Correlation between *DPYD* gene variation and *KRAS* wild type status in colorectal cancer

Britta Kleist,[1] Marcel Kempa,[2] Thuja Meurer,[2] Micaela Poetsch[2]

▶ Additional material is published online only. To view please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2015-202903).

[1]Department of Pathology, Southern Hospital Trust, Kristiansand, Norway
[2]Institute of Legal Medicine, University Hospital Essen, Essen, Germany

Correspondence to
Dr Britta Kleist, Department of Pathology, Southern Hospital Trust, Soerlandet sykehus HF, Kristiansand 4604, Norway; britta.kleist@sshf.no

Received 26 January 2015
Revised 19 July 2015
Accepted 26 July 2015
Published Online First 17 August 2015

ABSTRACT

Aims Failure and side effects of combined cytotoxic therapy are challenges in the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer (CRC). *DPYD* gene variations can potentially predict toxicity to 5-fluorouracil (FU)-based therapy and *KRAS*-, *NRAS*-, *BRAF*-, *PIK3CA*-wild type status is a known prerequisite for epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) inhibitor therapy. This study was performed to search for a possible link between these therapeutic markers.

Methods The *DPYD* gene variations c.496A>G, c.1679T>G, c.2846A>T and *KRAS/NRAS/BRAF/PIK3CA* mutational status were determined in non-neoplastic, primary CRC and metastatic CRC tissue from 115 patients.

Results The polymorphism c.496A>G was the *DPYD* gene variant with the highest detection rate (12.9%), occurred predominantly in females (86.7%, p=0.0044) and was exclusively seen in *KRAS* wild type primary CRC (15/65 (23.1%) vs 0/51 (0%) in *KRAS*-mutated primary CRC, respectively, p=0.0001).

Conclusions This genetic profile could define a patient group requiring alternative combined therapeutic approaches. Global testing of large patient cohorts is necessary to prove this concept.

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most commonly diagnosed cancer and the fourth leading cause of cancer-related death worldwide.[1] Up to 50% of patients show recurrence despite curative surgery and 20% of all patients present with metastases at the time of diagnosis.[2] 5-fluorouracil (FU)-based chemotherapy has become a fundamental tool to reduce recurrence in patients with stage III CRC.[3] Furthermore, combination of 5-FU and leucovorin (FLV) with oxaliplatin and irinotecan as well as additional blocking of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) have been proven to increase overall survival of patients with metastatic CRC.[3] However, a proportion of patients gain little or even no benefit from these therapies.[4] Furthermore, 10%–40% of patients develop severe to life-threatening toxicity from 5-FU.[5] These clinical and health economic challenges released a wide spectrum of research to detect predictive biomarkers. New biomolecular approaches include genetic testing for *KRAS*-, *NRAS*-, *BRAF*- and *PIK3CA*-mutations as markers of resistance to EGFR-inhibitor therapy[6] and risk assessment of 5-FU-toxicity or 5-FU therapy failure by dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (*DPYD*) gene variation or expression analysis.[7 8] Parallel testing of *KRAS*-, *BRAF*-, *PIK3CA*-mutation status and DPYD expression has already been performed to identify prognostic genetic and protein markers in CRC.[7] Furthermore, a frequent *DPYD*-mutation has been included in a previously developed screening test for the simultaneous detection of *KRAS*- and *BRAF*-mutations.[9]

To extend knowledge about genetic profiles in the context of 5-FU based and EGFR-inhibitor therapy, we searched for a possible link between three *DPYD* gene variants with relatively high population frequency[10] and possible importance for 5-FU metabolism[5] and *KRAS*-, *NRAS*-, *BRAF*- and *PIK3CA*-mutation status.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Tissue sampling and selection

Formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) CRC samples (116 primary tumours, 42 distant metastases, 109 lymph node metastases sample mixes, comprising between one and eight lymph node metastases per case) and 115 non-neoplastic FFPE samples from 115 patients were collected from the tissue archive (1999–2005) at Department of Pathology, Southern Norwegian Hospital Trust, Kristiansand. The material was partly included in a previous study.[11] Tissue and patient data were obtained and used after approval of the Regional Ethics Committee (REK) of Southern Norway in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the International Conference of Harmonization—Good Clinical Practice. The anonymity of the patients investigated was preserved corresponding to rules of data protection of the National Data Protection Commission (NSD) of Norway and the institutional guidelines of our hospital. All tumour samples underwent histopathological review (BK). Only material containing <20% necrosis and <20% non-neoplastic adherent tissue was included in this study. Tumour response to treatment was classified according to the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumours (RECIST).[12]

