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CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

HAVE CONSULTED FOR TROVAGENE AND INIVATA
WE HURT THE PATIENT IF WE GIVE A TARGETED DRUG WHEN THERE IS NO TARGET DUE TO EITHER A BIOLOGICAL OR TECHNICAL FALSE POSITIVES. THESE ARE DANGEROUS.
UPFRONT USING AN EGFR WITHOUT THE MUTATION 60% PROGRESSED BY FIRST VISIT SEE ARROW

IPASS: gefitinib benefit dependent on EGFR mutation status

EGFR mutation positive

EGFR mutation negative

FIRST

HAVE A ENOUGH SAMPLES TESTED FOR ACCURATE DETERMINATION OF PERFORMANCE

• WITH A FOUNDER MUTATIONS MY EXPECTATION WOULD BE CLOSE TO 99-100% FOR SPECIFICITY

• AND SENSITIVITY DETERMINATION THAT HAS AT THE MOST A 10% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL

• IF YOU DO NOT HAVE FALSE POSITIVES AND THE CONCORDANCE IS WITH A VALIDATED ASSAY WE DO NOT NEED TO DO PFS

• THE TWO APPROVED ASSAYS WERE TESTED ON 400+ SPECIMENS
APPROVED TESTS FOR FOUNDER MUTATIONS HAVE A HIGH SPECIFICITY AVOIDING HARM TO PATIENT: PLASMA THERASCREEEN APPROVED IN EUROPE : 1/547 POSITIVE IN PLASMA ALONE <1%

Table 4. Exploratory Biomarker Objective 1 data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted baseline tumour EGFR mutation status, n</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasma 1 EGFR mutation status (n)</th>
<th>Exon 19 deletions</th>
<th>L858R</th>
<th>L858R and T790M</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exon 19 deletions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L858R and T790M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordance</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROCHE COBRAS 4/165 POSITIVE 2% IN PLASMA AND TISSUE NEGATIVE
WELL BELOW THE NUMBERS WITH THE T790M RESULTS: 76% SENSITIVITY X 10% FREQUENCY X 20% INADEQUATE BIOPSY RATE = 1 TO 2 PATIENTS IN 100 USEFUL TO PREVENT REPEAT BIOPSY

### Agreement between Plasma Test & Tissue Test for Detection of EGFR Mutation (with 2.0 mL Plasma Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cobas® Tissue Test v1</th>
<th>EGFR+ (MD)</th>
<th>EGFR(-) (NMD)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cobas® Plasma Test v2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFR+ (MD)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFR(-) (NMD)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With only Valid Result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA (95% CI)</td>
<td>76.7% (70.5%, 81.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA (95% CI)</td>
<td>98.2% (95.4%, 99.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SO HOW DO WE FEEL ABOUT THE ROCHE ASSAY

• 76% SENSITIVITY X 10% EGFR FREQUENCY X 20% INADEQUATE BIOPSY RATE
  = 1 to 2 PATIENTS IN 100 USEFUL TO PREVENT REPEAT BIOPSY

• THIS IS EVEN NOT THE INTENDED USE POPULATION: ALL THESE PATIENTS HAD
  ADEQUATE BIOPSY

  • WOULD IT PREFORM WITH THE SAME SENSITIVITY IN PATIENTS WITH
    INADEQUATE TISSUE

  • WOULD BE NICE TO KNOW THE FREQUENCY OF MUTATIONS IN PLASMA
    DETECTED IN THIS GROUP COMPARED TO THE STUDIED GROUP

• WOULD BE NICE TO KNOW THE SPECIFIC NATURAL HISTORY OF THE 4 FALSE
  POSITIVES
SECOND
WHAT WE ALSO WANT: TO GIVE THE NODS UP ON CLINICAL UTILITY

