%	0.0%
Successful paired tumour and germline BRG	CA1/2 tes	ting coho	rt (N=38	(8)									
BRCA1/2 tested (no.)	0	42	82	107	112	343	45	388	361	6	15	1	2
gBRCA1/2 PV confirmed (no.)	0	5	£	9	-	15	23	38	32	-	ŝ	0	0
gBRCA1/2 wild-type (no.)	0	37	79	101	111	328	22	350	327	8	12	1	2
gBRCA1/2 PV missed in tumour DNA (no.)	0	0	0	2 ^b	0	2 ^b	0	2 ^b	2 ^b	0	0	0	0
% gBRCA1/2 PV Missed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	5.3%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
sBRCA1 PV (no.)	0	ε	ε	9	9	18	0	18	18	0	0	0	0
%c	0.0%	8.1%	3.8%	5.9%	5.4%	5.5%	0.0%	5.1%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
sBRCA2 PV (no.)	0	-	-	ε	11	16	0	16	15	-	0	0	0
%c	0.0%	2.7%	1.3%	3.0%	9.9%	4.9%	0.0%	4.6%	4.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Combined sBRCA1/2 PV (no.)	0	4	4	6	17	34	0	34	33	-	0	0	0
% Combined sBRCA1/2 PV ^c	0.0%	10.8%	5.1%	8.9%	15.3%	10.4%	0.0%	9.7%	10.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
sBRCA-to-gBRCA ratio	0.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	5.2	1.3	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missed rate gBRCA1/2 CNVs	0.0%	1.3%	1.2%	0.7%	0.4%	%6.0	5.0%	2.4%	2.7%	1.8%	1.3%	0.9%	0.0%
CCC clear cell carcinoma, CNVs copy-number var «RPCA comatic RPC41/2	riants, <i>EO</i> C	cendometr	ioid ovaria	n carcinon	ia, <i>g</i> BRCA g	germline <i>B</i> I	SCA1/2, HGSC hig	lh-grade serous carcino	oma, <i>no</i> . n	umber, OC	ovarian ca	incer, PV pathogenic	variant,
^a The denominator is the number of cases teste	ed for gen	nline BRCA	1/2 pathog	genic varia	nts.								
Two cases of non-mucinous epithelial ovarian The denominator is the number of cases tester	cancers h od for tum	iad a copy our <i>BRCA1</i>	-number v.	ariant dete	cted in ge s with con	firmed gei	A but not in tur mline <i>BRCA1/2</i> v	nour DNA. vild-tvne.					
^d Includes $n = 11$ and $n = 2$ low-grade serous ca	arcinoma	cases who	underwen	t blood (ge	ermline) an	d tumour	(somatic) testing	l, respectively, as well	as adenoc	arcinoma	otherwise	specified (NOS).	



Fig. 1 Flow chart for germline and tumour BRCA1/2 testing. Paired germline and tumour testing was requested in 409 patients. In total, 1755 patients underwent germline testing.

type cases remains unknown. This factor may explain the relatively high prevalence of *sBRCA* PVs detected in the paired testing cohort (9.7%; 34/350).

In conclusion, we report the detection rate of *sBRCA* PVs with paired blood (germline) and tumour (somatic) DNA testing in a large cohort of NMEOC cases. We recommend starting with tumour *BRCA* testing, and that germline testing is probably not indicated after confirming tumour *BRCA*1/2 wild-type in women diagnosed with NMEOC aged \geq 70 years and no family history of breast, ovarian, prostate and/or pancreatic cancer.

REFERENCES

- Ferlay J, Colombet M, Soerjomataram I, Dyba T, Randi G, Bettio M, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality patterns in Europe: Estimates for 40 countries and 25 major cancers in 2018. Eur J Cancer. 2018;103:356–87.
- Coleman RL, Fleming GF, Brady MF, Swisher EM, Steffensen KD, Friedlander M, et al. Veliparib with first-line chemotherapy and as maintenance therapy in ovarian cancer. N. Engl J Med. 2019;385:2403–15.
- Coleman RL, Oza AM, Lorusso D, Aghajanian C, Oaknin A, Dean A, et al. Rucaparib maintenance treatment for recurrent ovarian carcinoma after response to platinum therapy (ARIEL3): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet. 2017;390:1949–61.
- Gonzalez-Martin A, Pothuri B, Vergote I, DePont Christensen R, Graybill W, Mirza MR, et al. Niraparib in patients with newly diagnosed advanced ovarian cancer. N Engl J Med. 2019;381:2391–402.
- Moore K, Colombo N, Scambia G, Kim BG, Oaknin A, Friedlander M, et al. Maintenance olaparib in patients with newly diagnosed advanced ovarian cancer. N. Engl J Med. 2018;379:2495–505.
- Hauke J, Hahnen E, Schneider S, Reuss A, Richters L, Kommoss S, et al. Deleterious somatic variants in 473 consecutive individuals with ovarian cancer: results of the observational AGO-TR1 study (NCT02222883). J Med Genet. 2019;56:574–80.
- Huang KL, Mashl RJ, Wu Y, Ritter DI, Wang J, Oh C, et al. Pathogenic germline variants in 10,389 adult cancers. Cell. 2018;173:355–70.

