

Distinct mutational profile of Lynch syndrome colorectal cancers diagnosed under regular colonoscopy surveillance

Aysel Ahadova, Ph.D. (1), Pauline L. Pfuderer, B.Sc. (1), Maarit Ahtiainen, Ph.D. (2), Alexej Ballhausen, M.D. (1), Lena Bohaumilitzky, M.Sc. (1), Svenja Kösegi, B.Sc. (1), Nico Müller, B.Sc. (1), Yee Lin Tang, M.D. (1), Kosima Kosmalla, Cand. Med. (1), Johannes Witt, Cand. Med. (1), Volker Endris, Ph.D. (3), Albrecht Stenzinger, M.D. (3), Magnus von Knebel Doeberitz, M.D. (1), Hendrik Bläker M.D. (4), Laura Renkonen-Sinisalo, M.D., Ph.D. (5), Anna Lepistö, M.D., Ph.D. (5), Jan Böhm, M.D., Ph.D. (6), Jukka-Pekka Mecklin, M.D., Ph.D. (2,7), Toni T. Seppälä, M.D., Ph.D. (5,8)*, Matthias Kloor, M.D. (1)*.*

(1) Department of Applied Tumour Biology, Institute of Pathology, University Hospital Heidelberg, Cooperation Unit Applied Tumour Biology, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), and Molecular Medicine Partnership Unit (MMPU), University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany; (2) Department of Education and Research, Central Finland Central Hospital, Jyväskylä, Finland; (3) Department of General Pathology, Institute of Pathology, University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany; (4) Institute of Pathology, University Hospital Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany; (5) Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Helsinki University Hospital; (6) Department of Pathology, Central Finland Central Hospital, Jyväskylä, Finland; (7) Sports and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland, (8) Department of Surgical Oncology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA.

*-These authors contributed equally to this work

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Correspondence:

Dr. Aysel Ahadova

Department of Applied Tumor Biology

Institute of Pathology

University Hospital Heidelberg

Im Neuenheimer Feld 224

69120 Heidelberg

Tel.: +49-6221-564159

Fax: +49-6221-565981

E-Mail: aysel.ahadova@med.uni-heidelberg.de

ABSTRACT

Background

Regular colonoscopy even with short intervals does not prevent all colorectal cancers (CRC) in Lynch syndrome (LS). In the present study, we asked whether cancers detected under regular colonoscopy surveillance (incident cancers) are phenotypically different from cancers detected at first colonoscopy (prevalent cancers).

Methods

We analyzed clinical, histological, immunological and mutational characteristics, including panel sequencing and high through-put coding microsatellite (cMS) analysis, in 28 incident and 67 prevalent LS CRCs.

Results

Incident cancers presented with lower UICC and T stage compared to prevalent cancers ($p < 0.0005$). The majority of incident cancers (21/28) were detected after previous colonoscopy without any pathological findings. On the molecular level, incident cancers presented with a significantly lower *KRAS* codon 12/13 (1/23, 4.3% vs. 11/21, 52%; $p = 0.0005$) and pathogenic *TP53* mutation frequency (0/17, 0% vs. 7/21, 33.3%; $p = 0.0108$), compared to prevalent cancers; 10/17 (58.8%) incident cancers harbored one or more truncating *APC* mutations, all showing mutational signatures of mismatch repair (MMR) deficiency. The proportion of MMR deficiency-related mutational events was significantly higher in incident compared to prevalent CRC ($p = 0.018$).

Conclusions

LS CRC diagnosed under regular colonoscopy surveillance are biologically distinct, suggesting that the preventive effectiveness of colonoscopy in LS depends on the molecular subtypes of tumors.

INTRODUCTION

Individuals with Lynch syndrome (LS), the most common hereditary colorectal cancer (CRC) syndrome, have a 50% lifetime risk of developing CRC¹. LS is caused by pathogenic variants in one of the Mismatch Repair (MMR) genes *MLH1*, *MSH2*, *MSH6*, or *PMS2*².

Due to loss of MMR function, base mismatches occurring during DNA replication remain uncorrected and lead to insertion/deletion mutations (indels), particularly at repetitive sequences (microsatellites). Thus, cancers arising in LS exhibit the molecular phenotype of microsatellite instability (MSI). When indel mutations hit coding microsatellites (cMS), two possible biologically relevant consequences follow: first, mutations at cMS can lead to inactivation of tumor suppressor genes, contributing to carcinogenesis³; second, such mutations shift the reading frame and lead to generation of frameshift peptides (FSP), rendering MSI tumors highly immunogenic^{4-5,8}.