Molecular genetic analysis

Mutation status of *KRAS*, *NRAS*, *BRAF* and *PIK3CA* of the tumour tissue has already been determined in a previous study.[11] Description of DNA isolation and molecular genetic analysis of these four genes is added as online supplementary text and table S1. Three *DPYD* variants, c.496A>G (rs2297595, Met166Val), c.2846A>T (rs67376798, Asp949Val) and c.1679T>G (rs55886062, Ile560Ser), were selected for this study, because of documented minor allele frequency >1%,[10] proven amino acid change and possible impact on 5-FU chemotherapy.[5] Assessment of allele frequencies in *DPYD* variants was done in a multiplex PCR in 12.5 µL using the GeneAmp PCR system 9700 (Applied

To cite: Kleist B, Kempa M, Meurer T, *et al*. *J Clin Pathol* 2016;**69**:204–208.

J Clin Pathol: first published as 10.1136/jclinpath-2015-202903 on 17 August 2015. Downloaded from http://jcp.bmj.com/ on November 2, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Biosystems, Weiterstadt, Germany) with 0.3–1 ng of DNA as template in 15 mM Tris–HCl, 50 mM KCl, with 200 μM dNTPs (deoxyribonucleotide triphosphates), 1.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.1 μM each primer (primer sequences see online supplementary table S2) and 1.5 Units AmpliTaq Gold Polymerase (Applied Biosystems) for 30 cycles with an annealing temperature of 55°C. SNaPshot analyses were performed with the SNaPshot Multiplex kit (Applied Biosystems) (primer sequences see online supplementary table S2) in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and evaluated on an ABI310 Genetic Analyzer (Weiterstadt, Germany). Electrophoresis results were analysed using the GeneMapper ID Software V.3.2 with self-designed panels and bins sets.

Statistical analysis

Data were analysed using the χ^2 test and the Fisher's exact test (Graph Pad Quickcalcs).[13] A p value of <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

RESULTS

Clinical and histopathological data

Clinical data of the patients, histopathological characteristics of the primary tumours and distant metastatic sites are listed in table 1.Two patients, both <50 years old at the time of CRC diagnosis, presented a family history or clinical course, which could be suspicious for hereditary non-polyposis CRC. A third patient showed successive colorectal, urinary bladder and pancreatic cancer (table 1), but was already 78 years old at the time of first cancer diagnosis (CRC). Neither microsatellite instability in the tumours nor mutation status of mismatch repair (MMR) genes was determined for these patients.

DPYD variation analysis

The proportion of patients carrying *DPYD* gene variants is displayed in table 1. All variants occurred heterozygous. No differences of *DPYD* genotype were found between non-neoplastic tissue, primary tumours, lymph node metastases and distant metastases (ie, germline=somatic genotype). Variant c.496A>G occurred together with c.1679T>G in one patient and with c.2846A>T in another patient. The relationship between *DPYD* gene variants and clinicopathological parameters is displayed in table 1. Variant c.496A>G occurred significantly more frequently in females than in males ($p=0.0044$).

Chemotherapy response, side effects and liver function status among *DPYD* variant carriers are displayed in online supplementary table S3. Side effects were mainly seen in patients, who were treated with 5-FU-based combined therapy.

Mutational data of all patients and *DPYD* gene variant carriers

A case was regarded as mutated, if at least one sample (primary tumour, lymph node metastasis or distant metastasis) showed a mutation in one of the genes *KRAS*, *NRAS*, *BRAF* or *PIK3CA*. All investigated variants were point mutations, which resulted in amino acid changes or frameshift. Copy number changes have not been analysed in any of the genes. More detailed, primary tumours (n=116), lymph node metastases (sample mix/case, n=109) and distant metastases (n=42) showed *KRAS*-mutations in 44%, 51.4% and 61.9%, respectively, *NRAS*-mutations in 5.2%, 5.5% and 2.4%, respectively, *BRAF*-mutations in 12.9%, 12.8% and 0%, respectively, *PIK3CA*-mutations in 6.9%, 11% and 0%, respectively. The number of primary tumours with mutations in these genes is displayed in table 2.

