Overview of genome wide arrays in Haematological Malignancies

"Array-based or molecular karyotyping"
Principle of array-based karyotyping tools (1)
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Principle of array-based karyotyping tools (2) workflow
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Bioinformatic resolution of copy number imbalances

Arrays can detect only unbalanced DNA changes (ie chromosomal losses or gains) but are enable to detect balanced chromosomal translocation
Array-based karyotyping can be done with two main different platforms

- Array comparative genomic hybridization (« array CGH »)
  - copy number changes only

- Single-nucleotide polymorphism microarrays (« SNP array »)
  - copy number changes AND copy-neutral alterations (or acquired uniparental disomy - aUPD)
Single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)

- SNP: single nucleotide variations between paired maternal and paternal chromosomes
  
  heterozygosity

- In SNP-arrays, oligo probes are specific to each allelic variants of selected SNP within a given locus

- Hybridization of genomic DNA to both probes variants indicates heterozygosity while a signal for only one allele is consistent with loss of heterozygosity (or homo/hemizygosity)
Deletion with LOH vs Copy neutral LOH (aUPD)

aUPD (or copy neutral LOH) refers to a chromosomal region in which both copies of that region are acquired from the same parent, resulting in a copy number of two but with LOH (thus **copy neutral LOH**).
Copy neutral LOH or « acquired uniparental disomy (aUPD) in cancers

- constitute 20-80% of the LOH seen in both solid and liquid cancers [and generate homozygosity for mutated (inactivated) tumor supressor genes or (activated) oncogenes involved in transformation]

- CNLOH in MDS
  - TET2, EZH2, ...
    Epigenetic deregulation

  - normal karyotype and aUPD 7q

Langemeijer et al, Nat Genetics, 2009

Tiu et al Blood 117, 2011
Advantages

• High-resolution, genome-wide copy number assessment in **one** assay
  sensitive whole global scanning of genomic imbalances
  identification of very small copy-number aberrations (CNA)

• Does not require cell culture
  **performed on interphase cells** (and archival samples)

• Simultaneous detections of CNA (« copy loss LOH ») and aUPD (« copy neutral LOH ») if using
  a SNP-based array.
Limitations

- Inability to detect balanced translocations

- Inability to assess regions of the genome not represented on the arrays

- Decreased performance at low level of tumoral cells (tumoral sub-clones undetectable by array-based genomic profiling when level < 20%)
  
  "contamination" with normal cells can be problematic
Clinical applications of array-based karyotyping

Can arrays-based karyotyping serve as an alternative for conventional karyotyping and FISH in CNA detection?

Few studies on applications of whole genome arrays in diagnostics
Clinical applications of array-based karyotyping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diseases</th>
<th>Genetic aberrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CNA, translocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AML</td>
<td>translocations, gene mutations, CNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>CNA, gene mutations, translocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPN</td>
<td>gene mutations, CNA, translocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>CNA, translocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLL</td>
<td>CNA, gene mutations, translocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CNA = copy number alterations
# Array in CLL

## Genomic aberrations with prognostic relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caryotype</th>
<th>% of cases, range</th>
<th>Prognosis</th>
<th>Known and/or putative involved genes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13q14.3 loss</td>
<td>14-40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>mir-16-1; mir 15a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trisomy 12</td>
<td>11-30</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>? CLLU1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del(11q22-23)</td>
<td>10-32</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>ATM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del(17p13.1)</td>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>TP53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translocation chromosomique</td>
<td>20-42</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>IGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex karyotype</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del(6q)</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adapted from Dal-Bo et al *J Trans Med* 2009

Karyotype: low success rate (low mitotic index of the CLL cells)
Comparison on FISH and array: **very good concordance**

- **Hagenkord et al., JMD 2010:**
  134 CLL patients
  250K SNP-array (Affymetrix)
  98.5% concordance array and interphase FISH

- **O’Malley et al., Int Jnl Lab Hem 2011:**
  55 CLL patients
  BAC array (Hemescan)
  93% concordance array and interphase FISH

- **Unpublished studies in the Nederlands** [AMC Amsterdam & UMC St Radboud: Nijmegen] (data kindly provided by M. Stevens-Kroef Nijmegen)
  47 CLL patients compared array with FISH or MLPA
  Agilent 180K oligo array or Affymetrix CytoScan HD array
  98% concordance array/FISH and 100% concordance array/MLPA
(illustrations kindly provided by M. Stevens-Kroef, Radboud University Nijmegen)
Array identifies additional CNA and CNLOH (1)

