

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Validation of oral brushing as a non-invasive technique for the identification of feline oral squamous cell carcinoma by DNA methylation and TP53 mutation analysis

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Renzi, A., Morandi, L., Bellei, E., Marconato, L., Rigillo, A., Aralla, M., et al. (2021). Validation of oral brushing as a non-invasive technique for the identification of feline oral squamous cell carcinoma by DNA methylation and TP53 mutation analysis. *VETERINARY AND COMPARATIVE ONCOLOGY*, 19(3), 501-509 [10.1111/vco.12688].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/836765> since: 2021-11-01

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1111/vco.12688>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Validation of oral brushing as a non-invasive technique for the identification of feline oral squamous cell carcinoma by DNA methylation and *TP53* mutation analysis

Abstract

Feline oral squamous cell carcinoma (FOSCC) is a frequent and progressively invasive tumour. Early lesions are difficult to recognize based on the sole clinical examination and may be misinterpreted as non-neoplastic. Mutations of *TP53* and epigenetic alterations of specific genes are present in FOSCC and may be early detected. Aim of this prospective study was to investigate the DNA methylation pattern of a 17-gene panel and *TP53* mutational status of FOSCC cytological samples obtained by oral brushing. Results were compared with a control group, in order to validate this non-invasive procedure for the screening of FOSCC. In FOSCC, the same analyses were carried out on the corresponding histological sample, if available. Thirty-five FOSCC and 60 controls were included. Mutations of *TP53* were detected in 17 FOSCC brushings (48%) and in none of the controls ($P < 0.001$). Six genes (*ZAP70*, *FLI1*, *MiR124-1*, *KIF1A*, *MAGEC2*, *MiR363*) were differentially methylated in FOSCC and were included in a methylation score. An algorithm based on *TP53* mutational status and methylation score allowed to differentiate FOSCC from controls with a 69% sensitivity and a 97% specificity (accuracy, 86%).

In 19 FOSCC histological samples, *TP53* mutational status was fully concordant with brushings, and a positive methylation score was observed in all cases. These results are promising for the identification of FOSCC by oral brushing, although some factors may limit the accuracy of this technique, and further studies are required to assess its reproducibility in clinical practice.

1
2
3 **Keywords:** oral squamous cell carcinoma; feline; oral brushing; early diagnosis; p53; DNA
4
5
6 methylation; bisulfite next generation sequencing.
7
8

9 10 **Introduction**

11
12 Feline oral squamous cell carcinoma (FOSCC) is a frequent tumour, characterized by high local
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Feline oral squamous cell carcinoma (FOSCC) is a frequent tumour, characterized by high local
invasiveness and rapid progression. Histological biopsy currently provides the best means of
diagnosis, but early lesions can pass unnoticed or be misdiagnosed as a dental complaint, which is
commonly encountered in aged cats. Thus, in most cases, FOSCC are not identified until the lesion
has progressed significantly, with associated oral pain, anorexia and halitosis due to bacterial
infection. At this time, the prognosis is usually poor, regardless of treatment. A timely diagnosis is
therefore a cornerstone to improve the chances of survival of affected cats.^{1,2}

Aberrant DNA methylation involving cytosine-phosphate-guanine (CpG) islands is an early
epigenetic change in carcinogenesis and has long been considered as a promising biomarker for the
diagnosis of cancer.³⁻⁵ Several studies have explored the possibility of detecting aberrant DNA
methylation in cells obtained by non-invasive techniques, allowing the identification of early-stage
human oral squamous cell carcinoma (HOSCC) and preneoplastic lesions.⁶⁻⁸

Recently, a step-wise algorithm including the methylation profile of 4 genes (*KIF1A*, *FLI1*, *MIR124-1*
and *MAGEC2*) and the mutational status of *TP53* allowed to differentiate histological biopsies of
FOSCC from non-neoplastic samples with a 94% sensitivity and a 100% specificity.⁹

The aim of the present study was to investigate the methylation profile of a larger panel of genes
and the mutational status of *TP53* on cytological samples obtained by oral brushing. FOSCC were
compared with a control group including normal oral mucosa and other oral lesions, in order to
validate the diagnostic utility of this non-invasive procedure for the screening of feline oral cancer.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Materials and Methods

Study design and cytobrush procedure

A prospective study was carried out on feline patients presented with oral squamous cell carcinoma at the Veterinary Hospital of XXX and at different private veterinary clinics in XXX. In addition, cats of at least 5 years of age referred for other oral lesions (control group) were enrolled from a dental facility center (XXX). Finally, healthy control samples represented by cats without dental problems, were recruited upon owner compliance on a voluntary basis. Written informed consent was required for inclusion.

Demographic information and clinical presentation were collected for each case.

Cytological or histological diagnosis was a mandatory requirement for all FOSSC cases.

For the other oral lesions, diagnoses were obtained either histologically or clinically by a single specialist (XX). Healthy oral mucosa was judged as such by the same specialist.

A cytobrush was used to collect exfoliated cells from oral mucosa. For the cats requiring general anesthesia for a medical procedure, cell sampling was performed during anesthesia.

For FOSSC and other oral lesions, the surface of the lesion was gently brushed repeatedly for at least five seconds. For FOSSC, whenever possible, a second brush from the lesion and a third one from the clinically normal oral mucosa distant to the tumour were also obtained. For healthy control samples, brushes were obtained by gently rubbing all the oral mucosa, including gingiva, vestibule, palate and tongue. After sampling, each cytobrush was placed in a 1.8-mL tube containing DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo Research Europe, Freiberg, Germany) for cell preservation.

For FOSSC, genetic analyses were carried out in parallel on the corresponding histological samples, if available.

