### Your abstract submission has been received

Click here to print this page now.

You have submitted the following abstract to the 2017 ASCO Annual Meeting (June 2-6, 2017). Receipt of this notice does not guarantee that your submission was complete, free of errors, or accepted for presentation. Abstract notifications will be sent to the First Author by April 3, 2017.

# Comparing actionable results for breast and colorectal cancer patients across multigene panels.

Kelly Fulk, Carin Espenschied, Jessica Profato, Patrick Reineke, Holly LaDuca, Robina Smith; Ambry Genetics, Aliso Viejo, CA; AmbryGenetics, Aliso Viejo, CA

### **Abstract Text:**

**Background:** Many multigene panel (MGP) options are available for hereditary cancer testing. Previously. management guidelines were only published for a few high-risk genes, but now such guidelines exist for most genes on MGPs. Many clinicians question which MGP(s) may be most appropriate for their patients. We examined the likelihood of a positive result for patients diagnosed with breast cancer (BC) or colorectal cancer (CRC) across several MGPs and assessed the potential impact of these results on patient care. Methods: Positive results, defined by the presence of at least one pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant, were assessed for patients with BC or CRC across various MGPs ordered 6/2012-6/2016 at one commercial laboratory. For BC, the MGPs used for comparison were a high-risk BC panel (up to 6 genes), a comprehensive BC panel (up to 17 genes), and a multicancer panel (up to 32 genes). For CRC, a comprehensive CRC panel (up to 17 genes) was compared to the 32 gene multi-cancer panel. Results: For both BC and CRC patients, the utilization of a MGP with more genes led to more positive results than a MGP with fewer genes, with the vast majority of additional findings occurring in genes with published management guidelines (Table).

| Panel         | Positive<br>Rate | Positive rate in genes not included on smaller MGP | Positive rate in genes with published management guidelines not included on smaller MGP |
|---------------|------------------|--|---|
| вс            |                  |  |   |
| High-risk     | 6.1%             | -  | -   |
| Comprehensive | 9.4%             | 54.8% (1276/2327)                                  | 87.3% (1114/1276)   |
| Multi-cancer  | 11.3%            | 11.4% (175/1538)                                   | 99.4% (174/175)   |
| CRC           |                  |  |   |
| Comprehensive | 12.2%            |  |   |
| Multi-cancer  | 14.7%            | 37.1% (126/340)                                    | 86.5% (109/126)   |

Conclusions: The majority of positive results occurring in genes on larger MGPs, but not smaller MGPs, are in genes with published management guidelines. These results can impact treatment decisions and cancer risk management, including earlier and/or more frequent screening, chemoprevention, and/or other measures. In some cases, positive results occurred in genes not associated with the patient's cancer diagnosis, but may still impact risk management for other cancer(s). Further studies are needed to determine the impact of larger MGPs on clinical outcomes for patients and their families.

#### Title:

Comparing actionable results for breast and colorectal cancer patients across multigene panels.

#### Submitter's E-mail Address:

cespenschied@ambrygen.com

# Is this a late-breaking data submission?

No

#### Is this abstract a clinical trial?

No

## Would like to be considered for a Merit Award:

No

# Have the data in this abstract been presented at another major medical meeting?

No

# Has this research been submitted for publication in a medical journal?

No

# Type of Research:

Retrospective

## **Research Category:**

Clinical

#### **Continued Trial Accrual:**

No

## Received Grant funding:

No

# Relevant to geriatric oncology:

No

# Sponsor:

Robina Smith, MD

## **First Author**

# **Presenting Author**

Kelly Fulk, MS, CGC Ambry Genetics Aliso Viejo, CA

Email: kfulk@ambrygen.com

Click to view Conflict of Interest Disclosure

# **Second Author**

# Corresponding Author

Carin Espenschied, MS, CGC Ambry Genetics

Aliso Viejo, CA

Email: CESPENSCHIED@AMBRYGEN.COM

Click to view Conflict of Interest Disclosure

## **Third Author**

Jessica Profato, MS, CGC

Ambry Genetics Aliso Viejo, CA

Email: jprofato@ambrygen.com

Click to view Conflict of Interest Disclosure

#### **Fourth Author**

Patrick Reineke, BS Ambry Genetics Aliso Viejo, CA

Email: preineke@ambrygen.com

Click to view Conflict of Interest Disclosure

#### Fifth Author

Holly LaDuca, MS, CGC Ambry Genetics Aliso Viejo, CA

Email: HLADUCA@AMBRYGEN.COM

Click to view Conflict of Interest Disclosure

#### Sixth Author

Robina Smith, MD AmbryGenetics 15 Argonaut Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Email: rsmith@ambrygen.com

Click to view Conflict of Interest Disclosure

# If necessary, you can make changes to your abstract between now and the deadline of Tuesday, February 7, 2017

- To access your submission in the future, use the direct link to your abstract submission from one of the automatic confirmation emails that were sent to you during the submission.
- Or point your browser to <u>/asco/reminder.cgi</u> to have that URL mailed to you again. Your username/password are 190481/326088.

Any changes that you make will be reflected instantly in what is seen by the reviewers. You DO NOT need to go through all of the submission steps in order to change one thing. If you want to change the title, for example, just click "Title" in the abstract control panel and submit the new title.

When you have completed your submission, you may close this browser window.

Tell us what you think of the abstract submission process

Home Page