• Length Heterogeneity within the 13q14 deletions
  two distinct subtypes: - type I and type II deletions ( < 2 Mb and not including the \textit{RB1} locus) vs > 2Mb and including the \textit{RB1} locus) biological and prognostic distinct entities
  (Ouillette et al, Clin Cancer research 2011)

• « Atypical deletions»:
  11q22.3 deletions which do not involve the \textit{ATM} gene

• Genomic complexity: additional abnormalities detected
  21% of CLL cases have significant genome-wide aberrations at multiple loci not assessed by the standard FISH panels
SNP-Array identifies additional CNA and CNLOH

- CLL cases demonstrating UPD at regions with clinical relevances
  
  acquired UPD at chromosomal region 17p13.1 involves the *TP53* locus and represents two inactivated mutated copies of *TP53* that current testing methods (karyotype and FISH) would not detect!
Conclusion: array on CLL samples

- Array can replace FISH or MLPA for CNA detection
- Can be implemented in a routine clinical diagnostic setting
- Provides additional genetic informations
  (but clinical relevances of « new » genetic alterations need to be determined)
ARAYS in ALL

- Hyper/hypodiploïdy, CNA, translocations
- Karyotype: low success rate (failures or normal)
- Yield and quality of chromosomes often poor
- Small recurrent CNA not detectable by karyotyping
Comparative study: conventional karyotyping vs microarray-based genomic profiling


• Cohort of 60 childhood ALL

1 - Array has higher CNA detection rate than conventional karyotyping

- 61% CNAs detected by karyotyping vs 93% by array
- among nl karyotype cases, 88% showed CNAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karyotyping</th>
<th>array</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61% CNAs</td>
<td>93% CNAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% balanced translocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% no aberrations detected (failure or normal karyotype)</td>
<td>7% no CNAs detected (3 normal profiles and 1 failure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2- Recurrent small CNAs in ALL detected by genomic array technologies

- B-cell development (*EBF1, PAX5, IKZF1*)
- Cell cycle regulation (*RB1, CDKN2A*)
- Epigenetic factors (*BTG1*)

- Some deletions have clear prognostic impact

*IKZF1 (Ikaros) deletions predict poor outcome*

(illustration kindly provided by M. Stevens-Kroef, Radboud University, Nijmegen)
Conclusion: array on ALL samples

• High success rate (93%) in detecting CNAs; superior to karyotyping (65%)

• Provides additional genetic informations (clinically relevant) (e.g. $IKZF1$ gene deletion)

• FISH tests remain necessary for clinically relevant balanced aberrations
# Arrays in Multiple Myeloma

Genomic aberrations with prognostic relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genetic abnormality</th>
<th>Genes involved</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Clinical impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal karyotype (often complex)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(4;14)(p16.3;q32)</td>
<td><em>IGH-FGFR3</em></td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(14;16)(q32;q23)</td>
<td><em>IGH-MAF</em></td>
<td>~ 5%</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(11;14)(q13;q32)</td>
<td><em>IGH-CCND1</em></td>
<td>~ 20%</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperdiploidy (5,9,15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss 17p13</td>
<td><em>TP53</em></td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss 13q14</td>
<td><em>RB1</em></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1q21 gain</td>
<td><em>CKS1B</em></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p36 loss</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>20-30%</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arrays in Multiple Myeloma

- Karyotype: low success rate (30-40% of cases)

- Cryptic genomic abnormalities [ t(4;14), t(14;16) ]

- Gold standard: interphase FISH on enriched plasma cells
**Comparative study:** interphase FISH vs microarray based genomic profiling

(Stevens-Kroef M et al. Genes Chrom & Cancer, 2012)

- on selected plasma cells from 13 patients
- **very good concordance** between FISH and arrays in the identification of CNAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FISH</th>
<th>ARRAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients with aberrations</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>translocation</td>
<td>3 to 22 abnormalities per patient (including CNLOH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tetraploid vs hyperdiploid karyotype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed</td>
<td></td>
<td>mosaic del(17p) (13% of the cells)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>clinical relevance?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion: array on MM samples

• 92% concordance array and interphase FISH

• Allows discrimination between tetraploid and hyperdiploid karyotype

• FISH tests remain necessary for clinically relevant balanced translocations

• Identification of many additional lesions with array (clinical relevance to be determined)
Take-home messages

- Array is becoming applicable in routine diagnostics for hematological neoplasms according to their specific profiles

  ALL: high success rate (93% vs 65%) and detection of clinically small deletions

  CLL and MM: can replace interphase FISH/MLPA

- Do not replace metaphase karyotyping: balanced abnormalities not detected

- High resolution but low sensitivity (threshold: ~ 20%)

- Identification of novel genomic abnormalities; clinical relevance has to be determined