• NEW TEST POSITIVE, **BUT** VALIDATED TEST NEGATIVE UNDERSTAND THE **DISCORDANT** RESULT

TISSUE POSITIVE NEW TEST # TISSUE NEGATIVE OLD TEST
PLASMA POSITIVE # TISSUE NEGATIVE
IF SIGNIFICANT DISCORDANCE THE ONLY WAY TO KNOW TRUTH IS NOT TO ASK WHAT IS TRUTH BUT EXAMINE SPECIFICALLY IF THAT SUBSET BEHAVES LIKE THEY HAVE THE TARGET

• THERE IS NO NEED TO INCLUDE THE CONCORDANT, THOSE ARE POSITIVE ON A VALIDATED TEST
CLAIMS WITH T790M PLASMA OR URINE ASSAYS
A HIGHLY SENSITIVE AND QUANTITATIVE TEST PLATFORM FOR DETECTION OF NSCLC EGFR MUTATIONS IN URINE AND PLASMA

KAREN L. RECKAMP ET AL JOURNAL THORACIC ONCOLOGY IN PRESS
WITH THESE TECHNIQUES HAVE THEY REALLY DONE ENOUGH TRUE CONTROLS TO ELIMINATE TECHNICAL FALSE POSITIVES LIKE ROCHE AND QIAGEN DID FOR FOUNDER MUTATIONS: NO

THERE ARE VERY SMALL NUMBERS TO CALCULATE TECHNICAL SPECIFICITY AND NO DETAILS OF THE SPECIMENS

CLINICAL EGFR MUTATION DETECTION CUT-OFFS FOR URINE AND PLASMA WERE DETERMINED FOR EACH ASSAY BY ASSESSING THE LEVEL OF NON-SPECIFIC SIGNAL PRESENT, IF ANY, FROM URINE AND PLASMA DNA SAMPLES OBTAINED FROM 54-64 UNIQUE HEALTHY VOLUNTEERS AND METASTATIC PATIENTS WITH NON-NSCLC CANCERS (APPROXIMATELY 50%/50%). DETECTION CUT-OFFS WERE STANDARDIZED TO 100,000 WT GEQ YIELDING ADJUSTED CLINICAL DETECTION CUT-OFFS OF 5.5, 5.5 AND 12.6 COPIES/105 GEQ FOR EXON 19 DELETIONS, L858R AND T790M, RESPECTIVELY.
SPECIMENS FOR THESE 2 REPORTS ARE FROM THE TIGER X TRAIL WHERE THEY WERE ALL MEANT TO BE T790M +, YET WE HAVE A SMALL NUMBER OF TUMOR T790M- PATIENTS:

• to assess the safety and efficacy of rociletinib in previously treated NSCLC patients **known to have the T790M EGFR mutation**. BY LOCAL OR CENTRAL LAB

• INTERESTING MUST BE LOTS OF DISCORDANCE BETWEEN LOCAL AND CENTRAL

• Evidence of a tumor with one or more EGFR mutations excluding exon 20 insertion

• Biopsy of either primary or metastatic tumor tissue within 60 days of dosing
Of 63 patients, 60 had evaluable tissue specimens. Using the tissue result as reference, the sensitivity of EGFR mutation detection in urine was 72% (34/47) for T790M, 75% (12/16) for L858R, and 67% (28/42) for exon 19 deletions. With specimens that met a recommended volume of 90-100 mL, the sensitivity was 93% (13/14) for T790M, 80% (4/5) for L858R, and 83% (10/12) for exon 19 deletions. A comparable sensitivity of EGFR mutation detection was observed in plasma: 93% (38/41) for T790M, 100% (17/17) for L858R, and 87% (34/39) for exon 19 deletions. Together, urine and plasma testing identified 12 additional T790M-positive cases that were either undetectable or inadequate by tissue test.
HOW DID 12/60 SPECIMENS FAIL TO HAVE CONFIRMATION CENTRALLY WITH THERASCREEN OF THE T790M STATUS
WE NEED **TRANSPARENCY** TO UNDERSTAND THIS. DID THEY HAVE NGS WITH HIGHER SENSITIVITY