Surveillance by colonoscopy is a recommended preventive measure in LS mutation carriers^{9,10}. Colonoscopy has been shown to decrease the CRC incidence and mortality¹¹⁻¹⁴. However, in contrast to the general population¹⁵⁻¹⁷, a substantial proportion of LS mutation carriers develop “incident carcinomas”, or “post-colonoscopy CRC”^{11,18-24} despite regular colonoscopy. In fact, recent prospective studies^{22,23,25} collecting evidence from patients under surveillance demonstrated no difference in cumulative cancer incidence up to the age of 70 years when compared to studies on retrospective cohorts without surveillance²⁶⁻²⁸.

In parallel to technical, colonoscopy quality-related explanations for the high incidence of CRC under surveillance in LS, biological explanations have been proposed, suggesting that incident cancers may develop from a precursor lesion more difficult to detect than conventional adenomas, such as MMR-deficient crypts²⁹⁻³². MMR-deficient crypts are morphologically undistinguishable from normal colonic crypts, but they lack the MMR protein expression on the molecular level³²⁻³⁴. Like MSI CRC, MMR-deficient crypts also present with MSI and MSI-induced tumor suppressor gene mutations as a direct consequence of MSI, thus possessing the theoretical potential to develop into cancer.

However, direct evidence of such a progression is not trivial to obtain, as no technical means to monitor MMR-deficient crypts exist.

In contrast to clinical characteristics³⁵, the molecular properties of incident cancers have not been characterized so far. We aimed to analyze the molecular characteristics of incident LS CRCs diagnosed under regular surveillance and to compare them with prevalent LS CRCs diagnosed at first colonoscopy or prior to surveillance.

METHODS

Patients and tumor samples

Carriers of pathogenic MMR variants that underwent colonoscopy surveillance with a planned 3-year interval (2 years if previous CRC) were identified from the prospectively maintained Finnish Lynch syndrome registry. Available formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tumor blocks from patients who developed incident (n=28) and prevalent (n=7) cancers were collected from the Lynch Syndrome Biobank at the Central Finland Central Hospital, Jyväskylä, Finland. FFPE tumor tissue blocks from LS patients with prevalent CRC (n=60) were collected at the Department of Applied Tumour Biology, Institute of Pathology, University Hospital Heidelberg as part of the German HNPCC Consortium. All patients provided an informed and written consent, and the study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee. The DNeasy FFPE Kit was used for the isolation of tumor DNA after manual microdissection from 5-6 µm thick hematoxylin/eosin (HE)-stained FFPE tissue sections (Qiagen, Germany).

Mutation analysis

Targeted next generation sequencing was performed as described previously on IonTorrent S5XL/Prime sequencer using a custom 180 amplicon panel (CRC panel) encompassing mutation HotSpot regions in 30 genes^{36,37,38,39}. Data analysis was performed using the Ion Torrent Suite Software (version 5.10). Only variants with an allele frequency >5% and minimum coverage >100 reads were taken into account. Variant annotation was performed using Annovar (hg19 genome)³⁸. Annotations included information about nucleotide and amino acid changes of RefSeq annotated genes, COSMIC and dbSNP entries as well as detection of possible splice site mutations. For data interpretation and verification, the aligned reads were visualised using the IGV browser (Broad Institute)³⁹.

MSI analysis was performed using a sensitive and specific mononucleotide marker panel (BAT25, BAT26, and CAT25) as described previously⁴⁰. cMS mutation analysis was performed using a novel high-throughput method for quantitative fragment length analysis with 5-carboxyfluorescein-labeled primers specific for a set of 22 cMS⁴¹, (see Supplementary Table 1 for details), which were selected based on two criteria: evidence of a functional driver role of mutation⁴¹ and potential significance as a source of immunogenic frameshift peptide neoantigens⁴². PCR products were visualized on an ABI3130xl sequencer, and the obtained results were processed using the ReFrame algorithm to obtain quantitative estimation of the frequency of the mutant alleles in tumor specimens⁴³. Mutation status of *B2M* was determined by Sanger sequencing as described previously⁴⁴. The obtained mutational data for incident cancers were compared with the mutational data for prevalent cancers published in our previous reports^{31,36,43}.

Immunohistochemical staining and quantification of T cell density

FFPE tissue sections (2-3 μm) were used for immunohistochemical staining^{45,46}. Briefly, sections were deparaffinized and rehydrated and subsequently stained according to standard protocols. Following primary antibodies were used: anti-CD3 (clone PS1, dilution 1:100, Abcam, Germany); anti-MLH1 (clone G168-15, dilution 1:300, BD Pharmingen, Germany); anti-MSH2 (clone FE11, dilution 1:100, Calbiochem, Germany). As a secondary antibody, the biotinylated anti-mouse/anti-rabbit antibody (Vector Laboratories, was used at 1:100 dilution. Staining was visualized using the Vectastatin elite ABC detection system (Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA, USA) and 3,3'-Diaminobenzidine (Dako North America Inc., Carpinteria, CA, USA) as a chromogen. For counterstaining hematoxylin was used. Stained sections were scanned using NanoZoomer S210 slide scanner (Hamamatsu) and viewed using NDP.view2 Viewing Software (Hamamatsu). Four random 0.25 mm^2 square regions were drawn in the tumor tissue and positive cells in each region were counted using the QuPath Software, giving mean values per 0.25 mm^2 .

