Mis-annotated multi nucleotide variants in public cancer genomics datasets can lead to inaccurate mutation calls with significant implications

3

4 Sujaya Srinivasan^{1†}, Natallia Kalinava^{1†}, Rafael Aldana², Zhipan Li², Sjoerd van Hagen³,
5 Sander Y.A. Rodenburg³, Megan Wind-Rotolo⁴, Ariella S. Sasson¹, Hao Tang¹, Xiaozhong Qian
6 ^{4,5}, Stefan Kirov^{1*}

7 ¹Informatics & Predictive Sciences, Bristol Myers Squibb, Princeton, NJ 08648 USA

8 ²Sentieon Inc, Mountain View, CA, USA.

9 ³The Hyve, Arthur van Schendelstraat 650, 3511 MJ Utrecht, The Netherlands.

10 ⁴Translational Medicine, Bristol Myers Squibb, Princeton, NJ 08648 USA

11 ⁵Translational Sciences, Daichi Sankyo, Basking Ridge NJ, USA

12 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work

13 * Corresponding author: Stefan Kirov, stefan.kirov@bms.com

14

15 **Abstract**

16 **Background**

17 Next generation sequencing is widely used in cancer to profile tumors and detect
18 variants. Most somatic variant callers used in these pipelines identify variants at the lowest
19 possible granularity – single nucleotide variants (SNVs). As a result, multiple adjacent SNVs
20 are called individually instead of as a multi-nucleotide variant (MNV). The problem with this
21 level of granularity is that the amino acid change from the individual SNVs within a codon
22 could be different from the amino acid change based on the MNV that results from
23 combining the SNVs. Most variant annotation tools do not account for this, leading to
24 incorrect conclusions about the downstream effects of the variants.

25 **Method**

26 Here, we used Variant Call Files (VCFs) from the TCGA Mutect2 caller, and developed a
27 solution to merge SNVs to MNVs. Our custom script takes the phasing information from the
28 SNV VCFs and based on a gene model, determines if SNVs are at the same codon and need
29 to be merged into a MNV prior to variant annotation.

30 **Results**

31 We analyzed 10,383 VCFs from TCGA and found 12,141 MNVs that were incorrectly
32 annotated. Strikingly, the analysis of seven commonly mutated genes from 178 studies from
33 cBioPortal revealed that MNVs were consistently missed in 20 of these studies, while they
34 were correctly annotated in 15 more recent studies. The best and most common example of
35 MNVs was found at the BRAF V600 locus, where several public datasets reported separate
36 BRAF V600E and BRAF V600M variants, instead of a single merged V600K variant.

37 **Conclusion**

While some datasets merged MNVs correctly, many public datasets have not been corrected for this problem. As a best practice for variant calling, we recommend that MNVs be accounted for in NGS processing pipelines, thus improving analyses on the impact of somatic variants in cancer genomics.

Background

Next generation sequencing is commonly used in cancer to determine the underlying genomic features of the tumor¹. Pipelines that convert the raw sequencing data into useful knowledge include sequence alignment, variant calling and annotation tools. Single nucleotide variants and indels are the most common type of variants called by most variant callers, and these variants are prevalent in many important cancer genes. Most popular variant callers like Mutect2², VarScan2³, VarDict⁴, strelka2⁵ and the Sentieon⁶ suite of tools call variants at the most granular level of single nucleotide variants (SNVs) and indels. Missense and nonsense variants produce amino acid changes that could result in a protein that is either non-functional, or has a different or impaired function. Accurate annotation, of the amino acid changes that occur due to the SNVs and indels, is therefore critical to understanding the functional consequences of these variants.

A multi-nucleotide variant (MNV) is defined as two or more variants within the same codon on the same haplotype (see Figure 1). Variant callers commonly detect SNVs and small indels, but most callers and downstream variant annotation tools fail to consider whether nearby variants are part of the same haplotype. If multiple nearby variants happen to be within a single codon, the amino acid change could be different from the individual amino acid changes resulting from the SNVs. Many variant callers, such as Strelka, VarScan

61 and VarDict, do not include haplotype or phase information with the variant calls. Some of
62 the more recent variant callers such as Mutect2, Sentieon TNScope and Sentieon
63 TNHaplotyper include phase information to indicate if nearby variants are in phase (i.e. part
64 of the same haplotype) when there is enough evidence from the reads supporting the
65 variants.