Ethics statement

1
2
3 All the examined FOSCC samples (cytobrush and biopsies) were collected with a primary diagnostic
4 intent as part of routine standard care. For control cases, brushings were obtained either under
5 general anesthesia for other medical procedures or on alert cats, in the case of healthy and good-
6 natured subjects. Since no invasive procedures have been performed and the results of the present
7 research did not influence any therapeutic decision, approval by an ethics committee was not
8 required. However, all cats' owners were informed of the study purposes and methods and
9 participated on a voluntary basis, by signing a written informed consent.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *Genetic and Epigenetic Analyses*

21 Analyses were performed at XXX.

22
23 For DNA methylation analysis, DNA from cytobrush specimens were purified using the MasterPure
24 Complete DNA extraction kit (Lucigen, code MC85200, Madison, WI, USA). DNA from formalin-fixed
25 and paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissues (five consecutive 10 µm section for each sample) were
26 purified using the QuickExtract FFPE DNA Extraction kit (Lucigen, code QEF81050)
27

28 Bisulfite treatment of genomic DNA (200-500 ng) was carried out with the EZ DNA Methylation-
29 Lightning Kit (Zymo Research Europe, Freiberg, Germany), according to the manufacturer's protocol.
30

31 The panel included 17 target genes (*RB1*, *TERT*, *MiR296*, *CELSR3*, *EGFR*, *ZAP70*, *LRRTM1*, *KIF1A*,
32 *PDPN*, *PARP15*, *FLI1*, *GP1BB*, *CDKN2A*, *CDH1*, *MiR124*, *MiR363*, *MAGEC2*), selected because their
33 human orthologs were previously identified with altered methylation pattern in HOSCC and/or
34 because an altered protein function had been previously documented in FOSCC (Table 1).⁸⁻²²
35
36
37
38
39

40 In order to identify putative CpG island on promoter regions or early transcriptional regions of
41 genes, genomic sequence stored on Ensembl genome (<http://www.ensembl.org/index.html>) were
42 employed as query sequence. MethPrimer ([http://www.urogene.org/cgi-](http://www.urogene.org/cgi-bin/methprimer/methprimer.cgi)
43 [bin/methprimer/methprimer.cgi](http://www.urogene.org/cgi-bin/methprimer/methprimer.cgi)) designing was applied to identify CpGs and the primers of
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

choice.²³ Primer sequences used in this study are available in Table 1. The interrogated CpG sites for each gene have been numbered consecutively.

Locus-specific amplicon libraries were generated with tagged primers in two steps: a first PCR amplification for target enrichment, and a second shorter amplification session (eight cycles) to allow the barcoding of the template-specific amplicons obtained from the first amplification step. The DNA barcoding was performed using the Nextera Index Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) as previously described.^{8,20,24} The sequencing was conducted on MiSeq sequencer (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA), according to the manufacturer's protocol. Each next-generation sequencing (NGS) experiment was designed to allocate at least one-thousand reads/region, in order to have a depth of coverage of 1000x.

FASTQ files were processed in a Galaxy Project environment by the tool Filter by Quality for the quality control (>Q 30) and Filter FASTQ reads for read lengths (>80 bp). FASTQ files were then mapped by BWA-meth, generating bam files which were in turn processed by MethylDackel using *Felis_catus_9.0* as reference genome. This tool created a file for each case, assigning the exact methylation level for each investigated CpG position.²⁵

TP53 mutations analysis of exons 5-8 was performed as previously described.²⁶ Cases were classified as mutated when presenting one or more alterations in the nucleotide sequence of the amplified exons of feline *TP53*, resulting in amino acid changes with negative impact on the protein function according to PolyPhen-2 (missense mutations) or PROVEAN (indels mutations) and showing a variant allele frequency (VAF) >5%.^{27,28}

Statistical analysis

Continuous data were tested for normality with the D'Agostino and Pearson omnibus normality test. Variables were summarized as mean \pm standard deviation in case of normal distribution, or as

1
2
3 median and range in case of non-normal distribution; categorical variables were summarized as
4
5 frequencies and percentages.
6

7
8 For methylation analysis, the total number of reads of brushings obtained under general anesthesia
9
10 was compared with those obtained from alert cats and the number of reads of brushings was
11
12 compared with biopsies with Mann-Whitney U test. The VAF of *TP53* mutations in brushings was
13
14 compared with that of the corresponding biopsy by Wilcoxon's signed rank sum test for paired data.
15
16

17
18 An algorithm to differentiate FO SCC cytobrushes from controls was developed by integration of
19
20 previously published criteria with the results of new epigenetic analyses, if appropriate.⁹
21
22

23
24 The frequency of *TP53* mutations and alterations in the methylation profile in FO SCCs was compared
25
26 with that found in controls using the chi-square test. The ~~sensibility~~sensitivity, specificity and
27
28 accuracy of this algorithm was calculated.
29

30
31 The proportion of FO SCC correctly identified by the algorithm was compared between cats
32
33 undergoing anesthesia and alert cats using Fisher's exact test.
34

35
36 In the cases where a second cytobrush was obtained from the lesion, the agreement of results
37
38 obtained from the two samples was calculated. Finally, in FO SCC with available histological biopsy,
39
40 the accuracy of the algorithm was compared between cytobrush and biopsy.
41

42
43 Analyses were carried out with a commercial software program (SPSS Statistics v19, IBM, Armonk,
44
45 NY, USA) and the significance level was set at 0.05.
46
47

48 **Cell Line Validation Statement**

49
50 No cell lines were used in the current study.
51

52 **Results**

53 *FO SCC*

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Thirty-five samples of FOSCC were included in the analysis. Tumours belonged to 29 Domestic
4
5 Shorthair (DSH) cats, two domestic longhair (DLH) cats and one each of the following breeds:
6
7 Siamese, Maine Coon, Thai and Chartreux. There were 15 castrated males (43%) and 20 spayed
8
9 females (57%). The median age was 12 years (range, 5-19).
10
11

