

### **Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai**

1425 Madison Av, New York, NY 10029 Phone: (212) 241-6149

## **Personalized Cancer Research Findings**

**\* Caution – findings are investigational; limited by Federal law to investigational use only \***



# Molecular Testing Results

### **1. Most relevant somatic mutations**











### **Validated:**

a = mutation observed in both Illumina WES (Assay 1) and Hotspot (Assay 2) **Previously observed:**

yes = exact match

similar = no exact match, but other mutation observed at same position <sup>1</sup> previously observed variant is of unknown origin (unknown if it is somatic)

### **2. Somatic mutations in other genes:**

ABCC2, ANGEL2, ANKRD36, APOBR, ARHGAP15, ASTN1, ATN1, ATRNL1, AXDND1, BAI1, C17orf51, C4orf50, CADM1, CCDC147, CCDC28A, CCSER1, CD163, CDC27, CIB2, CLCN1, DAB1, DDX46, DMD, DNAH3, DOHH, DYNAP, ELF2, EVI5L, FAM109B, FAT4, FLNB, FMNL3, FOXP2, FRMPD4, GLG1, GNB5, GPATCH4, GREB1, HECW1, HSD17B4, HUWE1, IL20RA, IMPG2, KCNK1, KIF18B, LCP2, MAP7D3, MATN4, MMEL1, MYO5C, N4BP2, NEB, NETO1, NLRP14, OR2D3, OR5H14, OR8H3, OTOGL, PCDH17, PCDH7, PCDHGA6, PGK1, PHKA2, PKHD1L1, POMC, POTEF, PREX2, RAD54L2, RASAL2, RBM46, RGPD8, RSPO3, RYR1, SEMA3D, SEZ6L, SIPA1L2, SLC35E2B, SLC9B1P1, TCEB3C, TOM1, TONSL, TPBG, TRAM1L1, TRPV5, TSGA10, USP49, VN1R4, WDR52, ZFC3H1, ZFP69B, ZNF280A, ZNF518B, ZNF784

# Analysis Summary : Predictive

## **Tier 1: FDA Approved Drugs for Colorectal Cancer**



**Drugs that do not have genetic variants with reported predictive significance detected**: Regorafenib, Aflibercept,

### **Toxicity Prediction**



## **Tier 2: Drugs that directly interact with affected gene or pathway and are predicted to have potential benefit, but not FDA-approved for colorectal cancer treatment**



\* : **Not FDA Approved**

**Confidence Level#:** *Definitive*: FDA approved; *Strong*: NCCN guideline, or major prospective clinical trial confirmed; *Moderate*: Many (>=2) studies supported (a least one clinical study); *Weak*: few clinical studies supported, or from *in vitro*/animal studies or conflicting results