66 Commonly used variant annotation tools, such as SnpEff⁷, ANNOVAR⁸, & Ensembl
67 Variant Effect Predictor (VEP)⁹, annotate variants individually without considering haplotype
68 information or combining nearby in-phase variants to MNVs. There are some tools such as
69 bcftools csq¹⁰ (haplotype aware consequence caller) that have tried to address this problem,
70 but the software expects phased VCFs as input with phasing information in the genotype
71 (GT) field in a specific and seldom used format. MAC¹¹(Multi-nucleotide Variant Annotation
72 Corrector) requires both the VCF and the corresponding Binary Alignment Map (BAM) file in
73 order to correct for MNVs, corresponding to adjacent SNVs. MACARON (Multi-bAse Codon
74 Association variant ReannotatiON)¹² is another tool that uses both the VCF and the BAM to
75 re-annotate VCFs with corrected MNVs from multiple SNVs within a codon.

76 There are several important cancer genes that are known to have hotspot regions with
77 many variants. A few examples are BRAF at the V600 locus, and KRAS at G12 and G13 loci.
78 Sometimes these variants are part of the same haplotype, and therefore should be
79 annotated as MNVs, but most pipelines annotate them as multiple SNVs. This could lead to
80 incorrect functional predictions for the effect of the variants.

81 In this paper, we consider some common public cancer genomics datasets to
82 understand if MNVs are accounted for, and propose a method to merge SNVs into MNVs.

83

84 **Results**

85 **TCGA results**

86 We downloaded 10,383 Mutect2 VCF files processed with the human reference genome
87 (GRCh38) from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA). The downloaded VCFs comprise 33 cancer
88 types or indications.

89 We post-processed the TCGA mutect2 VCFs using a custom developed MNV merge
90 script. This script takes the SNVs that are in phase and within the same codon and merges
91 them into MNV. We excluded repeat regions and major histocompatibility complex (MHC)
92 regions for this analysis, and only characterized the instances of merged SNVs. Indels were
93 not considered at this time. We found that across all files, there were a total of 12,141
94 MNVs that were originally annotated as multiple SNVs, and of these 6,357 had a completely
95 novel protein effect, i.e the new protein effect was different from the SNVs' protein effects
96 (Table 1, Fig. 2). The most frequent novel MNV events were new missense events (5,413).
97 Nonsense events, both stop gain (254) and rescue of nonsense (517), had the most impact
98 on the interpretation of protein function. This shows that annotating MNVs correctly can
99 significantly alter downstream analysis results.

100 Skin Cutaneous Melanoma (SKCM) and lung cancers: lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and
101 lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) had the highest percentage of samples with MNVs
102 (Fig. 3a). We also found the highest median number of SNVs and MNVs in SKCM, LUAD and
103 LUSC (Fig. 3b and c). This is expected because of the high Tumor Mutation Burden (TMB) in
104 these indications. Breast cancer (BRCA), the indication with the largest number of samples
105 in this dataset (1,040 samples), is known to have a low TMB¹³, and our results are consistent
106 with this.

While most genes had only one or two MNVs, we found 22 genes that had 10 or more MNVs (Fig. 3d). Many of these genes are known for hotspot mutations, so this finding is not that surprising. The most consistent MNVs were in the BRAF gene: 43 out of 46 MNVs were at the V600 locus, all with a novel missense outcome. Furthermore, a single BRAF V600M never occurred alone, but always co-occurred in phase with another variant V600G or V600E, leading to the novel mutations V600R and V600K respectively.

cBioPortal results

We analyzed mutation annotation files (MAF) from cBioPortal^{14,15} (<http://www.cbioportal.org>) from all non-redundant studies (178) for 7 cancer genes (BRAF, KRAS, NRAS, PTEN, BRCA1, BRCA2, MUC16). Since cBioPortal MAFs do not have phasing information, we used counts for the variant reads and variant allele frequencies, as proxies for phase. If the variant allele frequencies of two variants within a codon was approximately the same, we inferred that they co-occurred on the same read (Fig. 4).