DPYD gene variant c.496A>G correlated significantly with *KRAS* wild type status of the primary tumours (p=0.0001, table 2). All distant metastases of c.496A>G carriers showed *KRAS* wild type. Only one patient with both, c.496A>G and c.1679T>G, was tested positive for *KRAS* mutation in a lymph node metastasis. Three patients carrying c.496A>G showed mutations in other EGFR pathway regulating genes (*BRAF* and *PIK3CA*).

DPYD gene variant c.2846A>T was significantly associated with occurrence of *BRAF* mutations in the tumour tissue ($p=0.028$, table 2). We could not identify pairs or groups of individual cases showing exactly the same alterations in the investigated genes.

DISCUSSION

Investigations of adverse events and limited therapeutic effects following 5-FU administration focus mainly on altered function of DPYD, the key enzyme in the catabolism of 5-FU.[5] *DPYD* gene variants account for at least 20% of cases with severe 5-FU-related toxicity and are of even greater importance in 5-FU-based combined therapies than in 5-FU monotherapy.[5] Alternative or first-line EGFR-inhibitor therapy could be considered for patients carrying *DPYD* risk alleles.[14] This therapeutic strategy depends on wild type *KRAS*-, *NRAS*-, *BRAF*- and *PIK3CA*-status.[6] A link between these EGFR-pathway regulating genes and *DPYD* genotype has not been investigated so far. Therefore, this study combined analysis of tumour-related factors as *KRAS/NRAS/BRAF/PIK3CA* mutation status and host-related factors as the allelic status of the *DPYD* variants c.496A>G, c.2846A>T and c.1679T>G. We found a mutation rate within the published range for primary tumours in the case of *KRAS* (32%–45%),[15 16] *NRAS* (2.9%–5%)[16 17] and *BRAF* (7%–17.6%)[16 18 19] and a only slightly lower mutation rate than the published rates in the case of *PIK3CA* mutations (9%–21%).[16 18] The frequency of the minor allele of all three *DPYD* variants in our patient group did not differ significantly from that published for Europeans.[10] Despite a large variety of investigated distant metastatic sites, which are regarded to cause heterogeneous molecular genetic results in primary tumours and metastases,[20] all three *DPYD* variants were concordant in primary and metastatic tumour tissue.

The *DPYD* variants c.496A>G and c.2846A>T could be differently linked to genes of the EGFR signalling pathway: the variant c.496A>G correlated significantly with *KRAS* wild type status, whereas c.2846A>T was associated with *BRAF*-mutated tumour tissue. To the best of our knowledge, these correlations have not been reported previously. However, polymorphisms and low mRNA expression of thymidylate synthase (TS), which is another enzyme with known impact on response and toxicity to 5-FU chemotherapy in patients with CRC,[21–23] were found to be associated with mutant *KRAS*.[24] This finding and our results point to a possible interaction between tumour-specific markers and host-specific factors. The functional *DPYD* variants c.496A>G and c.2846A>T occur at significantly conserved sites close to the Fe-S motif and may disrupt electron transport.[25 26] Further biomolecular studies are necessary to evaluate, whether *DPYD* variant-related impairment of electron transport and dNTP pool imbalances due to altered DPYD activity have mutagenic or protective effects on EGFR pathway regulating genes.

The study of Maus *et al*,[24] which is comparable to our study, revealed higher TS expression levels in rectal compared with distal colon cancer. Therefore, we searched for a possible association between *DPYD* variants and clinicopathological parameters. In contrast to the data of Maus *et al*,[24] none of the

J Clin Pathol: first published as 10.1136/jclinpath-2015-202903 on 17 August 2015. Downloaded from http://jcp.bmj.com/ on November 2, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 1 Clinicopathological parameters of all patients and of *DPYD* gene variant carriers