12 Tumours were located on mandibular gingiva ($n = 11$; 31%), maxillary gingiva ($n = 10$; 29%), tongue
13
14 ($n = 9$; 26%), caudal oral mucosa ($n = 4$; 11%) and vestibular mucosa ($n = 1$; 3%).
15
16

17
18 Cytobrushes were performed under general anesthesia in 26 cases (74%), whereas the remaining 9
19
20 cats were awake (26%). Eleven cats (31%) with FOSCC received a second cytobrush of the tumour,
21
22 while in 19 cats (54%), clinically healthy oral mucosa distant from the tumour was also sampled.
23
24

25 For 19 FOSCC (54%), the corresponding histological sample was submitted for genetic/epigenetic
26
27 analyses.
28
29

30 31 *Controls*

32
33 Sixty cats were enrolled in the control group, including 51 DSH, 3 DLH, 3 Persians and one each of
34
35 the following breeds: Siamese, Norwegian Forest Cat and Sphynx. There were 30 males (50%; 1
36
37 intact and 29 castrated) and 30 females (50%; 1 intact and 29 spayed). The median age was 10 years
38
39 (range, 5-18). Lesions were grouped according to the clinical or histological diagnosis in periodontal
40
41 disease with mucositis ($n = 20$), feline chronic gingivostomatitis (FCGS; $n = 15$), pyogenic granuloma
42
43 ($n = 4$), eosinophilic granuloma ($n = 3$) and oral sarcoma ($n = 3$). Fifteen cytobrush of healthy oral
44
45 mucosa were also included in the analysis.
46
47
48
49
50

51 Cytobrushes were performed under general anesthesia in 42 cases (70%), whereas the remaining
52
53 18 cats (30%) were alert.
54
55

56 57 *TP53 mutational status*

58
59
60

1
2
3 Mutations in the DNA-binding domain of *TP53* were detected in 17 tumours (48%). There were 12
4
5 missense mutations, 1 nonsense mutation, 1 in frame deletion, 2 frameshift deletions and 1
6
7 frameshift insertion; all the examined exons were involved (exon 5, $n = 3$; exon 6, $n = 6$; exon 7, $n =$
8
9 5; exon 8, $n = 3$).

10
11
12 In the 11 mutated FOSCC where the corresponding histological sample was tested, the mutational
13
14 status was confirmed and the same mutation was detected; however, the median VAF of
15
16 histological samples was significantly higher compared with the brush samples (35% vs. 13%; $P =$
17
18 0.05). In all 8 wild type FOSCC cytobrushes with the corresponding histological sample being tested,
19
20 no *TP53* mutation was detected, resulting in a 100% agreement between brushing and biopsies.
21
22
23 Of the 11 FOSCC in which a double brushing of the tumour was performed, 8 (73%) were in
24
25 agreement and 3 (27%) returned discordant results. Of the 19 cases of FOSCC in which a cytobrush
26
27 of the clinically normal oral mucosa distant from the tumour was performed, none had *TP53*
28
29 mutations.
30
31
32

33
34
35 Mutations in the DNA-binding domain of *TP53* were not detected in any control case ($P < 0.001$).

36 37 38 *Genetic analysis and diagnostic algorithm*

39
40
41 A total of 209 CpGs from the genes *RB1*, *TERT*, *MiR296*, *CELSR3*, *EGFR*, *ZAP70*, *LRRTM1*, *KIF1A*, *PDPN*,
42
43 *PARP15*, *FLI1*, *GP1BB*, *CDKN2A*, *CDH1*, *MiR124*, *MiR363*, *MAGEC2* were investigated by bisulfite-
44
45 NGS.
46

47
48 Of the previously tested genes, significant differences between FOSCC and control cases were
49
50 obtained for *ZAP70*, *KIF1A*, *FLI1*, *MiR124* and *MAGEC2*, confirming earlier results.⁹ Of the newly
51
52 tested genes, only *MIR363* showed relevant differential methylation.
53

54
55 Based on these results, a methylation score was formulated, resulting from the sum of the points
56
57 attributed to alterations in the methylation profile of the above-mentioned genes at specific CpG
58
59 sites, including hypermethylation of *ZAP70*, *FLI1* and *MiR124* and hypomethylation of *KIF1A*,
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

MIR363 and *MAGEC2*. Any combination of the detailed alterations totaling A a methylation score ≥ 3 was classified as suggestive of FOSCC (Table 2).

Seventeen FOSCC cytobrushes (48%) received a methylation score ≥ 3 , versus 2 brushings in the control group (3%, both diagnosed with periodontal disease; $P < 0.001$). The methylation score was not associated with *TP53* mutations ($P = 0.238$).

Of the 11 FOSCC in which a double brushing of the tumour was performed, only 3 cats (27%) obtained a positive score in both brushes; 4 cats (36%) obtained a positive result in only one case and 4 (36%) in none. Of the 19 cases of FOSCC in which a cytobrush of the clinically normal oral mucosa distant from the tumour was performed, 7 (37%) had an altered methylation profile similar to the tumour (Table 3).

Of the 19 FOSCC cases in which the analyses were carried out in parallel on the corresponding biopsy sample, all 19 biopsies (100%) had a methylation score ≥ 3 , compared with 11 cytobrushes (58%; $P = 0.003$). However, the overall number of reads was not significantly higher compared with brushings ($P = 0.851$; Table 3). Similarly, in FOSCC, the total number of reads of the cytobrushes obtained under general anesthesia was not significantly different compared with those obtained from alert cats ($P = 0.393$).