Some common hotspot regions of cancer genes, like BRAF V600 and KRAS G12 loci, were particularly affected by not merging the SNVs into MNVs. While some studies did call the MNVs correctly, there were 20 studies, including several TCGA studies, that did not. Table 1 shows the most common mis-annotated MNVs among the seven genes that we studied. The most frequently mis-annotated MNV was at the BRAF V600 locus, with a total of 61 MNVs (V600K and V600R). The KRAS G12 locus had 14 MNVs with the most common being co-occurring G12V and G12C SNVs which should have been annotated as G12F.

In our analysis of all BRAF V600 variants from cBioPortal, we found only two occurrences of V600M alone, with no other variant. Since we did not have the full set of variant calls

from this dataset, it was not possible for us to determine if these two occurrences were actually V600M, or if they co-occurred with another variant that was filtered out for quality reasons, or due to the fact that it was a synonymous variant. There were 64 other samples that had a BRAF V600M variant, but those samples also had either a V600G or V600E variant (Supplementary Table 1). When we examined all studies, including duplicate samples from studies that were submitted at different times, we found that there were conflicting entries for some samples. The SNVs from the earlier submissions were replaced by MNVs in later submissions, indicating that pipelines had probably been updated to correct for MNVs. Some examples of these are the corrections for the KRAS G12 variants and the BRAF V600 variants (Supplementary table 1). One important example of a corrected MNV was a V600D, which consists of a synonymous variant along with a V600E. These variants would be completely missed in our analysis from cBioPortal, since synonymous variants are filtered out. They would only appear if MNVs were correctly handled.

Double base mutation patterns

Somatic variants in cancer genomes have specific patterns, known as Mutational Signatures¹⁶ associated with underlying processes that characterize the specific etiology of the cancer. The Doublet Base Substitution (DBS) Signatures published in Mutational Signatures v3¹⁷ show the two base-pair signatures that are characteristic of certain cancer types.

We analyzed the TCGA data after it had been corrected for MNVs, and identified the most common double-base mutation patterns in Fig. 5a. We found that the CC to TT change was prominent in melanoma samples (Fig. 5b). This is consistent with the reported

signature, DBS 1, which is a characteristic of UV related damage. Lung cancer (LUAD and LUSC) samples predominantly showed CC to AA change (Fig. 5b), which was consistent with the DBS 2 signature, indicating exposure to tobacco smoking¹⁷. This shows that the detected MNVs are consistent with the expected mutational signatures, and by analyzing MNVs, we can detect underlying patterns that would be missed otherwise.

Discussion

We analyzed VCFs from TCGA as well as MAF files from cBioPortal, and found that there were over 12,000 MNVs that were characterized as SNVs in TCGA. Many of these MNVs are in important cancer genes, such as BRAF and KRAS. From a functional perspective, it is important to annotate these variants correctly, so that the effects of the variants can be properly evaluated and interpreted. For example, we did not find a single occurrence of a BRAF V600M alone in any of the studies, it was always in phase with a V600E or V600G.

At the same time a number of publications reference V600M¹⁸⁻²⁸; COSMIC database at the time we reviewed the data lists 31 occurrences of V600M. The methods for detecting the mutation are extremely diverse, ranging from Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism(RFLP) and direct Sanger sequencing to MassArray/Sequenom platform. We cannot evaluate to what extent these methods have the ability to detect MNVs as this is beyond the scope of this study, but it likely these errors are more broadly occurring.

