Comprehensive genomic and immune profiling of non-small cell lung cancer brain metastases reveals low tumor inflammation and elevated cancer testis antigen burden

R.J. Seager¹, Sarabjot Pabla¹, B. R. Achyut², Mary K. Nesline¹, Geoffrey Kannan², Anjen Chenn², Shengle Zhang¹, Roger Klein¹, Jeffrey Conroy¹, Mark Sausen², Kamal S. Saini², Taylor J. Jensen², Prasanth Reddy², Eric Severson², Shakti Ramkissoon² ¹Omniseq Inc. (a Labcorp subsidiary), 700 Ellicott Street, Buffalo, NY 14203, US Results ²Labcorp, Burlington, NC 27215, US

Introduction

- Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for ~50% of brain metastases.
- Many individual biomarkers describe the complexity of each tumor and its interactions with the tumor microenvironment (TME).
- We compare the genomic and immune biomarker landscapes of two cohorts of patients: one with primary NSCLC (pNSCLC) and another with metastatic NSCLC to the brain (mNSCLC).

Methods

- Standard-of-care comprehensive genomic and immune profiling was performed on FFPE tumors representing 39 histologic types, assessing expression levels of 395 immune genes and >500 tumor-associated genes [1,2].
- From this data, three previously published gene expression signatures were calculated: cell proliferation (CP), tumor immunogenic signature (TIGS), and cancer testis antigen burden (CTAB) [3,4,5].
- PD-L1 status of each tumor was assessed by IHC and designated as positive when $\geq 1\%$ tumor proportion score (TPS), and tumor mutational burden (TMB) was calculated and designated as high when ≥ 10 Mut/Mb was observed.
- We analyzed 137 mNSCLC patient tumors (ages 40-85y [mean 65y], 52% female, 48% male) and 5533 primary NSCLC (pNSCLC) patient tumors (ages 24-100y [mean 71y], 51% female, 49% male) with comprehensive genomic and immune biomarker profiling, including PD-L1 IHC, TMB, TIGS, CP, and CTAB.

Table 1: Biomarker and demographic composition of pNSCLC and mNSCLC cohorts.

DemographicsNumber of PatientsPercentage of Total DemographicsNumber of Patients137100.00%5533Gender137100.00%5533Female7151.82%2823Male6648.18%2710TMB (≥10Mut/Mb)6648.18%2710High7756.20%1581Not High5842.34%3134Missing21.46%818PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS)Positive7554.74%3678Negative6245.26%1833Missing0-22Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS)3424.82%1952		
Patients Cohort Patients 137 100.00% 5533 Gender	P Number of	
137 100.00% 5533 Gender - - Female 71 51.82% 2823 Male 66 48.18% 2710 TMB (≥10Mut/Mb) - - - High 77 56.20% 1581 Not High 58 42.34% 3134 Missing 2 1.46% 818 PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) - - - Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
Gender Image <		
Female 71 51.82% 2823 Male 66 48.18% 2710 TMB (≥10Mut/Mb) - - - High 77 56.20% 1581 Not High 58 42.34% 3134 Missing 2 1.46% 818 PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) - - - Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
Male 66 48.18% 2710 TMB (≥10Mut/Mb) High 77 56.20% 1581 Not High 58 42.34% 3134 Missing 2 1.46% 818 PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
TMB (≥10Mut/Mb) 77 56.20% 1581 High 77 56.20% 1581 Not High 58 42.34% 3134 Missing 2 1.46% 818 PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) 75 54.74% 3678 Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
High7756.20%1581Not High5842.34%3134Missing21.46%818PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS)7554.74%3678Positive7554.74%3678Negative6245.26%1833Missing0-22Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS)3424.82%1952		
Not High 58 42.34% 3134 Missing 2 1.46% 818 PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) - - - Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
Missing 2 1.46% 818 PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) 75 54.74% 3678 Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
PD-L1 IHC (≥1% TPS) 75 54.74% 3678 Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
Positive 75 54.74% 3678 Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) 34 24.82% 1952		
Negative 62 45.26% 1833 Missing 0 - 22 Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS) Image: Composition of the second sec		
Missing0-22Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS)Strong3424.82%1952		
Tumor Immunogenic Signature (TIGS)Image: Constraint of the second secon		
Strong 34 24.82% 1952		
Moderate 31 22.63% 1699		
Weak 72 52.55% 1882		
Cell Proliferation (CP)		
High 10 7.30% 470		
Moderate 58 42.34% 2042		
Poor 69 50.36% 3021		
Cancer Testis Antigen Burden (CTAB)		
High 94 68.61% 3185	+	
Low 43 31.39% 2348		

Presented at SNO 2022 – Abstract BIOM-03

©2022 Laboratory Corporation of America[®] Holdings All rights reserved.