SEE NEXT SLIDE
Epidermal growth factor receptor genotyping of matched urine, plasma and tumor tissue from non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with rociletinib
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Abstract 9001
Presented by: Heather A. Wakelee
SAME TRIAL, SAME AUTHORS MUCH LARGER NUMBER OF SPECIMENS WITH SIMULTANEOUS PLASMA AND TISSUE STUDIES. NOTE, ALL THESE STUDIES ARE LIMITED IN TECHNICAL SPECIFICITY BECAUSE OF LIMITED NUMBERS OF EFRG NEGATIVE PATIENTS TO TRULY ASSESS TECHNICAL FALSE POSITIVES. NOW WE HAVE 36 T790M NEGATIVE PATIENTS DISCORDANT RESULTS BETWEEN LOCAL AND CENTRAL LABS

**TIGER-X: Safety and Efficacy Population**

**TIGER-X: Patient Analysis Groups**
(500, 625, and 750 mg BID HBr)
Tissue and plasma collection mandatory
Urine collection optional

Safety population* N=548

Efficacy population† n=443

Sample types submitted for pretreatment EGFR testing
n=540 (tissue)
n=482 (plasma)
n=213 (urine)

---

*Includes patients with T790M-negative status by central tissue testing.
†Patients with centrally confirmed T790M-positive status (determined using Qiagen® therascreen test).

HBr, hydrogen bromide.
Plasma, Tissue, and Urine Identify Unique and Overlapping Subsets of T790M-Positive Patients

- 181 samples had matched pretreatment T790M results in plasma, tissue, and urine
  - 7 were T790M-negative or inadequate by all 3 sample types (4%)
  - 174 were T790M-positive by at least 1 sample type (96%)

**T790M-Positive Cases**

- Total positive by tissue: 146 of 181
- Total positive by plasma: 145 of 181
- Total positive by urine: 144 of 181

104 (57%) were positive by all 3 sample types
PLASMA POSITIVE / TISSUE NEGATIVE IS:

ONLY 1-2% OF PATIENTS USING THE APPROVED
PLASMA TESTS FOR EGFR FOUNDING MUTATIONS
ROCHE AND QIAGEN AND THESE TESTS WERE
DEVELOPED WITH ENOUGH CONTROL SAMPLES TO
DETERMINE SPECIFICITY

CAN THESE T790M TESTS CLAIM A SENSITIVITY WHEN
NOT ONE PUBLICATION HAS ADEQUATE OR
APPROPRIATE CONTROLS FOR SPECIFICITY
THE CLINICAL PROBLEM OR SIGNIFICANCE OF SUB CLONAL POPULATIONS WITH RESISTANT MUTATIONS

THE PROBLEM OF THE PLASMA POSITIVE : TUMOR NEGATIVE

CAN THIS MISLEAD THERAPEUTIC DECISION

HOW DO WE DEFINE THE DETECTION OF AClone ONLY IN THE BLOOD REPRESENTS A SIGNIFICANT TUMOR POPULATION
ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PLASMA GENOTYPING AND OUTCOMES OF TREATMENT WITH OSIMERTINIB (AZD9291) IN ADVANCED NON–SMALL-CELL LUNG CANCER

- J Clin Oncol 34. © 2016 by American Society of Clinical Oncology In press

- In total, 402 patients were enrolled in the phase I cohorts of AURA but far less than this reported, who progressed on front line EGFR TKI and bio specimens available: population enriched for T790M+ patients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDIES WITH CELL FREE DNA AND THE DETECTION OF T790 M</th>
<th>OXNARD ET AL JCO EPUB JUNE 27 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| PATIENTS ENROLLED                                   | 402                               |
| ANALYSIS OF TUMOR GENOTYPE AND OUTCOME              | 237                               |
| ANALYSIS OF PLASMA GENOTYPE AND OUTCOME             | 271                               |
| DIAGNOSTIC COMPARISON OF CENTRAL TUMOR AND PLASMA   | 216                               |
THE PFS ACCORDING TO T790M PLASMA RESULT = NO DIFFERENCE. THIS IS NOT CLINICAL VALIDITY DOES NOT DISTINGUISH 2 GROUPS WITH DIFFERENT OUTCOMES.