Statistical calculations

Statistical significance of differences between binary variables was calculated using Pearson's Chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test. Statistical significance of differences in mutation frequencies of cMS genes, as well as significance of differences in immune infiltration was calculated using two-sided Wilcoxon Rank Sum test (Mann-Whitney) test. Correction for multiple testing was performed using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. P values smaller than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. All scripts were written in R ⁴⁷, version 3.6.0 using the R Studio environment ⁴⁸. All 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated with modified Wald method.

RESULTS

Clinical characteristics

Clinical data and tumor specimens (n=28) were collected from 27 LS patients who developed incident CRC during the 2-3-yearly preventive colonoscopy surveillance (23 *MLH1* and 4 *MSH2* carriers, 15 females and 12 males). Sixty-seven tumors from LS patients diagnosed with CRC as prevalent cancers were used as a comparison group. Median age at diagnosis was not significantly different between patients with incident and with prevalent cancer (54.4 vs. 50.0 years, $p>0.05$). Nineteen out of 28 (68%) incident and 33 out of 49 (67%) prevalent cancers with information on tumor localization were localized in the proximal colon. The clinical parameters of incident cancers are summarized in Table 1.

The median duration of follow-up was 8.9 years (range 0.0-29.3 years). Twelve patients with incident cancers died during follow-up due to different reasons. Three of the 12 deceased patients died due to CRC: One patient (#11) died from a symptomatic CRC that was diagnosed only two years after previous uneventful colonoscopy. Patient #16 died from another, metachronous, CRC that was diagnosed after 6 years of not attending scheduled colonoscopies. Patient #9 developed CRC liver metastases 7 years after the operation of a T2N0 caecum cancer, though no other primary tumor was found (Table 1).

Incident cancers presented with lower UICC stage compared to prevalent cancers ($p=0.0002$); the majority of incident cancers were stage I, whereas the majority of prevalent cancers were stage II tumors (Figure 1A). T stage of incident cancers was significantly lower in prevalent cancers ($p=0.00004$), and no T4 lesions were identified among incident cancers (Figure 1B).

The median time since last colonoscopy in patients under surveillance was 27 months (range: 7.3-39.5 months). Time since last colonoscopy did not correlate with the stage of tumor (Supplementary

Figure 1). The majority of incident CRCs developed after a colonoscopy in which no lesions were detected (21/28, 75.0%, 95% CI: 56.4-87.6%, Table 1, Figure 1C). All performed colonoscopies were successful and of high quality, with complete examination reaching the remaining colon length and bowel preparation enabling the visualization of the entire mucosal surface.

Histopathology of incident cancers

Representative HE and immunohistochemistry sections of the incident cancers were examined for microscopic pattern of tumor growth, degree of differentiation and presence of MMR-deficient crypts (Supplementary Table 2).

Among the 22 cases assessable for the tumor growth pattern, 12 showed a sessile (55.5%), 6 (27.3%) showed a pedunculated and 3 (13.6%) showed an undermining growth pattern. All tumors showed at least moderate degree of differentiation, with 16/28 (57.1%) of them exhibiting mucinous components.

MMR-deficient crypts were present in two of the incident cancers: in both cases, these MMR-deficient crypts were present adjacent to areas of high-grade dysplasia/carcinoma *in situ* (Table 1, Patient #6, Figure 2A and Table 1, Patient #22, Figure 2B). The MMR deficient crypt in Patient #22 also showed pronounced immune infiltration (Figure 2B).

Mutational profile and MMR deficiency signatures in incident cancers

We aimed to analyze how MMR deficiency influences mutational events in incident cancers and studied MMR deficiency signatures, namely presence of C>T transitions at CpG sites and insertion/deletion (indel) mutations, in *APC* and *KRAS* mutations observed in incident cancers, and compared to previous sequencing results obtained from prevalent CRC^{31,36,49}.

In contrast to the relatively high prevalence of *KRAS* codon 12/13 mutations among prevalent LS CRCs described previously (11/21, 52%³⁶), only 1 codon 12 mutation was identified among the analyzed incident tumors (1/23, 4.3%; $p=0.0005$) (Figure 3A, Supplementary Tables 3 and 4). Moreover, no pathogenic *TP53* mutations were identified in the analyzed set (0/17), which compared to prevalent cancers (7/21, 33.3%³⁶) yielded a significantly lower *TP53* mutation frequency in incident CRCs ($p=0.0108$, Figure 3A, Supplementary Tables 3 and 4). The proportion of *CTNNB1*-mutant samples (5/23, 21.7%) in incident cancers was similar to the proportion of *CTNNB1*-mutant tumors detected in prevalent cancers⁴⁹ (10/48, 20.8%; $p=1.0$, Figure 3A).