Parameter	All* Patients (*n*=115) Tumours (*n*=116)	*DPYD* gene variant c.496A>G (*n*=15)	c.2846A>T (*n*=6)	c.1679T>G (*n*=3)
Age (years)				
Mean (range)	66 (32–88)	62 (32–88)	63 (42–77)	55 (32–65)
Gender				
Male	56 (48.7%)	2 (13.3%)	4 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)
Female	59 (51.3%)	13 (86.7%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)
Clinical stage				
III	68 (59.1%)	10 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)
IV	47 (40.9%)	5 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (66.7%)
5-FU chemotherapy				
Yes	92 (80%)	12 (80%)	3 (50%)	3 (100%)
No	23 (20%)	3 (20%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Anatomic site				
Caecum	22 (19%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (33.3%)
Ascending	17 (14.6%)	3 (20%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
Transverse	11 (9.5%)	2 (13.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Descending	19 (16.4%)	3 (20%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)
Sigmoid	19 (16.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.3%)
Rectum	28 (24.1%)	5 (33.4%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)
pT stage				
≤2	5 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
3	90 (78.3%)	15 (100%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (100%)
4	20 (17.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
pN stage				
0	6 (5.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1	68 (59.1%)	14 (93.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (66.7%)
2	41 (35.7%)	1 (6.7%)	6 (100%)	1 (33.3%)
Histological grade				
High	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Moderate	89 (76.7%)	14 (93.3%)	6 (100%)	3 (100%)
Poor	26 (22.4%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Distant metastatic site†				
Liver	10 (23.8%)	1 (25%)†	0 (0%)†	1 (33.3%)†
Non-liver	32 (76.2%)	3 (75%)†	1 (100%)†	2 (66.7%)†
Other malignant tumour‡				
No	92 (80%)	11 (73.3%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (100%)
Skin tumours (BCC, SCC, MM)	13 (11.3%)	3 (20%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)
Urinary bladder cancer	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Urinary bladder and pancreatic cancer	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Breast cancer	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lung cancer	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)
Malignant mesothelioma	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Renal cell carcinoma	1 (0.9%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Prostate carcinoma	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

*116 primary tumours of 115 patients were investigated.
†Number of investigated metastatic sites=42 in all patients, four in c.496A>G carriers, one in c.2846A>T carriers, three in c.1679T>G carriers.
‡Not analysed in this study.
BCC,basal cell carcinoma; 5-FU, 5-fluorouracil; MM, malignant melanoma; SCC,squamous cell carcinoma.

investigated *DPYD* variants in our study was related to a specific anatomic tumour site. However, the variant c.496A>G was significantly more frequently seen in female than in male patients. This female predominance is in line with a previous study, which detected *DPYD* c.1905+1G>A exclusively in women.[27] To the best of our knowledge, there is currently only one publication reporting an association between heterozygosity of a *DPYD* gene variant (*DPYD**2A) and increased FU-related toxicity in male.[21] Detailed genotype–phenotype analysis is necessary to evaluate, whether female predominance of several *DPYD* variants could be the genetic background for previously described lower DPYD expression levels in tumour tissue and plasma of females compared with males.[28–30]

The genotypic correlations found in this study could have different clinical importance. Considering *DPYD* variant c.496A>G as possible toxicity marker, its association with *KRAS* wild type status could define a patient group, which might be considered for first-line EGFR inhibitor monotherapy or eventually combined 5-FU/

J Clin Pathol: first published as 10.1136/jclinpath-2015-202903 on 17 August 2015. Downloaded from http://jcp.bmj.com/ on November 2, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 2 Primary tumour *KRAS/NRAS/BRAF/PIK3CA* mutation status of *DPYD* gene variant carriers

	DPYD gene variants		
	c.496A>G (*n*=15)	c.2846A>T (*n*=6)	c.1679T>G (*n*=3)
KRAS wild type (*n*=65)	15 (23.1%)	4 (6.1%)	3 (4.6%)
KRAS mutation (*n*=51)	0 (0%)	2 (3.9%)	0 (0%)
	p=0.0001	n.s.	n.s.
NRAS wild type (*n*=110)	15 (13.6%)	6 (5.4%)	3 (2.7%)
NRAS mutation (*n*=6)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
BRAF wild type (*n*=101)	13 (12.9%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)
BRAF mutation (*n*=15)	2 (13.3%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
	n.s.	*p*=0.028	n.s.
PIK3CA wild type (*n*=108)	14 (13%)	6 (5.6%)	3 (2.8%)
PIK3CA mutation (*n*=8)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

n.s., not significant.