# Analysis Summary: Prognostic



## **\*: Prognostic information does not imply type of response to therapy.**

## Clinical Trial Connection



## **More clinical trial information can be found at http://clinicaltrials.gov**

## Supplementary: Pathway Analysis

**See the attached Pathway Analysis Summary**

## References

- 1. De Roock, W., et al., (2010) *Effects of KRAS, BRAF, NRAS, and PIK3CA mutations on the efficacy of cetuximab plus chemotherapy in chemotherapy-refractory metastatic colorectal cancer: a retrospective consortium analysis*. Lancet Oncol, 11(8): p. 753-62.
- 2. Mao, C., et al., (2011) *BRAF V600E mutation and resistance to anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis.* Mol Biol Rep, 38(4): p. 2219-23.
- 3. Tol, J., et al., (2010) *Markers for EGFR pathway activation as predictor of outcome in metastatic colorectal cancer patients treated with or without cetuximab*. Eur J Cancer, 46(11): p. 1997-2009.
- 4. Corcoran, R.B., et al., (2012) *EGFR-mediated re-activation of MAPK signaling contributes to insensitivity of BRAF mutant colorectal cancers to RAF inhibition with vemurafenib*. Cancer Discov, 2(3): p. 227-35.
- 5. Prahallad, A., et al., (2012) *Unresponsiveness of colon cancer to BRAF(V600E) inhibition through feedback activation of EGFR*. Nature, 483(7387): p. 100-3.
- 6. Yang, H., et al., (2012) *Antitumor activity of BRAF inhibitor vemurafenib in preclinical models of BRAF-mutant colorectal cancer.* Cancer Res, 72(3): p. 779-89.
- 7. Frattini M, Saletti P, Romagnani E, Martin V, Molinari F, Ghisletta M, Camponovo A, Etienne LL, Cavalli F, Mazzucchelli L. (2007) *PTEN loss of expression predicts cetuximab efficacy in metastatic colorectal cancer patients*. Br J Cancer. 97(8):1139-45. Epub 2007 Oct 16.
- 8. Mekenkamp LJ, Tol J, Dijkstra JR, de Krijger I, Vink-Börger ME, van Vliet S, Teerenstra S, Kamping E, Verwiel E, Koopman M, Meijer GA, van Krieken JH, Kuiper R, Punt CJ, Nagtegaal ID. (2012) *Beyond KRAS mutation status: influence of KRAS copy number status and microRNAs on clinical outcome to cetuximab in metastatic colorectal cancer patients*. BMC Cancer. 12:292.
- 9. Valtorta E, Misale S, Sartore-Bianchi A, Nagtegaal ID, Paraf F, Lauricella C, Dimartino V, Hobor S, Jacobs B, Ercolani C, Lamba S, Scala E, Veronese S, Laurent-Puig P, Siena S, Tejpar S, Mottolese M, Punt CJ, Gambacorta M, Bardelli A, Di Nicolantonio F. (2013) *KRAS gene amplification in colorectal cancer and impact on response to EGFR-targeted therapy.* Int J Cancer. 133(5):1259-65.
- 10. Hamidi H, Lu M, Chau K, Anderson L, Fejzo M, Ginther C, Linnartz R, Zubel A, Slamon DJ, Finn RS. (2014) *KRAS mutational subtype and copy number predict in vitro response of human pancreatic cancer cell lines to MEK inhibition*. Br J Cancer. 111(9):1788-801.
- 11. Boulay J., Mild G., Lowy A., Reuter J., Lagrange M., Terracciano L., et al. (2002) *SMAD4 is a predictive marker for 5 fluorouracil-based chemotherapy in patients with colorectal cancer.* Br J Cancer 87: 630–634.
- 12. Zhang B et al (2014) *Loss of Smad4 in colorectal cancer induces resistance to 5-fluorouracil through activating Akt pathway.* Br J Cancer 110(4):946-57
- 13. Ribic C., Sargent D., Moore M., Thibodeau S., French A., Goldberg R., et al. (2003) *Tumor microsatellite-instability status as a predictor of benefit from fluorouracil-based adjuvant chemotherapy for colon cancer*. N Engl J Med 349: 247-257
- 14. Lv H, Li Q, Qiu W, Xiang J, Wei H, Liang H, Sui A, Liang J. (2012) *Genetic polymorphism of XRCC1 correlated with response to oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy in advanced colorectal cancer*. Pathol Oncol Res. 18(4):1009-14
- 15. Kweekel DM, Antonini NF, Nortier JW, Punt CJ, Gelderblom H, Guchelaar HJ. (2009) *Explorative study to identify novel candidate genes related to oxaliplatin efficacy and toxicity using a DNA repair array.* Br J Cancer. 101(2):357-6