Ten out of 17 incident cancers presented with a total of 14 truncating *APC* mutations (Figure 3A). All 14 detected *APC* mutations represented either C>T transitions at CpG sites or insertion/deletion (indel) mutations, reflecting mutational signatures associated with MMR deficiency and arguing in favor of the early onset of MMR deficiency in LS incident CRC, prior to *APC* mutations. Importantly, the proportion of such mutations was significantly higher in incident cancers compared to prevalent cancers (100% vs 75%, 95% CI: 74.9-100% and 58.7-86.4%, respectively; $p = 0.0470$, Figure 3B, 3C).

When focusing on indel *APC* mutations alone, a significantly higher proportion of mutations was found in incident CRC compared to prevalent CRC in LS patients (64.3% vs 16.7%, 95% CI: 38.6-83.8% and 7.5-32.3%, respectively; $p = 0.0068$, Figure 3B, 3D).

CMS analysis in incident cancers

Mutation frequencies obtained from the quantitative cMS analysis were compared between incident ($n=28$) and prevalent ($n=67$) tumors across all genes and for each gene. Generally, the frequency of cMS mutations in all 22 analyzed genes was slightly, but significantly elevated in the group of incident cancers compared to prevalent cancers (median 0.35 in incident vs 0.31 in prevalent tumors, $p = 0.018$, Figure 4A). As mutations at cMS presumably accumulate in association with the progression time of the tumor, we analyzed cMS mutation frequencies in association with the UICC stage. In prevalent LS CRC, we observed a significant increase of the cMS mutation frequencies from UICC I to

UICC II (median for UICC I 0.28 vs UICC II 0.36, $p = 0.002$, Figure 4B), whereas the incident LS CRC presented with high cMS mutation frequencies already in stage I tumors, and no further increase was observed in stage II tumors (Figure 4C). Importantly, the cMS mutation frequency was higher in stage I incident LS CRCs compared to stage I prevalent LS CRCs (median for UICC I in incident tumors 0.35 vs 0.28 in prevalent tumors, $p = 0.005$, Figure 4D).

The analysis of mutations in 22 specific cMS genes revealed a significantly higher proportion of mutant alleles in two genes (*LMAN1* (0.29 vs. 0.11) and *ELAVL3* (0.37 vs. 0.17)) and a significantly lower proportion of mutant alleles in one of the analyzed cMS located in the *RFC3* (0.03 vs. 0.19) gene in incident cancers compared to prevalent ones (Supplementary Figure 2 and 3).

Immune infiltration and immune evasion in incident cancers

We asked whether the early onset of MMR deficiency and the higher proportion of tumors with cMS mutations is reflected by the immune response in incident cancers, and analyzed the CD3-positive T cell infiltration in incident and prevalent LS CRC. As MMR gene-dependent differences of the immunogenicity of LS CRC have been reported before ^{49,50}, we performed an MMR gene-wise comparison of immune infiltration focusing on the *MLH1*-associated CRCs representing the vast majority in our incident cancer group (24/28). Dense immune infiltration was observed in both incident and prevalent tumor tissue (155 vs. 149 CD3+ cells/0.25mm², respectively) and normal mucosa, although no significant differences between incident and prevalent tumors could be detected ($p=0.6$, Figure 5).

The pronounced immune response against MSI CRC often results in the acquisition of *B2M* mutations, the most common mechanism of immune evasion in MSI tumors leading to abrogation of HLA class I-mediated antigen presentation ^{46,51}. We analyzed *B2M* in incident and prevalent CRCs and found a *B2M* mutation prevalence of 20.8% (5/24) in incident CRC, which was similar to the *B2M* mutation prevalence of prevalent CRC (13/54, 24.1%; $p=1.0$).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we provide first evidence that incident CRCs in LS are distinct from prevalent cancers with regard to their clinical, histological and mutational characteristics.

Clinically, most incident cancers were of UICC stage I/II and thus of significantly lower stage than the prevalent cancers of our control cohort. Low tumor stage, typical absence of lymph node involvement and a favorable clinical course of incident cancers observed in our study are in line with previous reports^{11,18,22,35,52,53}. Only one CRC-related death was clearly associated with a primary CRC included in this study and showing signet ring cell features, associated with poor survival⁵⁴. This mirrors the previously reported excellent survival under prospective observation⁵⁵, which could be attributed to the early detection via colonoscopy.