EGFR antibody therapy without other cytotoxic drugs. A possible limiting influence of concomitant *BRAF*- and *PIK3CA*-mutations has to be evaluated by large cohort studies. In contrast, the association between *DPYD* c.2846A>T and *BRAF*-mutations could point to a patient group with limited therapeutic options at all. However, it has not been clearly determined in the literature, whether *DPYD* variant c.496A>G predict toxicity to 5-FU-based chemotherapy or protection against adverse effects from this therapy[5] and due to the small sample size, we could not prove or exclude an impact of c.496A>G, c.2846A>T and c.1679T>G on 5-FU-based chemotherapy. Furthermore, we did not determine the MMR status of the tumours, which is probably associated with DPYD expression and might influence therapy response.[7] Another limitation of this study is that it considered only three out of approximately 33 000 recorded *DPYD* variants,[10] even if the vast majority of these mostly intronic variants can be expected to be non-functional.[5] Therefore, anticancer therapy should be increasingly based on results of high throughput sequencing technologies as recently published[8 31] and simultaneous testing of predictive biomarkers for several therapies[7 9] which are able to precisely define the clinical relevance of *DPYD* variants and their association to other tumour-related markers.

Take home messages

- *DPYD* gene variations can potentially predict toxicity to 5-fluorouracil (FU)-based therapy and *KRAS*-, *NRAS*-, *BRAF*-, *PIK3CA*-wild type status is a known prerequisite for epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) inhibitor therapy.
- The authors could demonstrate a correlation between occurrence of *DPYD* gene variant c.496A>G and *KRAS* wild type status of colorectal cancer tissue.
- This genetic profile could define a patient group requiring alternative combined therapeutic approaches.

Handling editor Cheok Soon Lee

Acknowledgements The authors thank C. Loland and M. Tellefsen for excellent technical assistance.

Contributors All authors named in the title page have contributed to, read and approved the final version of the manuscript for submission. Conception and design: BK, MP. Collection and assembly of data; data analysis and interpretation; final approval of manuscript: all authors. Manuscript writing: BK and MP.

Competing interests None declared.

Ethics approval Regional Ethics Committee (REK) of Southern Norway (Registration number 6.2009.82).

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

REFERENCES

1 Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, *et al*. Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: Sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. *Int J Cancer* 2015;136:E359–86.
2 Kelly C, Cassidy J. Chemotherapy in metastatic colorectal cancer. *Surg Oncol* 2007;16:6570.
3 Sabharwal A, Kerr D. Chemotherapy for colorectal cancer in the metastatic and adjuvant setting: past, present and future. *Expert Rev Anticancer Ther* 2007;7:477–87.
4 Kim JC, Kim SY, Cho DH, *et al*. Novel chemosensitive single-nucleotide polymorphism markers to targeted regimens in metastatic colorectal cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2011;17:1200–9.
5 Amstutz U, Froehlich TK, Largiadèr CR. Dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase gene as major predictor of severe 5-fluorouracil toxicity. *Pharmacogenomics* 2011;12:1321–36.
6 De Roock W, Claes B, Bernasconi D, *et al*. 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* 2010;11:753–62.
7 Etienne-Grimaldi MC, Mahamat A, Chazal M, *et al*. Molecular patterns in deficient mismatch repair colorectal tumors: results from a French prospective multicentric biological and genetic study. *Br J Cancer* 2014;110:2728–37.
8 Lee AM, Shi Q, Pavey E, *et al*. DPYD variants as predictors of 5-fluorouracil toxicity in adjuvant colon cancer treatment (NCCTG N0147). *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2014;106: pii:dju298.
9 Borràs E, Dotor E, Arcusa A, *et al*. High-resolution melting analysis of the common c.1905+1G>A mutation causing dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency and lethal 5-fluorouracil toxicity. *Front Genet* 2013;3:312.
10 NCBI database available from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/snp
11 Kleist B, Kempa M, Novy M, *et al*. Comparison of neuroendocrine differentiation and *KRAS/NRAS/BRAF/PIK3CA/TP53* mutation status in primary and metastatic colorectal cancer. *Int J Clin Exp Pathol* 2014;7:5927–39.
12 Cademartiri F, Luccichenti G, Maffei E, *et al*. Imaging for oncologic staging and follow-up: review of current methods and novel approaches. *Acta Biomed* 2008;79:85–91.
13 Graph Pad Quickcalcs available from http://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/index.cfm
14 Saridaki Z, Weidhaas JB, Lenz HJ, *et al*. A let-7 microRNA-binding site polymorphism in KRAS predicts improved outcome in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer treated with salvage cetuximab/panitumumab monotherapy. *Clin Cancer Res* 2014;20:4499–510.
15 Samowitz WS, Curtin K, Schaffer D, *et al*. Relationship of Ki-ras mutations in colon cancers to tumor location, stage, and survival: a population-based study. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2000;9:1193–7.
16 Peeters M, Oliver KS, Parker A, *et al*. Massively parallel tumor multigene sequencing to evaluate response to panitumumab in a randomized phase III study of metastatic colorectal cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2013;19:1902–12.
17 Vakiani E, Janakiraman M, Shen R, *et al*. Comparative genomic analysis of primary versus metastatic colorectal carcinomas. *J Clin Oncol* 2012;30:2956–62.
18 Baldus SE, Schaefer KL, Engers R, *et al*. Prevalence and heterogeneity of *KRAS*, *BRAF*, and *PIK3CA* mutations in primary colorectal adenocarcinomas and their corresponding metastases. *Clin Cancer Res* 2010;16:790–9.
19 Samowitz WS, Albertsen H, Herrick J, *et al*. Evaluation of a large, population-based sample supports a CpG island methylator phenotype in colon cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2005;129:837–45.
20 Knijn N, Mekenkamp LJM, Klomp M, *et al*. KRAS mutation analysis: a comparison between primary tumours and matched liver metastases in 305 colorectal cancer patients. *Br J Cancer* 2011;104:1020–6.
21 Schwab M, Zanger UM, Marx C, *et al*. Role of genetic and nongenetic factors for fluorouracil treatment-related severe toxicity: a prospective clinical trial by the German 5-FU Toxicity Study Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:2131–8.
22 Kristensen MH, Pedersen PL, Melsen GV, *et al*. Variants in the dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase, methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase and thymidylate synthase genes predict early toxicity of 5-fluorouracil in colorectal cancer patients. *J Int Med Res* 2010;38:870–83.
23 Lamas MJ, Duran G, Gomez A, *et al*. X-ray cross-complementing group 1 and thymidylate synthase polymorphisms might predict response to chemotherapy in rectal cancer patients. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012;82:138–44.