- Hennessy BT, Timms KM, Carey MS, Gutin A, Meyer LA, Flake DD 2nd, et al. Somatic mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2 could expand the number of patients that benefit from poly (ADP ribose) polymerase inhibitors in ovarian cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2010;28:3570–6.
- Pujol P, Barberis M, Beer P, Friedman E, Piulats JM, Capoluongo ED, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for BRCA1 and BRCA2 genetic testing. Eur J Cancer. 2021;146:30–47.
- Konstantinopoulos PA, Norquist B, Lacchetti C, Armstrong D, Grisham RN, Goodfellow PJ, et al. Germline and somatic tumor testing in epithelial ovarian cancer: ASCO guideline. J Clin Oncol. 2020;38:1222–45.
- 11. Sundar S, Manchanda R, Gourley C, George A, Wallace A, Balega J, et al. British Gynaecological Cancer Society/British Association of Gynaecological Pathology consensus for germline and tumor testing for BRCA1/2 variants in ovarian cancer in the United Kingdom. Int J Gynecol Cancer. 2021;31:272–8.
- Ellison G, Huang S, Carr H, Wallace A, Ahdesmaki M, Bhaskar S, et al. A reliable method for the detection of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations in fixed tumour tissue utilising multiplex PCR-based targeted next generation sequencing. BMC Clin Pathol. 2015;15:5.
- Morgan RD, Bulman M, Clamp AR, MacMohon S, Thompson L, Ribeiro S, et al. Incidence of tumour BRCA1/2 variants in relapsed, platinum-sensitive ovarian, fallopian tube and primary peritoneal cancer. Ann Oncol. 2019;30:v403–v434.
- Morgan RD, Burghel GJ, Flaum N, Bulman M, Clamp AR, Hasan J, et al. Prevalence of germline pathogenic BRCA1/2 variants in sequential epithelial ovarian cancer cases. J Med Genet. 2019;56:301–7.
- Flaum N, Morgan RD, Burghel GJ, Bulman M, Clamp AR, Hasan J, et al. Mainstreaming germline BRCA1/2 testing in non-mucinous epithelial ovarian cancer in the North West of England. Eur J Hum Genet. 2020;28:1541–7.
- 16. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D, Das S, Gastier-Foster J, et al. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17:405–24.
- Alsop K, Fereday S, Meldrum C, deFazio A, Emmanuel C, George J, et al. BRCA mutation frequency and patterns of treatment response in BRCA mutationpositive women with ovarian cancer: a report from the Australian Ovarian Cancer Study Group. J Clin Oncol. 2012;30:2654–63.

- Cunningham JM, Cicek MS, Larson NB, Davila J, Wang C, Larson MC, et al. Clinical characteristics of ovarian cancer classified by BRCA1, BRCA2, and RAD51C status. Sci Rep. 2014;4:4026.
- 19. Frugtniet B, Morgan S, Murray A, Palmer-Smith S, White R, Jones R, et al. The detection of germline and somatic BRCA1/2 genetic variants through parallel testing of patients with high-grade serous ovarian cancer: a national retro-spective audit. BJOG. 2022;129:433–42.
- Plaskocinska I, Shipman H, Drummond J, Thompson E, Buchanan V, Newcombe B, et al. New paradigms for BRCA1/BRCA2 testing in women with ovarian cancer: results of the Genetic Testing in Epithelial Ovarian Cancer (GTEOC) study. J Med Genet. 2016;53:655–61.
- Flaum N, Crosbie EJ, Woodward ER, Lalloo F, Gareth Evans D. Challenging the believed proportion of ovarian cancer attributable to BRCA2 versus BRCA1 pathogenic variants. Eur J Cancer. 2020;124:88–90.
- Hodgson DR, Brown JS, Dearden SP, Lai Z, Elks CE, Milenkova T, et al. Concordance of BRCA mutation detection in tumor versus blood, and frequency of bi-allelic loss of BRCA in tumors from patients in the phase III SOLO2 trial. Gynecol Oncol. 2021;163:563–8.
- Callens C, Vaur D, Soubeyran I, Rouleau E, Just PA, Guillerm E, et al. Concordance between tumor and germline BRCA status in high-grade ovarian carcinoma patients in the phase III PAOLA-1/ENGOT-ov25 trial. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2021;113:917–23.
- 24. Fumagalli C, Tomao F, Betella I, Rappa A, Calvello M, Bonanni B, et al. Tumor BRCA test for patients with epithelial ovarian cancer: the role of molecular pathology in the era of PARP inhibitor therapy. Cancers. 2019;11:1641.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ERW and DGRE are supported by the Manchester National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Manchester Biomedical Research Centre (IS-BRC-1215-20007). EJC is supported by a NIHR Advanced Fellowship (NIHR300650). NF is supported by CRUK via the funding to Cancer Research UK Manchester Centre: [C147/A18083] and [C147/A25254].

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

RDM and DGRE designed and initiated the study. RDM, NF, ARC, JH, CLM, ZS, ERW, FL, EJC, RJE, GCJ and DGRE gained consent for germline and tumour *BRCA1/2* testing.

GJB, MB, PS and AJW reported all germline and tumour *BRCA1/2* results. All authors interpreted the data and reviewed the final version of the manuscript.

FUNDING

The tumour *BRCA1/2* testing service was funded by AstraZeneca and Merck Sharp & Dohme, who gave permission to publish the data. Neither company had any influence in the writing of the manuscript or the views expressed by the authors.

COMPETING INTERESTS

RDM, GJB, NF, MB, PS, JH, CLM, ZS, ERW, FL, EJC, RJE, AJW and DGRE declare no competing interests. GCJ declares research funding from AstraZeneca for investigator-led clinical trials. ARC declares research funding and advisory boards fees from AstraZeneca, and speaker and advisory board fees from Clovis Oncology.

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

All women included in this study provided informed consent to undergo germline and tumour *BRCA1/2* testing. The germline *BRCA1/2* database is approved by North Manchester Research Ethics Committee (08/H1006/77). The Genetic Variants in Gynaecological Cancer database is approved by the Christie NHS Foundation Trust (59).

CONSENT TO PUBLISH

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Robert D. Morgan.

Reprints and permission information is available at http://www.nature.com/ reprints

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.