Histologically, tumors with mucinous components were frequent among incident CRCs in LS. Presentation with mucinous histology in MSI cancer has previously been associated with a high cMS mutational load⁵⁶. The elevated cMS mutation frequency detected in incident cancers of our study (Figure 4) and suggesting the predominance of MMR deficiency-initiated CRC evolution among incident CRCs may therefore be responsible for a high mutational variability resulting in mixed and mucinous histology.

The hypothesis of MMR deficiency as an initiating factor in incident CRC formation is supported by two additional observations: (1) histologically normal MMR-deficient crypt foci were detected in the direct vicinity of two incident CRCs, providing first evidence that MMR-deficient crypts can give rise to incident CRC development in LS; (2) on the molecular level, *APC* mutations in incident CRCs showed a significantly stronger association with signatures of MMR deficiency⁵⁷ than in prevalent CRCs, indicating that MMR deficiency as an early event commonly precedes *APC* mutations.

Importantly, we found significantly less *KRAS* mutations in incident cancers than previous studies analyzing prevalent CRC in LS⁵⁸. Two scenarios for the observations are possible: (1) colonoscopy

with adenoma removal may theoretically be more effective in preventing *KRAS*-mutated lesions, as *KRAS* mutations are associated with conventional adenomas^{59,60}. This would imply that incident cancers may develop from other, *KRAS*-wild type lesions that are more difficult to detect. In fact, a recent study analyzing the efficacy of colonoscopy depending on the molecular subtype of tumors in the general population showed a weaker CRC risk reduction after colonoscopy for *KRAS*-wild type tumors⁶¹. (2) Alternatively, oncogene-activating missense mutations, which need to affect very specific nucleotides and therefore have a lower likelihood per genome replication than indel mutations, may be less frequent in tumors with rapid evolution and short progression times such as incident cancers⁶². This hypothesis could also explain the absence of *TP53* point mutations, which are generally considered late events in colorectal carcinogenesis⁶³, and the relative scarcity of *CTNNB1*-activating point mutations in the incident CRC of our study.

In contrast to rare point mutations, the cMS mutation load of incident CRCs was significantly elevated. In addition to the general enrichment, we observed a significantly higher mutation frequency of 2 cMS genes, *LMAN1* and *ELAVL3*, and a significantly lower mutation frequency of the *RFC3* cMS gene. A high proportion of *LMAN1* mutations in LS incident cancers may thus lend support to the previously reported crucial role of cMS mutations during early steps of MSI carcinogenesis⁶⁴.

Colonoscopy quality might be another factor responsible for the development of cancers under surveillance. In our study, colonoscopies performed prior to the examination revealing cancer were documented as complete procedures fulfilling the criteria for a high quality colonoscopy (evidence of full visualization of the remaining bowel length and adequate bowel preparation)⁶⁵. This is in line with the previous observations by Lappalainen et al. showing no association between incident cancers and a prior colonoscopy of compromised quality⁶⁶. Also, the proportion of tumors located in the proximal colon, a localization often associated with lower colonoscopy sensitivity^{15,61}, was identical between incident and prevalent tumors analyzed in our study, indicating that localization-related colonoscopy sensitivity alone also does not explain the occurrence of incident CRCs in LS carriers under surveillance. The adenoma detection rate (ADR) in the contributing centers for follow-

up colonoscopies has also been shown to be comparable with the previous reports of recent large prospective studies ^{22,66}.

In line with previous observations reported by the Prospective Lynch Syndrome Database (PLSD) ⁵² and other large studies ^{22,35}, no correlation was observed between time since last colonoscopy and tumor stage among incident cancers. Previous studies reported incident cancer development in the same segment of colon, where previously a polypectomy was performed, in 20-50% of cases ^{35,67}. Although no information on the localization of a lesion detected at previous colonoscopy was available in this study, adenoma at previous colonoscopy was found in 25% of patients with incident cancers, which is in line with other reports ^{18,35,66}.

The strength of our study is the first molecular characterization of incident cancers in LS and their comparison to prevalent CRC in LS, as well as high-resolution analysis of MMR deficiency-associated mutational events using a newly established method ⁴³. The weakness of the study is the analysis of incident cancers from a single country, the majority harboring *MLH1* germline variants and thereby representing only one of the two *MMR* genes most frequently associated with incident cancer ⁴⁹. Validation of our results in a larger international multi-center study is therefore warranted in order to include more *MSH2* pathogenic variant carriers to analysis and examine potential differences between *MLH1* and *MSH2*-associated LS, as has been suggested recently ⁴⁹.

In conclusion, our study for the first time identifies a set of characteristics that differentiate incident cancers in LS from prevalent cancer occurring without surveillance: a lower tumor stage, a high proportion of tumors with mucinous areas, a predominance of indel mutations over point mutations, and a low prevalence of RAS mutations. This implies that prevention by colonoscopy may shift the molecular manifestation of LS-associated CRCs towards MMR deficiency-initiated cancers highlighting the need for preventive measures targeting MMR-deficient cells directly.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Acknowledgements

The excellent technical support of Nina Nelius, Petra Höfler and Lena Ehret-Maßholder is gratefully acknowledged.