J Clin Pathol: first published as 10.1136/jclinpath-2015-202903 on 17 August 2015. Downloaded from http://jcp.bmj.com/ on November 2, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

24 Maus MK, Hanna DL, Stephens CL, *et al*. Distinct gene expression profiles of proximal and distal colorectal cancer: implications for cytotoxic and targeted therapy. *Pharmacogenomics J* 2015;15:354–62.
25 Van Kuilenburg AB, Dobritzsch D, Meinsma R, *et al*. Novel disease-causing mutations in the dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase gene interpreted by analysis of the three-dimensional protein structure. *Biochem J* 2002;364:157–63.
26 Mattison LK, Johnson MR, Diasio RB. A comparative analysis of translated dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase cDNA conservation of functional domains and relevance to genetic polymorphisms. *Pharmacogenetics* 2002;12:133–44.
27 Loganayagam A, Arenas-Hernandez M, Fairbanks L, *et al*. The contribution of deleterious DPYD gene sequence variants to fluoropyrimidine toxicity in British cancer patients. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2010;65:403–6.
28 Yamashita K, Mikami Y, Ikeda M, *et al*. Gender differences in the dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase expression of colorectal cancer. *Cancer Lett* 2002;188:231–6.
29 He YF, Wei W, Zhang X, *et al*. Analysis of the DPYD gene implicated in 5-fluorouracil catabolism in Chinese cancer patients. *J Clin Pharm Ther* 2008;33:307–14.
30 Sumi T, Katsumata K, Tsuchida A, *et al*. Correlations of clinicopathological factors with protein expression levels of thymidylate synthase, dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase and orotate phosphoribosyltransferase in colorectal cancer. *Chemotherapy* 2010;56:120–6.
31 Rosmarin D, Palles C, Pagnamenta A, *et al*. A candidate gene study of capecitabine-related toxicity in colorectal cancer identifies new toxicity variants at DPYD and a putative role for ENOSF1 rather than TYMS. *Gut* 2015;64:111–20.