Other studies identified double V600M-V600E or V600M-V600G mutants that are possibly MNVs, as the detection method does not allow for phasing information to be known (typically Sanger sequencing)^{29,30}. In this specific case, the correct identification of the amino acid change may have serious consequences. A number of BRAF inhibitors are

approved for either V600E or V600E/K^{31,32}, but treatment options may differ for other rare mutations, including V600M. For example, there is preclinical data suggesting that BRAF kinase activity may not be altered in V600M/A unlike V600E/K/D³³. Retrospective analysis points to V600K carriers having a worse prognosis³⁴ and worse PFS response to existing BRAF inhibitors³⁵.

From a cancer biology perspective, it is also curious to understand how these MNVs evolve. The V600K/R for example are not driven by UV damage as V600K originates from GT->AA and V600R originates from GT->AG, whereas UV signature is associated with C->T events³⁶. Studies on germ-line MNVs have shown that this type of events tends to be more pathological than SNVs and associated mostly with APOBEC and DNA polymerase zeta³⁷. Another potential mechanism would argue that two independent SNVs happen to occur by chance in the same codon, and that the resulting MNV clone gains an advantage and eventually displaces the original SNV clone from the tumor population. However, we should be able to at least occasionally detect the founding clone mutation in the same tumor specimen, evidence of which we have not seen to date.

There have been many large-scale efforts to characterize MNVs within a germline context, most recently with gnomAD³⁸. However, one of the potential issues we did not address in this paper is when germline variants are part of the same haplotype with a proximal somatic variant as part of the same codon. There is not much evidence that this is a widespread problem³⁹, but it would be important to assess the effect of it.

In our analysis of the various cBioPortal studies, we observed that several studies after 2017 from larger academic hospitals and institutions had corrected for MNVs, indicating that the problem was recognized and fixed in some of these pipelines. We also found that

the ICGC PCAWG⁴⁰ effort and the AACR Genie⁴¹ project called MNVs correctly. However, there are still several smaller academic and commercial labs that may not have fixed this issue, and our analysis shows the need for the MNV merge step to be incorporated into variant-calling pipelines as a standard best practice. Needless to say, clinical assays should be assessed not only on the correct characterization of BRAF V600 mutants, but also the precise amino acid change associated with it.

Methods

MNV Merging for TCGA VCFs

We downloaded 10,383 TCGA VCFs processed using the Mutect2 variant caller on the GRCh38 reference genome from the Cancer Genomics cloud. When nearby variants are part of the same haplotype (in phase), Mutect2 adds tags to indicate this – PGT is the phased genotype of the variant, and PID is an ID that is shared between variants of the same haplotype; this information is then used by a python script to merge SNVs to MNVs.

We downloaded Refseq transcripts BED file from the UCSC table browser (<https://genome.ucsc.edu>) and pre-processed it into a codon file that had the positions of each codon defined. The MNV merge script then used this codon file to determine whether to merge SNVs, based on whether they are part of the same haplotype and codon.

The python script (merge_mnp.py) takes the input VCF, reference genome, pre-processed codons text file and a parameter that specifies if indels should be considered. For the purposes of this study, we did not consider indels. The python script identifies SNVs that are both in phase and within the same codon into a new MNV. The new MNV has a PASS in the filter field, while the original SNVs have a MERGED in the filter field to represent that

they have been superseded by the MNV. All code can be found on GitHub at

<https://github.com/Sentieon/sentieon-scripts>.

The VCFs that have the merged MNVs were annotated using SnpEff. Annotations from gnomAD v2.1.1⁴², dbSNP⁴³ version 146 and COSMIC⁴⁴ version 84 were added to the VCFs, and both “PASS” and “MERGED” variants were retained in order to be able to trace the MNVs and the original SNVs. The repeat masker GRCh38 annotations were used to mask the repetitive regions and were excluded from the MNV analysis. The highly variable MHC region at chromosome 6 position 28510120 - 33480578 was also excluded from the MNV analysis.