Based on these results, a step-wise algorithm was proposed. According to this algorithm, a diagnosis of FOSCC is highly probable in case of at least one of the following:

- *TP53* mutations;
- methylation score ≥ 3

This algorithm allowed to differentiate FOSCC cytobrushes with a 69% sensitivity and 97% specificity (overall accuracy, 86%).

1
2
3 The proportion of FOSCCs positive to the algorithm was significantly higher in cats in which the
4
5 sample was obtained under general anesthesia (21 out of 26; 81%) compared to alert cats (3 out of
6
7 9; 33%; $P = 0.014$).

11 Discussion

12
13 In a previous study, an algorithm based on the mutational analysis of *TP53* and the methylation
14
15 pattern of 4 genes allowed to differentiate histological biopsies of FOSCC from healthy and
16
17 inflammatory controls with a 97% accuracy.⁹

18
19 In ~~this~~ the present study, genetic and epigenetic alterations were detected in samples obtained by
20
21 a non-invasive approach: oral brushing. This method has already provided promising results for
22
23 the early diagnosis of HOSCC and, if applicable in cats, could lead to a significant advantage in
24
25 identifying suspected neoplastic lesions before they reach an advanced and incurable stage.

26
27 ~~In the present study,~~ *TP53* mutational status was confirmed as a reliable marker, with a 100%
28
29 concordance between histological biopsies and brushings, albeit with a lower VAF value in the
30
31 latter, suggesting a greater dilution of neoplastic cells, probably due to the presence of non-
32
33 neoplastic exfoliated cells. However, in this study, as in the previous ones, *TP53* mutations were
34
35 only found in a proportion of cases, meaning that there is a percentage of FOSCC ranging from 30
36
37 to 50% that does not harbor mutations in the sequenced exons. The correct identification of these
38
39 cases is therefore entirely dependent on the detection of abnormal methylation patterns, which
40
41 has returned more variable results in this study.

42
43 In addition to the 10 previously investigated genes, we tested the diagnostic potential of 7 other
44
45 genes whose molecular pathways showed significant dysregulations in previous studies on FOSCC
46
47 and/or the human counterpart, including *RB1*, *CELSR3*, *EGFR*, *PDPN*, *p16*, *CDH1*,

48
49 *MIR363*.^{12,13,18,19,22,29}

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Of these genes however, only *MIR363* was differentially methylated in FOSCC compared with controls. Of the previously investigated genes, the 4 already included in the formerly developed algorithm (*FLI1*, *MIR124-1*, *KIF1A* and *MAGEC2*) confirmed their diagnostic relevance, and *ZAP70* was included as well.

However, compared with biopsies, the amplitude of differential methylation between FOSCC and controls was significantly lower in brushings and extremely variable among cases. As a result, an altered methylation pattern was found in all FOSCC biopsies, while only 48% of FOSCC cytobrushes had a methylation score ≥ 3 . Indeed, oral brushing allows a lower selectivity on the lesion when compared with biopsy and, being superficial, runs the risk of sampling cellular debris and necrotic material, whereas the microscopic examination of histological biopsies ensures that a significant amount of neoplastic cells is being tested. Furthermore, during brushing execution, saliva and exfoliated cells may dilute samples, thereby contaminating neoplastic cell DNA with that of normal keratinocytes, other cell types and, potentially, microbial DNA. This hypothesis is supported by the evidence that the number of reads of the analyzed genes in brushing samples was not significantly lower than that found in the corresponding biopsy samples, meaning that a similar amount of DNA was collected. Furthermore, the percentage of cases with altered methylation pattern was significantly higher in samples obtained under general anesthesia, suggesting that a more targeted and probably more prolonged sampling can improve diagnostic accuracy.

Importantly, in only 27% of FOSCC receiving a double sampling the test returned a positive result in both. According to a possible explanation, the first sampling may only collect necrotic material and cellular debris; once the outer crust is removed, the second sampling could successfully collect neoplastic cells. Alternatively, the second sampling may have been inadvertently performed too hastily, especially if the cat was awake.

1
2
3 Finally, an altered methylation pattern was observed in 37% of cases in which normal oral mucosa
4
5 distant from the tumour was sampled. This may be due to neoplastic cell exfoliation in saliva, but
6
7 the evidence of this finding only in a part of cases could also be explained with the theory of field
8
9 cancerization. According to this theory, large tissue areas exposed to the same insult for a
10
11 prolonged period of time can be initiated to the process of carcinogenesis; this predisposes to the
12
13 onset of multiple independent tumours following a promoter event.³⁰

14
15
16
17
18 According to several studies, the alteration of the epigenetic pattern is a very early event in the
19
20 carcinogenetic process, potentially earlier than *TP53* mutations, which in fact were not detected
21
22 in any brushing of oral mucosa distant from tumours. This leads to the assumption that it is
23
24 precisely on methylation that we must focus to develop an early screening test. Another possibility
25
26 is that epigenetic alterations occur in senescent cells even if not neoplastic and therefore may
27
28 represent non-specific event linked to the advanced age of patients, but the fact that they have
29
30 not been found significantly in cats of the control group (which only had a mildly lower median
31
32 age) leads us to consider this hypothesis less likely.³¹

33
34
35
36
37 Further encouraging data is that very rare control cases showed alterations, indicating a high
38
39 specificity of the test. This let us hypothesize that, in most cases, chronic inflammation does not
40
41 significantly alter the methylome, suggesting the possibility of identifying neoplastic lesions at
42
43 their initial stage, and to effectively differentiate them from morphologically similar lesions of
44
45 different nature, such as a pyogenic granuloma or ulcerative-hyperplastic gingival lesions in the
46
47 context of chronic inflammatory diseases. Not even sarcomas, the second most frequent oral
48
49 cancer in cats, showed alterations in the examined genes, further confirming the selectivity of
50
51 these changes in FOSCC.