Authors' contributions

Study concept and design (AA, TS, JPM, MK); acquisition of data (AA, PLP, MA, AB, LB, SK, NM, YLT, KK, JW, VE, AS, LRS, AL, JB, TS); analysis, interpretation of data, manuscript draft (AA, PLP, TS, MK, JPM); critical revision of the manuscript and decision to submit (all authors); obtained funding (TS, JKM, MvKD, HB, MK); study supervision (TS, JKM, MK).

Ethics approval

All patients provided an informed and written consent, and the study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University Hospital Heidelberg and Central Finland Hospital District Ethical Committee. The study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Data availability

All data presented in this manuscript are available at the Department of Applied Tumor Biology and can be shared upon request.

Conflict of interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding

The present study was performed with grant support of the Wilhelm Sander Foundation (grant number 2016.056.1), Emil Aaltonen Foundation, Finnish Medical Foundation, Sigrid Juselius Foundation, Finnish State Research Funds (VTR), the Finnish Cancer Foundation and Jane and Aatos Erkko Foundation. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

TABLES

Table 1 Clinical characteristics of patients with incident CRC. M – male, F – female, LG – low grade, CUP – carcinoma with unknown primary. *-Finding at last colonoscopy column refers to the previous colonoscopy before cancer diagnosis.

Patient	Age at diagnosis	Gender	Location	TNM Stage	UICC Stage	Gene	Age at last FU	Age at death	Cause of death	Months since last colonoscopy	Reason of examination	Finding at last colonoscopy*
1	54.6	M	splenic flexure	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	62.9			21.0	symptoms	0
2	61.7	F	ascendens	T1N0M0	I	MLH1	76.5			20.3	follow-up	Advanced lesion
3	44.2	M	descendens	Dukes A	I	MLH1	55.1			36.0	follow-up	LG adenoma
4	69.7	F	sigmoid	T1N0M0	I	MSH2	74.9	75.1	cardiac insufficiency	7.3	follow-up	Advanced lesion
5	63.1	F	tranverse	T3N0M0	II	MSH2	72.6	72.6	pancreatic cancer	25.0	follow-up	0
6	70.5	M	sigmoid	TisNxM0	0	MLH1	78.4			24.5	follow-up	0
7	35.5	M	caecum	T3N1M0	III	MLH1	44.3	44.3	gastric cancer	28.0	symptoms	0
8	57.3	F	sigmoid	T3N0M0	II	MLH1	63.3			30.0	follow-up	0
9	54.5	F	caecum	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	63.4	63.4	CRC	31.2	follow-up	0
10	71.6	F	rectum	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	75.1	75.1	biliary tract cancer	24.0	follow-up	0
11	41.7	F	descendens	T3N2M0	III	MLH1	44.7	44.7	CRC	23.0	symptoms	0
12	43.6	F	ascendens	T1N0M0	I	MLH1	57.5	57.5	breast cancer	26.0	follow-up	0
13	41.7	F	tranverse	T1N0M0	I	MLH1	50.1			26.0	follow-up	LG adenoma
14	42.4	F	tranverse	T3N0M0	II	MLH1	48.8	48.8	pancreatic cancer	24.4	follow-up	0
15	71.5	M	ascendens	T2N0M0	I	MSH2	84.1			36.0	follow-up	LG adenoma
16	43.6	M	tranverse	T3N0M0	II	MLH1	53.9	53.9	another CRC	26.0	follow-up	0
17	71.9	F	caecum	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	81.4	81.4	pneumonia	29.0	follow-up	0
18	69.0	F	caecum	T2N0M0	I	MSH2	69.0	69.0	postoperative complication	37.7	symptoms	0
19	42.0	F	caecum	T1N0M0	I	MLH1	58.2			39.5	follow-up	0
20	35.1	M	caecum	Dukes B	II	MLH1	64.4			37.6	follow-up	0
21.a	54.2	F	ascendens	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	63.3			30.1	follow-up	0
21.b	56.8	F	sigmoid	T3N0M0	II	MLH1	63.3			28.8	follow-up	0
22	54.2	M	ascendens	T3N0M0	II	MLH1	63.4	65.0	CUP (brain, lung)	18.0	follow-up	LG adenoma
23	53.8	M	ascendens	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	58.8			16.4	follow-up	LG adenoma
24	82.8	M	descendens	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	85.1			24.6	follow-up	0
25	55.0	F	caecum	T1N0M0	I	MLH1	66.4			39.1	follow-up	0
26	43.5	M	caecum	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	52.5			36.2	follow-up	0
27	27.2	M	caecum	T2N0M0	I	MLH1	42.9			37.9	follow-up	0

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Clinical characteristics of incident cancers. A-B. Distribution of UICC stage among incident and prevalent tumors. Tumors identified under surveillance have significantly lower UICC stage (A) and T stage (B) compared to tumors identified outside of surveillance. C. Findings at previous colonoscopy in patients with incident cancers. The majority of patients with incident cancers did not present with any lesion at previous colonoscopy examination.