cBioPortal

We downloaded Mutation Annotation Files (MAF) from the cBioPortal (<https://www.cbioportal.org/>) by choosing “Curated list of non-redundant studies” for 7 genes – BRAF, KRAS, NRAS, PTEN, BRCA1, BRCA2, MUC16. To identify variants that were part of the same haplotype and at the same codon position, we looked for those instances where there were multiple variants from the same sample at the same codon position, and had the same Variant Allele Frequency (VAF). This indicated that it was highly likely that the variants appeared together on most reads

In addition, we queried the public cBioPortal API (<https://www.cbioportal.org/api/>), retrieving the complete collection of mutation data for all loaded studies. We then filtered mutations for few selected mutation hotspots, i.e. BRAF V600, KRAS G12, and NRAS Q61, and subsequently determined which variant calls occurred in each sample at these hotspots. Samples occurring in multiple studies were combined, but we kept track of the cases where samples had different variant calls between studies.

245

246 **Declarations**

247 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

248 Not applicable

249

250 **Consent for Publication**

251 Not applicable

252

253 **Availability of data and materials**

254 TCGA data is available from the Genomic Data commons at

255 <https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/>. Data from cBioPortal is available at

256 <https://www.cbioportal.org/>.

257

258 **Financial & competing interests disclosure**

259 The research for this paper was funded by Bristol Myers Squibb. Rafael Aldana and
260 Zhipan Li are employees of Sentieon, Inc. Sjoerd van Hagen and Sander Y.A. Rodenburg are
261 employees of The Hyve. Xiaozhong Qian is an employee of Daichi Sankyo, Inc. The other
262 authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. No writing assistance was utilized in the
263 production of this manuscript.

264

265 **Author contributions**

266 SS and NK identified, processed and analyzed the datasets, and wrote the manuscript.

267 SK identified the problem presented in the manuscript and SK, SS and NK conceived the

idea. RA and ZL developed the scripts and code. SH and SR helped with data retrieval and analysis from cBioPortal. MWR, AS, HT and XQ contributed to the analysis of the results and downstream implications. All authors discussed results and contributed to the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The results shown here are in whole or part based upon data generated by the TCGA Research Network: <https://www.cancer.gov/tcga>.

Ethical conduct of research

The authors state that they have obtained appropriate institutional review board approval or have followed the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki for all human or animal experimental investigations. In addition, for investigations involving human subjects, informed consent has been obtained from the participants involved.

Bibliography

1. Ding, L., Wendl, M. C., McMichael, J. F. & Raphael, B. J. Expanding the computational toolbox for mining cancer genomes. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **15**, 556–570 (2014).
2. Benjamin, D. *et al.* Calling Somatic SNVs and Indels with Mutect2. *bioRxiv* 861054 (2019) doi:10.1101/861054.
3. Koboldt, D. C. *et al.* VarScan 2: somatic mutation and copy number alteration discovery in cancer by exome sequencing. *Genome Res.* **22**, 568–576 (2012).

- 291 4. Lai, Z. *et al.* VarDict: a novel and versatile variant caller for next-generation sequencing in
292 cancer research. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, e108 (2016).
- 293 5. Kim, S. *et al.* Strelka2: Fast and accurate variant calling for clinical sequencing
294 applications. *bioRxiv* 192872 (2017) doi:10.1101/192872.
- 295 6. Freed, D., Pan, R. & Aldana, R. TNscope: Accurate Detection of Somatic Mutations with
296 Haplotype-based Variant Candidate Detection and Machine Learning Filtering. *bioRxiv*
297 250647 (2018) doi:10.1101/250647.
- 298 7. Cingolani, P. *et al.* A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single
299 nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster*
300 strain w¹¹¹⁸; iso-2; iso-3. *Fly (Austin)* **6**, 80–92 (2012).
- 301 8. Wang, K., Li, M. & Hakonarson, H. ANNOVAR: functional annotation of genetic variants
302 from high-throughput sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **38**, e164 (2010).
- 303 9. McLaren, W. *et al.* The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. *Genome Biol.* **17**, 122 (2016).
- 304 10. Danecek, P. & McCarthy, S. A. BCFtools/csq: haplotype-aware variant consequences.
305 *Bioinforma. Oxf. Engl.* **33**, 2037–2039 (2017).
- 306 11. Wei, L. *et al.* MAC: identifying and correcting annotation for multi-nucleotide variations.
307 *BMC Genomics* **16**, (2015).
- 308 12. Khan, W. *et al.* MACARON: a python framework to identify and re-annotate multi-base
309 affected codons in whole genome/exome sequence data. *Bioinforma. Oxf. Engl.* **34**,
310 3396–3398 (2018).
- 311 13. Lee, C.-H., Yelensky, R., Jooss, K. & Chan, T. A. Update on Tumor Neoantigens and Their
312 Utility: Why It Is Good to Be Different. *Trends Immunol.* **39**, 536–548 (2018).