52
53
54
55 Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that the great majority of FOSCC tested in this study were
56
57 at an advanced stage. Hence, the actual sensitivity of the test in identifying the subclinical lesions
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(i.e. not obvious lesions which would be biopsied anyway) needs to be addressed to ultimately confirm the clinical utility of this procedure. Only the cases detected early can be treated effectively and get an improvement in terms of survival and quality of life. In this scenario, a sensitivity of 70%, even if not excellent, could bring significant benefits to a number of patients. Reasoning in terms of technical applicability and cost analysis, the availability of NGS platforms is increasing in veterinary medicine; and evidence suggests the value of these methods applied in clinical fields, beyond research purposes, as demonstrated for infectious diseases.^{32,33} In human oncology, NGS technologies have revolutionized the approach to molecular diagnostics, thanks to their ability to investigate hundreds of targets simultaneously instead of performing numerous single-gene biomarker assays. This can result in improved tissue utilization, efficiency and cost-effectiveness.³⁴ Although the initial investment cost remains high, the price per information unit (nucleotide) is lower compared with first generation sequencing, and the analysis of larger numbers of samples may make the cost for the single sample comparable to other ancillary molecular tests performed in veterinary laboratories. The time commitment is also comparable to other molecular diagnostic techniques, although the execution of NGS experiments requires specific competences for the instrument and the bioinformatic analysis of data.

Despite these promising data, the detection of the methylation score in FOSCC remains a critical point, especially in the subgroup without *TP53* mutations, whose identification by oral brushing seems less problematic. The effectiveness of the methylation score in histological biopsies lead to assume that the limits of the method are mainly related to the execution of sampling. Namely, the cooperation of patients appears to be critical. The fact that the technique is less effective in alert cats can be considered a limitation for a screening test, but only during general anesthesia cat's mouth can be carefully inspected, allowing the identification of potentially neoplastic lesions. Sampling could therefore be obtained during scaling sessions, which are frequently performed in

1
2
3 aged cats. Additionally, earlier lesions could be less painful and therefore easier to sample in alert
4
5 patients. Further measures to enhance method's sensitivity could be to systematically carry out a
6
7 double sampling, compare the performances of different collection devices, provide the clinicians
8
9 with detailed instructions on how to perform the procedure in order to reduce operator variability
10
11 and ensure an adequate restraining of animals in the absence of general anesthesia.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Data Availability Statement**

19 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon
20
21 reasonable request.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **References**

- 28
29 1. Bilgic O, Duda L, Sánchez MD, Lewis JR. Feline Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma: Clinical
30
31 Manifestations and Literature Review. *J Vet Dent* 2015;32(1):30-40.
32
33
- 34
35 2. Liptak JM. Cancer of the gastrointestinal tract. In: Vail DM, Thamm DH, Liptak JM, Withrow
36
37 and MacEwen's Small Animal Clinical Oncology. 6th ed. St. Louis, Missouri: Elsevier;
38
39 2019:432-448.
40
41
- 42
43 3. Heyn H, Esteller M. DNA methylation profiling in the clinic: applications and challenges. *Nat*
44
45 *Rev Genet* 2012;13(10):679–692.
46
47
- 48
49 4. Kanwal R, Gupta K, Gupta S. Cancer Epigenetics: An Introduction. In: Verma M, ed. Cancer
50
51 Epigenetics: Risk Assessment, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prognosis. New York, NY: Humana
52
53 Press; 2015:1238:3-26.
54
55
- 56
57 5. Irimie AI, Ciocan C, Gulei D, et al. Current Insights into oral cancer epigenetics. *Int J Mol Sci*
58
59 2018;19(3):670.
60