- 16. Lambrechts D, Lenz HJ, de Haas S, Carmeliet P, Scherer SJ. (2013) *Markers of response for the antiangiogenic agent bevacizumab.* J Clin Oncol. 20;31(9):1219-30
- 17. Gerger, A., et al. (2011) *Pharmacogenetic angiogenesis profiling for first-line Bevacizumab plus oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer*. Clin Cancer Res, 17(17),5783-92.
- 18. Moorcraft SY et al (2013) The role of personalized medicine in metastatic colorectal cancer: an evolving landscape Therap Adv Gastroenterol. 6(5): 381–395.
- 19. Morel, A., et al. (2006) *Clinical relevance of different dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase gene single nucleotide polymorphisms on 5-fluorouracil tolerance*. Mol Cancer Ther, 5(11), 2895-904.
- 20. Kleibl Z, Fidlerova J, Kleiblova P, Kormunda S, Bilek M, Bouskova K, Sevcik J, Novotny J. (2009) *Influence of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase gene (DPYD) coding sequence variants on the development of fluoropyrimidine-related toxicity in patients with high-grade toxicity and patients with excellent tolerance of fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy*. Neoplasma. 56(4):303-16.
- 21. Tziotou, M., et al., (2014) *Polymorphisms of uridine glucuronosyltransferase gene and irinotecan toxicity: low dose does not protect from toxicity. Ecancermedicalscience*, 8: p. 428.
- 22. Carlini, L.E., et al., (2005) *UGT1A7 and UGT1A9 polymorphisms predict response and toxicity in colorectal cancer patients treated with capecitabine/irinotecan*. Clin Cancer Res, 11(3), 1226-36.
- 23. Kweekel, D.M., et al., (2009) *Explorative study to identify novel candidate genes related to oxaliplatin efficacy and toxicity using a DNA repair array*. British Journal of Cancer, 101(2), 357-362.
- 24. Chapman, M. S. & Miner, J. N. *Novel mitogen-activated protein kinase kinase inhibitors*. Expert Opin. Investig. Drugs 20, 209–220 (2011)
- 25. Santarpia, L., S.M. Lippman, and A.K. El-Naggar, (2012) *Targeting the MAPK-RAS-RAF signaling pathway in cancer therapy.* Expert Opin Ther Targets, 16(1): p. 103-19.
- 26. Hatzivassiliou G *et al.* (2013) *Mechanism of MEK inhibition determines efficacy in mutant KRAS- versus BRAF-driven cancers.* Nature 501(7466):232-6
- 27. Maira SM *et al* (2012) *Identification and characterization of NVP-BKM120, an orally available pan-class I PI3-kinase inhibitor.* Mol Cancer Ther. 11(2):317-28.
- 28. Solit DB, et al (2006) BRAF mutation predicts sensitivity to MEK inhibition. Nature. 439(7074):358-62.
- 29. Mao M., Tian F., Mariadason J., Tsao L., Lemos R., Jr, Dayyani F., et al. (2012) Resistance to BRAF inhibition in BRAFmutant colon cancer can be overcome with PI3K inhibition or demethylating agents. Clin Cancer Res 19: 657-667.
- 30. Liao X., Lochhead P., Nishihara R., Morikawa T., Kuchiba A., Yamauchi M., et al. (2012) Aspirin use, tumor PIK3CA mutation, and colorectal-cancer survival. N Engl J Med 367: 1596-1606.
- 31. Grady W., Carethers J. (2008) *Genomic and epigenetic instability in colorectal cancer pathogenesis.* Gastroenterology 135: 1079-1099
- 32. Merok MA *et al* (2013) *Microsatellite instability has a positive prognostic impact on stage II colorectal cancer after complete resection: results from a large, consecutive Norwegian series.* Ann Oncol. 24(5):1274-82.
- 33. Eklöf V *et al* (2013) *The prognostic role of KRAS, BRAF, PIK3CA and PTEN in colorectal cancer.* Br J Cancer. 108(10):2153- 63.

### **Signaling Pathway Analysis P0000**

The TCGA study, focused on colorectal cancers, has defined 5 significantly altered pathways in colorectal cancer. Described below are alterations found in these and some other critical pathways. A detailed description of how these deregulate growth is also provided.

#### *ERK Pathway*

Most colorectal cancers harbor mutations in the ERK pathway. Receptor tyrosine kinase activation drives RAS (KRAS, NRAS, HRAS) to stimulate RAF (BRAF, CRAF, ARAF) (Figure 1). This drives MEK and ERK activity, leading to proliferation and survival of the cell. This patient has a BRAF p.V600E mutation, a likely driver for P0000. Here, the ERK pathway is activated downstream of receptor tyrosine kinase (Figure 1), possibly rendering this patient unresponsive to anti-EGFR antibody therapy, if give alone.

#### *AKT Pathway*

PI3K drives signaling through the AKT pathway. The actions of PI3K are reversed through dephosphorylation

of phosphatidylinosito l lipids at the 3' position. The major phosphatase responsible for this step is PTEN. P0000 harbors a mutation that will allow for the acquisition of an extra splice site. This is predicted to alter the function of PTEN and allow for enhanced signaling through AKT.



Figure 1. Major signaling pathways influencing colorectal cancer 14058. Green indicates an activated oncogene and red indicates inactivation of a tumor suppressor.

### *TGF-*β *Pathway*

Activation of the TGF-β receptor, comprised of TGFβR1 and TGFβR2, leads to phosphorylation of SMAD2/3 and association of the active SMAD2/3-SMAD4 complex. This transcription factor drives a growth-suppressive transcriptional program. In this patient, there is a loss of function mutation in SMAD4 (p.R361H). Therefore, TGF-β receptor signaling is unable to stimulate SMAD-dependent growth suppression through this pathway.

#### *Wnt Pathway*

According to the TCGA data for colorectal cancer, 70% of these tumors have APC mutations. Two mutations in APC were identified, p.T1556fs\*3 and p.R232\*. These mutations will generate truncated proteins and will likely lead to stabilization of β-catenin. This would drive cell proliferation.

#### *Hippo Pathway/Planar Cell Polarity Pathway*

A mutation was found in the FAT4 gene, which is a known tumor suppressor. FAT4 may be a component of the Hippo signaling pathway, which normally suppresses cell proliferation when the pathway is active. Additionally, FAT4 may interact with components of the Wnt/PCP pathway. Loss of FAT4 activity may lead to increased cell proliferation through loss of Hippo signaling or gain of Wnt/PCP signaling.