- 313 14. Gao, J. *et al.* Integrative analysis of complex cancer genomics and clinical profiles using
314 the cBioPortal. *Sci. Signal.* **6**, pl1 (2013).
- 315 15. Cerami, E. *et al.* The cBio cancer genomics portal: an open platform for exploring
316 multidimensional cancer genomics data. *Cancer Discov.* **2**, 401–404 (2012).
- 317 16. Alexandrov, L. B. & Stratton, M. R. Mutational signatures: the patterns of somatic
318 mutations hidden in cancer genomes. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **24**, 52–60 (2014).
- 319 17. Alexandrov, L. B. *et al.* The repertoire of mutational signatures in human cancer. *Nature*
320 **578**, 94–101 (2020).
- 321 18. Fisher, K. E. *et al.* Accurate detection of BRAF p.V600E mutations in challenging
322 melanoma specimens requires stringent immunohistochemistry scoring criteria or
323 sensitive molecular assays. *Hum. Pathol.* **45**, 2281–2293 (2014).
- 324 19. Lee, S. H. *et al.* BRAF and KRAS mutations in stomach cancer. *Oncogene* **22**, 6942–6945
325 (2003).
- 326 20. Siroy, A. E. *et al.* Beyond BRAF(V600): clinical mutation panel testing by next-generation
327 sequencing in advanced melanoma. *J. Invest. Dermatol.* **135**, 508–515 (2015).
- 328 21. Santarpia, L. *et al.* Mutation profiling identifies numerous rare drug targets and distinct
329 mutation patterns in different clinical subtypes of breast cancers. *Breast Cancer Res.*
330 *Treat.* **134**, 333–343 (2012).
- 331 22. Liu, S. *et al.* Rapid detection of genetic mutations in individual breast cancer patients by
332 next-generation DNA sequencing. *Hum. Genomics* **9**, (2015).
- 333 23. RAS/RAF pathway activation in gliomas: the result of copy number gains rather than
334 activating mutations. - Abstract - Europe PMC.
335 <https://europepmc.org/article/med/17588166>.

- 336 24. Chan, T. L., Zhao, W., Leung, S. Y., Yuen, S. T. & Cancer Genome Project. BRAF and KRAS
337 mutations in colorectal hyperplastic polyps and serrated adenomas. *Cancer Res.* **63**,
338 4878–4881 (2003).
- 339 25. Lovly, C. M. *et al.* Routine multiplex mutational profiling of melanomas enables
340 enrollment in genotype-driven therapeutic trials. *PloS One* **7**, e35309 (2012).
- 341 26. Litvak, A. M. *et al.* Clinical characteristics and course of 63 patients with BRAF mutant
342 lung cancers. *J. Thorac. Oncol. Off. Publ. Int. Assoc. Study Lung Cancer* **9**, 1669–1674
343 (2014).
- 344 27. Parakh, S., Murphy, C., Lau, D., Cebon, J. S. & Andrews, M. C. Response to MAPK
345 pathway inhibitors in BRAF V600M-mutated metastatic melanoma. *J. Clin. Pharm. Ther.*
346 **40**, 121–123 (2015).
- 347 28. Popescu, A., Haidar, A. & Anghel, R. M. Treating malignant melanoma when a rare BRAF
348 V600M mutation is present: case report and literature review. *Romanian J. Intern. Med.*
349 *Rev. Roum. Med. Interne* **56**, 122–126 (2018).
- 350 29. Ponti, G., Tomasi, A. & Pellacani, G. Overwhelming response to Dabrafenib in a patient
351 with double BRAF mutation (V600E; V600M) metastatic malignant melanoma. *J. Hematol.*
352 *Oncol. J Hematol Oncol* **5**, 60 (2012).
- 353 30. Ponti, G. *et al.* The somatic affairs of BRAF: tailored therapies for advanced malignant
354 melanoma and orphan non-V600E (V600R-M) mutations. *J. Clin. Pathol.* **66**, 441–445
355 (2013).
- 356 31. FDA Approves Dabrafenib Plus Trametinib for Adjuvant Treatment of Melanoma With
357 **BRAF** V600E or V600K Mutations - The ASCO Post.