- 1
2
3 6. Shaw RJ, Hobkirk AJ, Nikolaidis G, et al. Molecular staging of surgical margins in oral
4
5 squamous cell carcinoma using promoter methylation of p16(INK4A), cytoglobin, E-cadherin,
6
7 and TMEFF2. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013;20(8):2796–2802.
8
- 9
10 7. Schussel J, Zhou XC, Zhang Z, et al. EDNRB and DCC salivary rinse hypermethylation has a
11
12 similar performance as expert clinical examination in discrimination of oral cancer/dysplasia
13
14 versus benign lesions. *Clin Cancer Res* 2013;19(12):3268-75.
15
16
- 17
18 8. Morandi L, Gissi D, Tarsitano A et al. DNA methylation analysis by bisulfite next-generation
19
20 sequencing for early detection of oral squamous cell carcinoma and high-grade squamous
21
22 intraepithelial lesion from oral brushing. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg* 2015;43(8):1494-1500.
23
24
- 25
26 9. Renzi A, Morandi L, Lenzi J, et al. Analysis of DNA methylation and TP53 mutational status
27
28 for differentiating feline oral squamous cell carcinoma from non-neoplastic mucosa: A
29
30 preliminary study. *Vet Comp Oncol* 2020;18(4):825-837.
31
32
- 33
34 10. Marsit CJ, Christensen BC, Houseman EA, et al. Epigenetic profiling reveals etiologically
35
36 distinct patterns of DNA methylation in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma.
37
38 *Carcinogenesis* 2009;30(3):416-422.
39
- 40
41 11. Demokan S, Chang X, Chuang A, et al. KIF1A and EDNRB are differentially methylated in
42
43 primary HNSCC and salivary rinses. *Int J Cancer* 2010;127(10):2351-2359.
44
- 45
46 12. Bergkvist GT, Argyle DJ, Morrison L, MacIntyre N, Hayes A, Yool DA. Expression of epidermal
47
48 growth factor receptor (EGFR) and Ki67 in feline oral squamous cell carcinomas (FO SCC). *Vet*
49
50 *Comp Oncol* 2011;9(2):106-117.
51
- 52
53 13. Mascolo M, Siano M, Ilardi G, et al. Epigenetic dysregulation in oral cancer. *Int J Mol Sci*
54
55 2012;13(2):2331-2353.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 14. Roh JL, Westra WH, Califano JA, Sidransky D, Koch WM. Tissue imprint for molecular
4
5 mapping of deep surgical margins in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma.
6
7 *Head Neck* 2012;34(11):1529-1536.
8
- 9
10 15. Sun Q, Zhang J, Cao W, et al. Dysregulated miR-363 affects head and neck cancer invasion
11
12 and metastasis by targeting podoplanin. *Int J Biochem Cell Biol* 2013;45(3):513-520.
13
- 14
15 16. Guerrero-Preston R, Michailidi C, Marchionni L, et al. Key tumor suppressor genes
16
17 inactivated by “greater promoter” methylation and somatic mutations in head and neck
18
19 cancer. *Epigenetics* 2014;9(7):1031-1046.
20
- 21
22 17. Li YF, Hsiao YH, Lai YH, et al. DNA methylation profiles and biomarkers of oral squamous cell
23
24 carcinoma. *Epigenetics* 2015;10(3):229-236.
25
- 26
27 18. Supsavhad W, Dirksen WP, Hildreth BE, Rosol TJ. p16, pRb, and p53 in Feline Oral Squamous
28
29 Cell Carcinoma. *Vet Sci* 2016;3(3):18.
30
- 31
32 19. Itai S, Yamada S, Kaneko MK, et al. Expression of Cat Podoplanin in Feline Squamous Cell
33
34 Carcinomas. *Monoclon Antib Immunodiagn Immunother* 2017;36(6):243-250.
35
- 36
37 20. Morandi L, Gissi D, Tarsitano A, et al. CpG location and methylation level are crucial factors
38
39 for the early detection of oral squamous cell carcinoma in brushing samples using bisulfite
40
41 sequencing of a 13-gene panel. *Clin Epigenetics* 2017;9(1):85.
42
- 43
44 21. Lian Y, Meng L, Ding P, Sang, M. Epigenetic regulation of MAGE family in human cancer
45
46 progression-DNA methylation, histone modification, and non-coding RNAs. *Clin Epigenetics*
47
48 2018;10(1):115.
49
- 50
51 22. Fan S, Tang J, Li N, et al. Integrative analysis with expanded DNA methylation data reveals
52
53 common key regulators and pathways in cancers. *NPJ Genom Med* 2019;4(1),1-11.
54
- 55
56 23. Li LC, Dahiya R. MethPrimer: designing primers for methylation PCRs. *Bioinformatics*
57
58 2002;18(11):1427–1431.
59
60

- 1
2
3 24. Gabusi A, Gissi DB, Montebugnoli L, et al. Prognostic impact of intra-field heterogeneity in
4
5 oral squamous cell carcinoma. *Virchows Arch* 2020;476(4),585-595.
6
7
8 25. Afgan E, Baker D, Batut B, et al. The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and
9
10 collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2018; 46(W1): W537–
11
12 W544.
13
14
15 26. Renzi A, De Bonis P, Morandi L, et al. Prevalence of p53 dysregulations in feline oral
16
17 squamous cell carcinoma and non-neoplastic oral mucosa. *PLoS One* 2019;14(4):e0215621.
18
19
20 27. Adzhubei IA, Schmidt S, Peshkin L, et al. A method and server for predicting damaging
21
22 missense mutations. *Nat Methods* 2010;7(4):248–249.
23
24
25 28. Choi Y, Chan AP. PROVEAN web server: a tool to predict the functional effect of amino acid
26
27 substitutions and indels. *Bioinformatics* 2015;31(16):2745-2747.
28
29
30 29. Gissi DB, Gabusi A, Tarsitano A, Luccarini L, Morandi L, Montebugnoli L. Podoplanin
31
32 expression as a predictive marker of dysplasia in oral leukoplakia. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*
33
34 2018;46(5):759-764.
35
36
37 30. Curtius K, Wright N, Graham T. An evolutionary perspective on field cancerization. *Nat Rev*
38
39 *Cancer* 2018;18(1):19-32.
40
41
42 31. Michalak EM, Burr ML, Bannister AJ, & Dawson, M. A. (2019). The roles of DNA, RNA and
43
44 histone methylation in ageing and cancer. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2019;20(10):573-589.
45
46
47 32. Ghosh M, Sharma N, Singh AK, Gera M, Pulicherla KK, Jeong DK. Transformation of animal
48
49 genomics by next-generation sequencing technologies: a decade of challenges and their
50
51 impact on genetic architecture. *Crit Rev Biotechnol.* 2018;38(8):1157-1175.
52
53
54
55 33. Zamperin G, Lucas P, Cano I, et al. Sequencing of animal viruses: quality data assurance for
56
57 NGS bioinformatics. *Virol J.* 2019;16(1):140.
58
59
60

1
2
3 [31.34. Pennell NA, Mutebi A, Zhou Z-Y, et al. Economic impact of next generation](#)
4 [sequencing vs sequential single-gene testing modalities to detect genomic alterations in](#)
5 [metastatic non-small cell lung cancer using a decision analytic model. *J Clin Oncol.*](#)
6 [2018;36\(15 suppl\):9031.](#)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. List of genes interrogated in this study with their relative primers.