J Clin Pathol: first published as 10.1136/jclinpath-2015-202903 on 17 August 2015. Downloaded from http://jcp.bmj.com/ on November 2, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Supplementary description of methods regarding analysis of *KRAS, NRAS, BRAF, PIK3CA*

DNA isolation

Manual microdissection was performed before DNA extraction from primary and metastatic CRC tissue: A sufficient amount of neoplastic tissue was microscopically identified on hematoxylin- and eosin stained slides. This same area was then re-identified on the unstained 10 µm dewaxed, rehydrated and air-dried tissue section and separately isolated with a cannula, predominantly without adherent non-neoplastic tissue. Separately embedded resection margins without evidence of tumor were used as normal tissue for CRC patients. DNA isolation from paraffin embedded tissue was performed with the High Pure PCR Template Preparation Kit (Roche Molecular Biochemicals, Mannheim, Germany) and the innuPrep DNA Minikit (Analytik Jena, Jena, Germany). Quality of DNA was assessed by agarose gel electrophoresis.

Sequencing analysis

Sequencing analysis of *Kras* Exon 2 was done for part of samples as a means of quality control with primers F 5'AGGCCTGCTGAAAATGACTGAATA and R 5' CTGTATCAAAGAATGGTCCTGCAC. PCR amplification was performed in 12.5 µl sample volumes with 1-2 ng of genomic tumour or nonneoplastic DNA as template in 15 mM Tris/HCl, 50 mM KCl, with 200 µM dNTPs, 1.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.1 nM primers, and 1 Unit HotStart Taq Polymerase (Applied Biosystems). An initial denaturation and activation step of 8 min at 95°C was followed by 30-35 cycles of 1 min at 95°C, 1 min at 55°C and 2 min at 72°C, and a 30 min final elongation step at 72°C. Sequencing was always carried out in both directions with the BigDye sequencing kit according to the manufacturer's instructions (Applied Biosystems). Each mutation was verified by a second sequencing reaction of an independent amplification product.

Assessment of Kras mutations with Kras strip assay

For assessment of mutation status of *Kras* positions 12, 13 and 61, we used the KRAS 12/13/61 StripAssay® (ViennaLab, Vienna, Austria) according to the manufacturer's instructions. It detects the mutations c.35G>C, c.34G>C, c.35G>A, c.34G>T, c.[34G>A;35G>T], c.[34G>C;35G>T], c.34G>A, c.35G>T, c.38G>A, c.37G>T, c.182A>G, c.183A>T and c.182A>T and includes positive and negative amplification and

hybridization controls. As quality control, the mutation status was verified by a second reaction directly by ViennaLab in 54 randomly chosen samples with no divergent results.

SNP analysis

Twenty-six recurrent cancer pathway mutations were included in this study as summarized in table S1 (primer sequences partly from Dias-Santagata [S1], and partly self-designed with primer 3 [S2]). They were combined to two SNaPshot assays with the additional safeguard against artefacts that neighbouring mutations were never amplified in one assay together. For both SNP analyses, multiplex PCR was done in a volume of 12.5 µl in the GeneAmp® PCR system 9700 (Applied Biosystems) with 0.5-2 ng of DNA as template in 15 mM Tris/HCl, 50 mM KCl, with 200 µM dNTPs, 1.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.1 µM each primer (primer sequences see table S1) and 1.5 Units AmpliTaq Gold Polymerase (Applied Biosystems). PCR conditions were: Initial denaturation and activation step of 8 min at 95°C, 30 cycles of 1 min at 94°C, 1 min at 52°C and 2 min at 72°C, and a 45 min final elongation step at 60°C. SNaPshot analyses were performed with the SNaPshot Multiplex kit (Applied Biosystems) (primer sequences displayed in table S1) in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and evaluated on an ABI310 Genetic Analyzer. Electrophoresis results were analysed using the GeneMapper® ID Software v3.2 with self-designed panels and bins sets.

Supplementary references

S1 Dias-Santagata D, Akhavanfard S, David SS, *et al*. Rapid targeted mutational analysis of human tumours: a clinical platform to guide personalized cancer medicine. *EMBO Mol Med* 2010;**2**:146-158.