- 358 https://www.ascopost.com/News/58790?utm_source=TrendMD&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=Skin_Cancer_TrendMD_0.
- 359
- 360 32. FDA Grants Regular Approval to Dabrafenib and Trametinib Combination for Metastatic
- 361 NSCLC With *BRAF* V600E Mutation - The ASCO Post.
- 362 https://www.ascopost.com/News/57776?utm_source=TrendMD&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=Lung_Cancer_TrendMD_0.
- 363
- 364 33. Kiel, C., Benisty, H., Lloréns-Rico, V. & Serrano, L. The yin–yang of kinase activation and
- 365 unfolding explains the peculiarity of Val600 in the activation segment of *BRAF*. *eLife* **5**,
- 366 e12814 (2016).
- 367 34. Li, Y., Umbach, D. M. & Li, L. Putative genomic characteristics of *BRAF* V600K versus
- 368 V600E cutaneous melanoma. *Melanoma Res.* **27**, 527–535 (2017).
- 369 35. Pires da Silva, I. *et al.* Distinct Molecular Profiles and Immunotherapy Treatment
- 370 Outcomes of V600E and V600K *BRAF*-Mutant Melanoma. *Clin. Cancer Res. Off. J. Am.*
- 371 *Assoc. Cancer Res.* **25**, 1272–1279 (2019).
- 372 36. Brash, D. E. UV Signature Mutations. *Photochem. Photobiol.* **91**, 15–26 (2015).
- 373 37. Kaplanis, J. *et al.* Exome-wide assessment of the functional impact and pathogenicity of
- 374 multinucleotide mutations. *Genome Res.* **29**, 1047–1056 (2019).
- 375 38. Wang, Q. *et al.* Landscape of multi-nucleotide variants in 125,748 human exomes and
- 376 15,708 genomes. *bioRxiv* 573378 (2019) doi:10.1101/573378.
- 377 39. Koiré, A. *et al.* Codon-level co-occurrences of germline variants and somatic mutations in
- 378 cancer are rare but often lead to incorrect variant annotation and underestimated impact
- 379 prediction. *PLoS ONE* **12**, (2017).
- 380 40. Pan-cancer analysis of whole genomes. *Nature* **578**, 82–93 (2020).

41. Consortium, T. A. P. G. AACR Project GENIE: Powering Precision Medicine through an
International Consortium. *Cancer Discov.* (2017) doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-17-0151.
42. Karczewski, K. J. *et al.* Variation across 141,456 human exomes and genomes reveals the
spectrum of loss-of-function intolerance across human protein-coding genes. *bioRxiv*
531210 (2019) doi:10.1101/531210.
43. Sherry, S. T. *et al.* dbSNP: the NCBI database of genetic variation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **29**,
308–311 (2001).
44. Tate, J. G. *et al.* COSMIC: the Catalogue Of Somatic Mutations In Cancer. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. **47**, D941–D947 (2019).

Figures and Tables legends

Fig. 1: Schematic presentation of MNV and SNV events. (a) Two SNVs co-occurring on the
same read indicate they are part of the same haplotype and should be annotated as MNV.
(b) Two adjacent SNVs are on different reads and should be annotated as individual SNVs.