| Gene | Description | Forward Primer | Reverse Primer | Number of interrogated CpG | Percentage of the feline sequence* matching the sequence of the human orthologue |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| RB1 - Retinoblastoma | Tumor suppressor gene whose protein pRb is dysregulated in FOSCC;¹⁸ the human RB1 gene was found hypermethylated in HOSCC.¹³ | GGGGGAGTTAT GTYGTTTAAAAT | CRCTCRCTCACC TAAACAA | 21 | 85% |
| TERT - Telomerase reverse transcriptase | Up-regulation of TERT can increase proliferative activity in cancers; Veterinary and Comparative Oncology hypomethylation was reported both in HOSCC and FOSCC.^{9,20} | GGTTTGGGATTT GGGATTAAG | AAACCAAACAA AACCTACTCTA ACT | 6 | 66% |
| MiR296 -MicroRNA 296/KMT2C | MicroRNA gene found hypomethylated in HOSCC and hypermethylated in FOSCC.^{9,20} | TGATTTTTGGTT ATTTTAGTTTTG | CACTCTAAAAAT TTACTACTAAACA CC | 8 | 87% |
| CELSR3 - Cadherin EGF LAG seven-pass G-type receptor 3 | Considered a promising biomarker in HOSCC based on the "triple evidence" of alterations (protein expression, somatic mutations and DNA methylation).²² | ATTTGTAAATAG AAGAAAGAGTA AGAGATG | CATAACAAATCT AACTACTAAAAC C | 9 | 90% |
| EGFR - Epidermal growth factor receptor | Dysregulation of this tyrosine kinase receptor can promote neoplastic transformation and its overexpression has been reported in FOSCC.¹² | GGTTAGTTTTTG ATTTTTATTAGG GTTT | AATTTATACCAA AATCCCATTTC C | 8 | 91% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------------------|----|-----|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 | ZAP70 - Zeta chain of T cell receptor associated protein kinase 70 | Tyrosine kinase normally expressed by natural killer cells and T cells. Hypermethylation of ZAP70 was found in both FOSCC and HOSCC.^{8,9,20} | GATTTYGAYGG GTTGTTTTG | CTCTCACCTCCA ACTTCCAC | 19 | 94% |
| | LRRTM1 - Leucine-rich repeat transmembrane neuronal 1 | Encodes a type I transmembrane protein involved in nerve development and regeneration; hypermethylation of LRRTM1 was found in both HOSCC and FOSCC.^{9,20} | TATAGTTTGGYG GAGGGAAG | CCACTAACCRAT ACCACCTTTT | 20 | 77% |
| | KIF1A - Kinesin family member 1A | Encodes a microtubule-dependent molecular motor involved in important intracellular functions as cell division; KIF1A was found hypermethylated HOSCC and hypomethylated in FOSCC.^{8,9,20} | GGGTAGGGTTG TAGGAGTTTAG | AACTCCAACCTC TTCAAAAACAAAT | 10 | 97% |
| | PDPN - Podoplanin | Transmembrane glycoprotein whose overexpression can favor neoplastic transformation and metastatic invasion in HOSCC;²⁹ expression of podoplanin was also reported in FOSCC.¹⁹ | TTTTTAATTGTA AAGTTTGTTTT T | AATTAATAATC CTCTTTAAAACC C | 7 | 64% |
| | PARP15 - Poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase family member 15 | Nuclear enzyme involved in DNA repair, cell proliferation, and differentiation; PARP15 was found hypermethylated in HOSCC and hypomethylated in FOSCC.^{9,20} | AATTTTAAGATT ATAAGGAAGGT AGAAGTG | CCACAAATACT ATACAAATTCTT C | 10 | 70% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 | <p>FLI1 - <i>Fli-1 proto-oncogene, ETS transcription factor</i></p> <p>GP1BB - <i>Glycoprotein 1b platelet beta subunit</i></p> <p>p16/CDKN2A - <i>Cyclin dependent kinase inhibitor 2A</i></p> <p>CDH1 - <i>Cadherin 1</i></p> <p>MiR124-1 - (<i>ENSFCAG0000016467.6</i>) <i>MicroRNA 124-1</i></p> | <p>Encodes a transcription factor that regulates genes involved in proliferation and differentiation; <i>FLI1</i> was reported to be hypermethylated both in HOSCC and FOSCC.^{9,20}</p> <p>Encodes a transmembrane protein that normally mediates platelet adhesion; it was supposed to act as tumor suppressor in HOSCC, showing aberrant DNA methylation levels.^{8,10,20}</p> <p>Tumor suppressor protein that can be dysregulated in FOSCC;¹⁸ the silencing of this gene by hypermethylation can occur both in HOSCC and in human preneoplastic oral lesions.¹³</p> <p>Encodes E-Cadherin, which regulates intercellular adhesion and polarity of epithelial cells. The under-expression of E-Cadherin may favor the invasiveness of HOSCC; hypermethylation of <i>CDH1</i> was reported in HOSCC.¹³</p> <p>Acts as tumor suppressor by regulating target genes and is down-regulated in several human cancers including HOSCC; <i>Mir124</i> was found hypermethylated in both HOSCC and FOSCC.^{9,20}</p> | <p>AGGGTTTAGGG YGTTAGGG</p> <p>GTTGTTGTTGTT GTTGTTGTTGT</p> <p>GAGYGAGTAGG ATTGGAAG</p> <p>GGAGGGAATTT GGTGGAAT</p> <p>GGATTAAGATT AGATTTTGT T</p> | <p>CCACTACCCAAT CRCTTACC</p> <p>AAACTCCTTAAA ACAAAATCCTAT C</p> <p>CTTCCCCACRA CTTCTTTC</p> <p>AACCRCAACCAA TAAACRAC</p> <p>AAATTTATTCTA CTACCCCTCAAA CC</p> | <p>10</p> <p>26</p> <p>19</p> <p>15</p> <p>7</p> | <p>95%</p> <p>89%</p> <p>80%</p> <p>82%</p> <p>100%</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----|-----|
| MIR363 - Micro-RNA 363 | Encodes the MicroRNA 363, which targets the <i>PDPN</i> gene and inhibits its expression. Hypermethylation of <i>MIR363</i> was associated with podoplanin overexpression in HOSCC.¹⁵ | TTTGGTTTTATTT TATTGTAGTGTG GGTAT | AAAACATATATA AAATCCCAAAC C | 4 | 97% |
| MAGEC2 - Melanoma- associated Antigen C2 | Expressed in several cancer types but not in somatic cells; demethylation of this gene was associated to resisting cell death. Hypomethylation of <i>MAGEC2</i> was reported in FOSCC.⁹ | AGTAGTTTGGG GAAGTTTGTTTT TT | CAATTTAACTAC CATCTTATCTAA AACATC | 10 | 37% |