Figure 2. Histology images of tumor specimens with MMR-deficient crypt foci. A. Resection sample with carcinoma in situ arising presumably from an MMR-deficient crypt. On the left panel, the overview of the resected sample (MLH1 staining), on the right upper panel, higher magnification of the MMR-deficient crypt (MLH1 staining), on the right lower panel, higher magnification of carcinoma in situ (MLH1 staining). B. MMR-deficient crypt, MLH1 staining on the left and another region of the same sample showing a non-invasive carcinoma in situ on the right panel.

Figure 3. Mutational profile and MMR deficiency signatures in incident LS CRC. A. Mutation status of CRC genes in incident cancers analyzed in this study and prevalent cancers reported before^{31,36} (for cohorts: red – incident CRC, blue – prevalent CRC; for genes: orange – mutant, white – wild type, grey – n.a.; * - KRAS mutations at codons other than codon 12/13). B. Summary of the number of specific MMR deficiency-related mutations in incident LS CRC compared to prevalent LS CRC, sporadic MSI CRC and MSS CRC previously reported in Ahadova et al³⁶. C. Comparison of the proportion of all MMR deficiency-related mutations between different CRC groups reveals higher proportion in incident compared to prevalent tumors (100%, 95% CI: 74.85-100% vs. 75%, 95% CI: 58.7-86.4%; Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.0470$). D. Comparison of the proportion of indel mutations between different CRC groups reveals higher proportion in incident compared to prevalent tumors (64.3%, 95% CI: 38.6-83.8 vs 16.7%, 95% CI: 7.5-32.3%; Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.0068$).

Figure 4. Analysis of coding microsatellite (cMS) mutations in incident and prevalent LS CRC. A. CMS mutation frequency in incident and prevalent LS CRC. B. CMS mutation frequency in prevalent

LS CRC by UICC stage. C. CMS mutation frequency in incident LS CRC by UICC stage (stage I group includes data from UICC 0 tumor, see black data points). D. CMS mutation frequency in stage I incident (stage I group includes data from UICC 0 tumor, see black data points) and stage I prevalent LS CRC.

Figure 5. Immune infiltration with CD3-positive T cells in incident and prevalent cancers. A. Immune infiltration in MLH1-associated incident and prevalent LS CRC. B-D. Exemplary CD3 stainings of an MMR-deficient crypt (B, see Figure 2B for the MLH1 staining, red arrow points to the MMR-deficient crypt) tumor (C) and normal mucosa (D) regions of a transverse colon cancer specimen.




Figure 1. Clinical characteristics of incident cancers. A-B. Distribution of UICC stage among incident and prevalent tumors. Tumors identified under surveillance have significantly lower UICC stage (A) and T stage (B) compared to tumors identified outside of surveillance. C. Findings at previous colonoscopy in patients with incident cancers. The majority of patients with incident cancers did not present with any lesion at previous colonoscopy examination.




Figure 2. Histology images of tumor specimens with MMR-deficient crypt foci. **A.** Resection sample with carcinoma in situ arising presumably from an MMR-deficient crypt. On the left panel, the overview of the resected sample (MLH1 staining), on the right upper panel, higher magnification of the MMR-deficient crypt (MLH1 staining), on the right lower panel, higher magnification of carcinoma in situ (MLH1 staining). **B.** MMR-deficient crypt, MLH1 staining on the left and another region of the same sample showing a non-invasive carcinoma in situ on the right panel.




Figure 3. Mutational profile and MMR deficiency signatures in incident LS CRC. A. Mutation status of CRC genes in incident cancers analyzed in this study and prevalent cancers reported before^{31,36} (for cohorts: red – incident CRC, blue – prevalent CRC; for genes: orange – mutant, white – wild type, grey – n.a.; * - KRAS mutations at codons other than codon 12/13). **B.** Summary of the number of specific MMR deficiency-related mutations in incident LS CRC compared to prevalent LS CRC, sporadic MSI CRC and MSS CRC previously reported in Ahadova et al 36. **C.** Comparison of the proportion of all MMR deficiency-related mutations between different CRC groups reveals higher proportion in incident compared to prevalent tumors (100%, 95% CI: 74.85-100% vs. 75%, 95% CI: 58.7-86.4%; Fisher’s exact test, $p = 0.0470$). **D.** Comparison of the proportion of indel mutations between different CRC groups reveals higher proportion in incident compared to prevalent tumors (64.3%, 95% CI: 38.6-83.8 vs 16.7%, 95% CI: 7.5-32.3%; Fisher’s exact test, $p = 0.0068$).