POSSIBLE CONFOUNDING VARIABLES  
PFS  
790M POSITIVE  16% NEG– ON TUMOR  9.7 MOS  
790m NEGATIVE  30% POSITIVE ON TUMOR  8.2

THE INSIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE HERE MAKES YOU SUSPECT THAT THERE ARE PATIENTS WHO HAVE A SHORTER PFS IN PLASMA + THAN EXPECTED WITH THIS DRUG IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES.
Let's break these T790M groups down and see if tumor negative makes a difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Tumor Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plasma Positive</td>
<td>Tumor Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma Negative</td>
<td>Tumor Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma Negative</td>
<td>Tumor Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma Positive</td>
<td>Tumor Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LET'S LOOK IN DETAIL AT THE POPULATION WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT
DOES PLASMA POSITIVE TUMOR NEGATIVE BEHAVE DIFFERENTLY THAN PLASMA POSITIVE, TUMOR POSITIVE?
THE ANSWER IS AN EMPHATIC YES
SPECIFICITY OF THE CELL FREE DNA MEASUREMENT OF T790M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TUMOR POSITIVE</th>
<th>TUMOR NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLASMA POSITIVE</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLASMA NEGATIVE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore 18/129 of plasma positive patients (14%) will be tumor negative. If you look at PFS of all plasma positive patients regardless if this is due to biologically difference or they are technical false positives: since 80% of the patients are tumor positive it is unlikely they will contribute significantly to the PFS even if they do badly. There is no way they can effect the median. PFS of all plasma positive patients, this should not be used at the surrogate for validity again in only 14% of the patients are tumor T790M – and all EGFR +, therefore we really do not have any specificity controls non EGFR mutant NSCLC.
### COMPARISON OF OUTCOME OF PLASMA POSITIVE VERSUS PLASMA NEGATIVE WHEN TUMOR IS NEGATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLASMA + TUMOR NEGATIVE</th>
<th>PLASMA – TUMOR NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESPONSE RATE</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PFS</strong></td>
<td>4.2 MONTHS</td>
<td>2.8 MONTHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 MONTH PFS</strong></td>
<td>6% 1 PATIENT 12.25 MOS</td>
<td>20% SEVERAL PATIENTS 18+ MOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Tumor Negative, Plasma Positive Patients: 4 not confirmed by Orthogonal methods. Highest allele frequency 7%, several less than 0.1%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient No.</th>
<th>Dose</th>
<th>Result of Central Tumor Genotyping for T790M</th>
<th>Result of Central Plasma BEAMing for T790M</th>
<th>T790M AF (BEAMing), %</th>
<th>EGFR Driver</th>
<th>EGFR Driver AF (BEAMing), %</th>
<th>Relative Prevalence Plasma T790M</th>
<th>T790M Detected With Alternative Plasma Assay</th>
<th>Alternative Plasma Assay Used</th>
<th>BOR</th>
<th>Best % Change From Baseline</th>
<th>PFS (month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>12.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cobas</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>9.76*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>160 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>160 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cobas</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>L858R*</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cobas</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>L858R</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cobas</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>160 mg</td>
<td>Not detected</td>
<td>Detected</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>19 del</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ddPCR</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: AF, allelic fraction; BOR, best overall response; ddPCR, droplet digital polymerase chain reaction; EGFR, epidermal growth factor receptor; NA, not applicable; ND, not detected; PD, progressive disease; PFS, progression-free survival; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease.