• PD-L1 expression (%TPS) for all cases by IHC was not significantly different. However, pNSCLC cases were more likely to be PD-L1 positive (≥1%TPS) (p=0.00506) and mNSCLC cases were more likely to be PD-L1 negative (p=0.0037)



PD-L1 IHC \geq 1%TPS) composition of each cohort with overrepresentation test p-values indicated.

Genomic alteration (GA) frequency in mNSCLC and pNSCLC were similar; only KRAS was significantly increased (39.9% vs 25.5%, p<0.0005). Mean TMB was significantly higher in mNSCLC versus pNSCLC (p=7.8e-10). Additionally, mNSCLC cases were more likely to have high TMB (TMB≥10 mut/Mb) (p=3.33e-11) and pNSCLC cases were more likely to not have high TMB (TMB<10 mut/Mb) (p=0.000943) [Fig. 2].



mNSCLC cases had a significantly higher mean CP score (p=0.025) [Fig. 3].





Cohort 33) ercentage of Total Cohort 100.00% 51% 49% 28.57% 56.64% 14.78% 66.47% 33.13% 0.40% 35.28% 30.71% 34.01% 8.49% 36.91% 54.60%

57.56% 42.44%



The TIGS score was significantly higher for pNSCLC cases (p=3.9e-6). mNSCLC cases were more likely to be weakly inflamed (p=1.19e-5) while pNSCLC cases were more likely to be moderately (p=0.0392) or strongly (p=0.00979) inflamed [Fig. 4].



Cohort pNSCLC mNSCLC Cohort Figure 4: A) Tumor immunogenic signature (TIGS) distributions in each cohort; B) Bar plot detailing TIGS group composition of each cohort with overrepresentation test p-values indicated.

The CTAB score was significantly higher in mNSCLC cases (p=2e-5). Additionally, mNSCLC cases were more likely to have high (≥171) CTAB (p=0.00902) while pNSCLC cases were more likely to have low (<171) CTAB (p=0.00902) [Fig. 5].



Cohort pNSCLC mNSCLC Figure 5: A) Cancer testis antigen burden (CTAB) distributions in each cohort; B) Bar plot detailing CTAB group composition of each cohort with overrepresentation test p-values indicated.

Conclusions

- Comprehensive genomic and immune profiling (CGIP) facilitates the interrogation of tumor immunity biomarkers in real-world NSCLC brain metastasis specimens.
- CGIP reveals that mNSCLC cases have a larger antigen burden, with increased TMB and CTAB, likely due to the immune privileged nature of the brain, which is reflected in the lower TIGS scores and PD-L1 positivity.
- Despite lower overall PD-L1 positivity, mNSCLC with negative PD-L1 IHC may potentially benefit from immunotherapy including cancer vaccine and adoptive cell therapy strategies given the high TMB and CTAB.

References

- Conroy JM, Pabla S, Glenn ST. Analytical validation of a next generation sequencing assay to monitor immune responses in solid tumors. J Mol Diagn. 2018;20(1).
- sequencing assay for comprehensive genomic profiling of solid tumors. PLoS ONE 2021;16(12).
- immune checkpoint blockade in lung cancer patients. J Immunother Cancer. 2019;7(27). cell renal cell carcinoma patients. Oncoimmunology. 2020;9.
- improves prediction of immunotherapy resistance and response. Biomark Res 2021;9(56).









Conroy JM, Pabla S, Glenn ST, Seager RJ, Van Roey E, Gao S, et al. A scalable high-throughput targeted next-generation Pabla S, Conroy JM, Nesline MK, Glenn ST, Papanicolau-Sengos A, Burgher B, et al. Proliferative potential and resistance to

Zhang T, Pabla S, Lenzo FL, Conroy JM, Nesline MK, Glenn ST, et al. Proliferative potential and response to nivolumab in clear

Pabla, S., Seager, R.J., Van Roey, E. et al. Integration of tumor inflammation, cell proliferation, and traditional biomarkers