* Reference genome: *Felis_catus_9.0/felCat9*. [FOSCC: feline oral squamous cell carcinoma](#). [HOSCC: human oral squamous cell carcinoma](#).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60**Table 2.** Methylation score assigned to 95 bushings from feline oral mucosa.

| Gene | Criteria (% methylation) |
|--------|---|
| ZAP70 | >20% in at least one CpG (#3-19): 1 point >40%: 2 points |
| KIF1A | <70% in at least one CpG (#1-3, 5-7) or <30% in CpG #4: 1 point |
| FLI1 | >20% in at least one CpG (#2-5): 1 point >40%: 2 points |
| MiR124 | >40% in at least one CpG (#2, 3): 1 point |
| MiR363 | <70% in CpG #1 or <80% in at least one CpG (#2-4): 1 point |
| MAGEC2 | <70% in one CpG (#7-10): 1 point |

Methylation score: total scorePositive (suggestive ≥ 3 pointsof carcinoma)**Positive methylation score (suggestive of carcinoma) ≥ 3 points.**

Table 3. Oral squamous cell carcinoma samples: mutation analysis of *TP53*, methylation score and algorithm applied on oral brushings and on their corresponding biopsy samples.

| ID | Brushing sample | | | | | | Biopsy sample | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----|----|-----------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-----|----|-----------|
| | <i>TP53</i> | VAF | MS | Algorithm | Algorithm on additional brushing | Algorithm on normal oral mucosa | <i>TP53</i> | VAF | MS | Algorithm |
| 01 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 02 | p.Y227C | 46% | 5 | Pos | - | - | p.Y227C | 25% | 5 | Pos |
| 03 | p.S234F | 6% | 1 | Pos | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 04 | C231_N232 del <i>in frame</i> | 13% | 5 | Pos | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 05 | WT | - | 5 | Pos | - | Pos | WT | - | 5 | Pos |
| 06 | WT | - | 2 | Neg | - | - | WT | - | 5 | Pos |
| 07 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 08 | WT | - | 4 | Pos | - | - | WT | - | 7 | Pos |
| 09 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | Neg | Neg | WT | - | 3 | Pos |
| 10 | p.R150H | 18% | 3 | Pos | - | - | p.R150H | 35% | 6 | Pos |
| 11 | p.R167H | 13% | 3 | Pos | - | - | p.R167H | 17% | 5 | Pos |
| 12 | WT | - | 4 | Pos | - | - | WT | - | 4 | Pos |
| 13 | p.R206* | 24% | 4 | Pos | - | Pos | p.R206* | 73% | 6 | Pos |
| 14 | p.V209A | 7% | 0 | Pos | - | - | p.V209A | 13% | 4 | Pos |
| 15 | p.V209A | 13% | 5 | Pos | - | Pos | p.V209A | 52% | 8 | Pos |
| 16 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|-----|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 18 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 19 | p.G272E | 26% | 5 | Pos | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 20 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | - | - | Neg | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | 21 | WT | - | 4 | Pos | Neg | Pos | Pos | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 22 | p.R242K | 70% | 4 | Pos | Pos | Pos | Pos | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 23 | p.E172K | 38% | 4 | Pos | - | - | Neg | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | 24 | p.R206Q | 12% | 2 | Pos | - | - | Neg | p.R206Q | 27% | 6 | Pos | Pos |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | 25 | p.E264K | 12% | 1 | Pos | Neg | Neg | Neg | p.E264K | 49% | 5 | Pos | Pos |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | 26 | WT | - | 1 | Neg | Neg | Neg | Neg | WT | - | 4 | Pos | Pos |
| 17 | 27 | T277del <i>frameshift</i> | 16% | 2 | Pos | - | - | Neg | T277del <i>frameshift</i> | 48% | 5 | Pos | Pos |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | 28 | WT | - | 0 | Neg | Neg | Neg | Neg | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | 29 | WT | - | 1 | Neg | Neg | Neg | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | 30 | WT | - | 3 | Pos | Neg | Pos | Pos | - | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | 31 | S253 ins <i>frameshift</i> | 60% | 7 | Pos | Pos | Pos | Pos | S253ins <i>frameshift</i> | 34% | 6 | Pos | Pos |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | 32 | P183_L187 del <i>frameshift</i> | 8% | 2 | Pos | Neg | Neg | Neg | P183_L187del <i>frameshift</i> | 47% | 4 | Pos | Pos |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | 33 | p.R206Q | 7% | 2 | Pos | - | - | Neg | - | - | - | - | - |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | 34 | WT | - | 3 | Pos | Pos | Neg | Neg | WT | - | 6 | Pos | Pos |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | 35 | WT | - | 3 | Pos | - | - | Neg | WT | - | 6 | Pos | Pos |

WT: wild type; VAF: Variant allele frequency; MS: Methylation score; Pos: positive; Neg: negative.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46