*Subject 3 had discordant tumor and plasma genotyping. Plasma genotyping showed L858R and T790M while tumor genotyping showed G719X and no T790M.
IMPRESS – EVALUATING EGFR TKI CONTINUATION AFTER STARTING CISPLATIN/PEMETREXED FOLLOWING FRONT LINE EFGR FAILURE

Cisplatin-Pemetrexed + Gefitinib

EGFR mut NSCLC RECIST PD on gefitinib

Cisplatin-Pemetrexed

CHEMOTHERAPY GIVES A PFS OF 6 MONTHS LONGER THAN PFS SECOND LINE WITH TAGRESSO IN A PLASMA + TUMOR - PATIENT

HR 0.86 (95% CI 0.65–1.13); p=0.27

CHEMOTHERAPY GIVES A PFS OF 6 MONTHS LONGER THAN PFS SECOND LINE WITH TAGRESSO IN A PLASMA + TUMOR - PATIENT
SOME CONCLUSIONS FROM THIS SUBSET

• RESPONSE RATE OF 5/16 28% IS NOT SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT THAN THE RESPONSE RATE IN TUMORS NEGATIVE FOR T790M

• THIS DRUG IS NOT SELECTIVE IN PATIENTS WITH THIS MUTATION AND MAY IN FACT ULTIMATELY BE GRADUATED TO FIRST LINE

• THE PFS IS CLEARLY NO WHERE NEAR 9 MONTHS ONLY 4 OF 16 PATIENTS REACHING THIS POINT AND NO PATIENT IS STILL RESPONDING. PFS= 4.2 MONTHS (SEE TABLE)

• THIS IS AGAIN IS REFLECTED IN THE MARKED DIFFERENCE SHOWN IN THE NEXT CURVE: WHERE PATIENTS WITH POSITIVE TUMORS AND PLASMA TESTS CLEARLY DO BETTER THAN IF THE TUMOR IS NEGATIVE, AND NOTE HOW QUICKLY SOME PATIENTS HAVE PROGRESSED BY THE FIRST FOLLOW UP 2 MONTHS OR LESS
• T-P+, these patients potentially could do better with chemotherapy

• If we look at the table they all had the sensitizing mutation so the technical false positive may not be so much in play

• This maybe a concerning problem with a non-founder that small clones in the blood are not biologically relevant
• Can some of these plasma T790M patients be technically false positive?

• To quote the manuscript, among patients with T790M positive on tumor genotyping, sensitivity of the plasma T790M assay is lower where no EGFR sensitizing mutation is detected in plasma (P<0.01),

• Yet the assay for the founder mutations is more sensitive, how can we pick up 21/158, 13% more calls with a less sensitive assay which if true, should have identified the founder clone with the simultaneous more sensitive assay.

• See next slide 21 positive cases with no founder mutation.
21 plasma assays were positive when the founding EGFR mutation was not present yet the founding mutation assay is a more sensitive assay and should be at least at the same allele frequency; does this make sense, what size clones are we measuring?
PROPOSAL FROM MANY:
IF PLASMA TEST IS POSITIVE, FORGO TISSUE BIOPSY DESPITE SUGGESTION THAT POTENTIALLY 14/100 PATIENTS THIS MAY NOT BE OF BENEFIT, AND MAY EVEN BE HARMFUL
Dividing patients with T790M-negative plasma results on the basis of tumor geno-typing results, ORR was higher in patients with T790M-positive tumors (31 of 45; 69%; 95% CI, 53% to 82%) than in patients with T790M-negative tumors (10 of 40; 25%; 95% CI, 13% to 41%; P , .001), as was median PFS (16.5 months v 2.8 months; P , .001; Fig 3C). Of interest, patients with T790M-positive plasma could also be divided on the basis of tumor genotyping results, with ORR and median PFS higher in those with T790M-positive tumors (69 of 108; 64%; 95% CI, 54% to 73%; PFS, 9.3 months) than in those with T790M-negative tumors (5 of 18; 28%; 95% CI, 10% to 53%; P = .004; PFS.4.2 months; P = .0002; Fig 3D).
THE PROBLEM