Fig. 2: Novel MNV effects in TCGA data. (a) Categories and examples of the MNV novel
annotation effects as a result of combination of two SNVs. (b) Number of MNVs for novel
effects in TCGA data.

Fig. 3: MNV summary in TCGA dataset. (a) Distribution of TCGA samples by indication. The
bars indicate the percent of samples that had MNV(s). (b) Boxplot of the SNV count per
indication. (c) Boxplot of the MNV count per indication. Indications are ordered the same as
the SNV count. (d) Distribution of novel and original MNV for genes with total MNV ≥ 10 .

404

405 **Fig. 4:** Variant allele frequencies of variants present on the same codon in cBioPortal. The
406 high correlation between the VAs of the variants indicates that they were present on the
407 same reads.

408

409 **Fig. 5:** Double-base mutation patterns found in the TCGA data based on the MNV
410 corrections. (a) Frequency of double-base mutation patterns found in all indications of TCGA
411 results. The reverse complement was accounted according to the double-base signatures
412 described in Alexandrov et al, 2020. (b) Double-base mutation patterns plotted for the
413 selected indications: melanoma and lung carcinoma. Lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and lung
414 squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) were combined into one panel for lung carcinoma.

415

416 **Table 1:** Most commonly mis-annotated MNVs in cBioPortal among the 7 genes that were
417 studied

418

419 **Supplementary Table 1:** Table of all samples from cBioPortal that have a variant at the BRAF
420 V600 and G469, KRAS G12 and NRAS Q61 loci. The common samples that have conflicting
421 annotations between studies are indicated by separating with a ";"

A **B**

Figure 1: Schematic presentation of MNV and SNV events. (A) The 2 SNVs co-occurring on the same reads indicates they are part of the same haplotype and should be annotated as MNV. (B) The 2 SNVs in this case are adjacent but on different reads, and should be annotated as individual SNVs.

Gene	SNVs	MNV	Count
BRAF	V600M + V600E	V600K	52
BRAF	V600M + V600G	V600R	9
BRAF	G469V + G469*	G469L	2
KRAS	G12V + G12C	G12F	8
KRAS	G12A + G12C	G12S	2
KRAS	G12V + G12S	G12I	2
KRAS	G12V + G12R	G12L	2
NRAS	Q61R + Q61K	Q61R	5

Table 1: Most commonly mis-annotated MNVs in cBioPortal among the 7 genes that were studied

A

Category	SNVs effects	MNV effect
Novel missense	missense A, missense B	missense C
Rescue of nonsense	stop gained, missense A	missense B
Gain of nonsense	missense A, missense B	stop gain
Novel splice	splice A, splice B	splice C
Rescue of missense	missense A, missense B	synonymous
Other	stop lost, missense A	missense B

B

Figure 2: Novel MNV effects in TCGA data. (A) Categories and examples of the MNV novel annotation effect as a result of combination of two SNVs. (B) Number of MNVs for novel effects in TCGA data.

Figure 3: MNV summary in TCGA dataset. (A) Distribution of TCGA samples by indication. The bars indicate the percent of samples that had MNV(s). (B) Boxplot of the SNV count per indication. (C) Boxplot of the MNV count per indication. Indications are ordered the same as the SNV count. (D) Distribution of novel and original MNV for genes with total MNV ≥ 10 .

Figure 4: Variant allele frequencies of variants present on the same codon in cBioPortal. The high correlation between the VAFs of the variants indicates that they were present on the same reads.

A

Double-base mutation patterns in TCGA results

B

Double-base mutation patterns for the selected indications

Figure 5: Double-base mutation patterns found in the TCGA data based on the MNV corrections. (A) Frequency of double-base mutation patterns found in all indications of TCGA results. The reverse complement was accounted according to the double-base signatures described in Alexandrov et al, 2020. **(B)** Double-base mutation patterns plotted for the selected indications: melanoma and lung carcinoma. Lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) were combined into one panel for lung carcinoma.