S2 Primer 3: http://bioinfo.ut.ee/primer3-0.4.0/

Table S1. Primer sequences for multiplex PCR and SNaPshot assays

Gene	Position	Multi-plex	Forward primer	Reverse primer	SNaPshot primer
KRAS	351	1	5'TGAAGATGTACCTATGGTCCT	5'CTGAGCCTGTTTTGTGTCTA	ATGGTCCTAGTAGGAAATAA
	436	1	5'GCAAGAAGTTATGGAATTCCT	5'TGATTTTGCAGAAAACAGATC	ctcTTCCTTTTATTGAAACATCA
NRAS	34	1	TGCTGGTGTGAAATGACTGAG	TGGATTGTCAGTGCGCTTTT	tcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcAACTGGTGGTGGTTGGAGCA
	35	2			ACTGGTGGTGGTTGGAGCAG
	37	1			tcagtcagtcagtcaCAGTGCGCTTTTCCCAACAC
	38	2			ctcTCAGTGCGCTTTTCCCAACA
	181	1	TGGTGAAACCTGTTTGTTGGA	TGATGGCAAATACACAGAGGA	tcagtcagtcagACATACTGGATACAGCTGGA
	182	2			ctctctCATACTGGATACAGCTGGAC
	183	1			tcagtcagtcagtcaCTCATGGCACTGTACTCTTC
BRAF	1799	2	TGCTTGCTCTGATAGGAAAATG	CTGATGGGACCCACTCCAT	tcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtACCCACTCCATCGAGATTTC
PIK3CA	263	1	CCCCTCCATCAACTTCTTCA	AAAAGCCGAAGGTCACAAAG	tcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagATTTTTTGATGAAACAAGAC
	1624	1	GACAAAGAACAGCTCAAAGCAA	TTTAGCACTTACCTGTGACTCCA	tcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagCTACACGAGATCCTCTCTCT
	1633	2			ctctctctcATCCTCTCTCTGAAATCACT
	1636	1			tcagctagtcagtcagctcagtcagtcagttcaCTCTCTCTGAAATCACTGAG
	1637	2			tcagtcagtcagtcaTCCATAGAAAATCTTTCTCC
	3139	1	GAGCAAGAGGCTTTGGAGTA	ATCCAATCCATTTTTGTTGTCC	tcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcagtcaTGAAACAAATGAATGATGCA
	3140	2			tcagtcagtcagGAAACAAATGAATGATGCAC
	3145	1			ctctctCATTTTTGTTGTCCAGCCAC

Table S2: Primer sequences for multiplex and SNaPshot PCR

Variant	rs number	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Base extension primer
c.496A>G	rs2297595	5'ATTTTTTCTGGGGGAGGCA	5'CATGACAATTGATTTCCCCG	cagtCCCCGTAGGTATTCAAAGCA
c.1679T>G	rs55886062	5'GAAAGTTTTGGTGAGGGCAA	5'AACTCCAGCCACCAGCACAT	cagtcagtAGTTGATACACATTTCTTCA
c.2846A>T	rs67376798	5'AGGATTCTTACCTGGTAGCCA	5'TGAATTGAGCAACGTAGAGCA	tcagtcagtcagCAGCTTCAAAAGCTCTTCGA

Table S3. 5-FU chemotherapy response and side effects in *DPYD* gene variant carriers[1]

Case	Combined regime	Response	Side effect	*DPYD* gene variant	Liver disease	Liver function test[2]
4	No	Yes	Neutropenia	c.1679T>G	Metastasis	Normal
11	Irinotecan	Yes	Diarrhea, dry skin	c.496A>G	Metastasis	Pathologic
15	No	Yes	No	c.496A>G	No	Normal
21	No	No	No	c.496A>G	No	Normal
23	No	No	No	c.2846A>T	Metastasis	Pathologic
25	No	Yes	No	c.496A>G, c.1679T>G	Hepatitis C	Pathologic
27	Irinotecan	Yes	No	c.496A>G	Metastasis	Pathologic
45	No	Yes	No	c.496A>G	No	Normal
48	Oxaliplatin	No	Neutropenia	c.2846A>T	No	Normal
57	Oxaliplatin	Yes	Thrombocytopenia	c.496A>G	No	Normal
60	Xeloda	No	No	c.1679T>G	No	Normal
65	No	Yes	No	c.496A>G	No	Normal
67	No	Yes	No	c.496A>G	No	Normal
68	No	Yes	No	c.496A>G	No	Normal
73	No	Yes	No	c.2846A>T	No	Pathologic
75	Oxaliplatin	Yes	Neuropathy	c.496A>G	Metastasis	Normal
81	No	Yes	Neutropenia	c.496A>G	no	Normal

[1]Comprising only *DPYD* gene variant carriers, who received chemotherapy (n = 17). [2]Blood test comprising transaminases (AST, ALT), gamma-glutamyl transferase, alkaline phosphatase. Bilirubin was only determined for cases 4, 11, 23, 25, 27, 48, 60, 75, 81, which showed normal level.