WHEN MEASURING A SUB CLONE AND NOT A FOUNDER MUTATION HOW DO WE IDENTIFY IT IS THE PREDOMINANT MOST RELEVANT CLONE

EVEN THOUGH A NUMBER OF THESE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN TISSUE AND CONCORDANT PLASMA SAMPLES MAY BE TECHNICAL, IT MAY REALLY BE BIOLOGICAL

USE OF CELL FREE DNA IN THE RESISTANT SPACE WHERE WE DEAL WITH SUB CLONES MAYBE FRAUGHT WITH DANGER IN MAKING THERAPEUTIC DECISIONS AND DO HARM TO THE PATIENT

REAL CONCERNS ARE EXPRESSED IN THE COLON CANCER SPACE, WHERE THEY PROPOSING MAKING DECISIONS ON LOW ALLELE FREQUENCY OF RAS MUTATIONS
QUESTION

• The frequency of a drug resistance mutation that should necessitate a change of treatment when an alternate therapy exists is unknown. What should be the clinical response when the new clone is 0.1% of tumor cells that is otherwise sensitive to a targeted drug. If the technology is valid a resistant clone is clearly emerging, but in this setting the majority of the tumor presumably continues to be suppressed by use of the current agent. Some BCR–ABL1 kinase domain resistance mutations can be present at low levels before TKI treatment without leading to clinical relapse. Likewise, in patients with AML, the AML–ETO fusion product, which is considered a driver of the disease, can remain detectable at low levels in the blood in patients who have been in complete remission for years.
FOR A SUBCLONE MUTATION

SHOW
PLASMA + TISSUE – PFS
NOT INFERIOR TO TUMOR POSITIVE, PLASMA POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE
KEY CHALLENGE IS TO DISTINGUISH DOMINANT MUTATIONS FROM PRECANCEROUS MUTATIONS AND COOPERATING MUTATIONS
ANOTHER PROBLEM: SOME MUTATIONS ARE CONFOUNDED BY THE FREQUENT FINDINGS OF CLONAL HEMATOPOIESIS OF UNDETERMINED SIGNIFICANCE: P53 IS COMMON IN THIS DISORDER AND EVEN RAS

Effects of Solid tumor type on CH

- Thyroid Cancer (n=125)
- Bladder Cancer (n=248)
- Melanoma (n=161)
- Pancreatic Cancer (n=190)
- Hepatobiliary Cancer (n=176)
- Prostate Cancer (n=326)
- Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (n=744)
- Endometrial Cancer (n=102)
- Esophagogastric Carcinoma (n=182)
- Ovarian Cancer (n=121)
- Colorectal Cancer (n=473)
- Breast Carcinoma (n=665)
- Soft Tissue Sarcoma (n=220)
- Renal Cell Carcinoma (n=165)
- Glioma (n=269)
- Germ Cell Tumor (n=145)

Percent patients

- Patients with CH
- Patients without CH

Age at DNA collection
WHAT SHOULD WE HAVE TO FEEL COMFORTABLE
AN ASSAY SHOWS CLINICAL UTILITY

• Robust numbers to accurately gauge specificity and sensitivity
• Correct controls for specificity
• Studies on performance and utility in the intended use population
• If discordant with a companion diagnostic, natural history of the discordant population determined to see which is truth
CONCLUSIONS

• The technology is more advanced, maybe than the understanding of the biology

• How do we quantitate the new clone

• At this moment tissue biopsy should always be done, it is potentially dangerous given the frequency 10-20% of discordance in the relapse situation to use plasma and the possibility that in fact T-P+ patients may do poorly

• Tests are being marketed that have not had adequate specificity controls eg non EGFR mutant lung cancer specimens or using other cancer subtype specimens

• Trials should test clinical outcome in T-P+ patients separately if there is any discordant rate for that mutation