Figure 4. Analysis of coding microsatellite (cMS) mutations in incident and prevalent LS CRC. A. CMS mutation frequency in incident and prevalent LS CRC. B. CMS mutation frequency in prevalent LS CRC by UICC stage. C. CMS mutation frequency in incident LS CRC by UICC stage (stage I group includes data from UICC 0 tumor, see black data points). D. CMS mutation frequency in stage I incident (stage I group includes data from UICC 0 tumor, see black data points) and stage I prevalent LS CRC.




Figure 5. Immune infiltration with CD3-positive T cells in incident and prevalent cancers. A. Immune infiltration in MLH1-associated incident and prevalent LS CRC. **B-D.** Exemplary CD3 stainings of an MMR-deficient crypt (**B**, see Figure 2B for the MLH1 staining, red arrow points to the MMR-deficient crypt) tumor (**C**) and normal mucosa (**D**) regions of a transverse colon cancer specimen.

REFERENCES

1. Jasperson KW, Tuohy TM, Neklason DW, et al: Hereditary and familial colon cancer. *Gastroenterology* 138:2044-58, 2010
2. de la Chapelle A: Microsatellite instability. *N Engl J Med* 349:209-10, 2003
3. Woerner SM, Kloor M, von Knebel Doeberitz M, et al: Microsatellite instability in the development of DNA mismatch repair deficient tumors. *Cancer Biomark* 2:69-86, 2006
4. Linnebacher M, Gebert J, Rudy W, et al: Frameshift peptide-derived T-cell epitopes: a source of novel tumor-specific antigens. *Int J Cancer* 93:6-11, 2001
5. Buckowitz A, Knaebel HP, Benner A, et al: Microsatellite instability in colorectal cancer is associated with local lymphocyte infiltration and low frequency of distant metastases. *Br J Cancer* 92:1746-53, 2005
6. Popat S, Hubner R, Houlston RS: Systematic review of microsatellite instability and colorectal cancer prognosis. *J Clin Oncol* 23:609-18, 2005
7. Le DT, Durham JN, Smith KN, et al: Mismatch repair deficiency predicts response of solid tumors to PD-1 blockade. *Science* 357:409-413, 2017
8. Le DT, Uram JN, Wang H, et al: PD-1 Blockade in Tumors with Mismatch-Repair Deficiency. *N Engl J Med* 372:2509-20, 2015
9. Vasen HF, Blanco I, Aktan-Collan K, et al: Revised guidelines for the clinical management of Lynch syndrome (HNPCC): recommendations by a group of European experts. *Gut* 62:812-23, 2013
10. Stormorken AT, Clark N, Grindedal E, et al: Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic surveillance in families with hereditary colorectal cancer. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 42:611-7, 2007
11. Jarvinen HJ, Aarnio M, Mustonen H, et al: Controlled 15-year trial on screening for colorectal cancer in families with hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. *Gastroenterology* 118:829-34, 2000
12. Newton K, Jorgensen NM, Wallace AJ, et al: Tumour MLH1 promoter region methylation testing is an effective prescreen for Lynch Syndrome (HNPCC). *J Med Genet* 51:789-96, 2014
13. Jarvinen HJ, Renkonen-Sinisalo L, Aktan-Collan K, et al: Ten years after mutation testing for Lynch syndrome: cancer incidence and outcome in mutation-positive and mutation-negative family members. *J Clin Oncol* 27:4793-7, 2009
14. Renkonen-Sinisalo L, Aarnio M, Mecklin JP, et al: Surveillance improves survival of colorectal cancer in patients with hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. *Cancer Detect Prev* 24:137-42, 2000
15. Brenner H, Chang-Claude J, Jansen L, et al: Reduced risk of colorectal cancer up to 10 years after screening, surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology* 146:709-17, 2014
16. Brenner H, Chang-Claude J, Seiler CM, et al: Protection from colorectal cancer after colonoscopy: a population-based, case-control study. *Ann Intern Med* 154:22-30, 2011
17. Samadder NJ, Curtin K, Pappas L, et al: Risk of Incident Colorectal Cancer and Death After Colonoscopy: A Population-based Study in Utah. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 14:279-86 e1-2, 2016
18. Engel C, Rahner N, Schulmann K, et al: Efficacy of annual colonoscopic surveillance in individuals with hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 8:174-82, 2010
19. de Vos tot Nederveen Cappel WH, Nagengast FM, Griffioen G, et al: Surveillance for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer: a long-term study on 114 families. *Dis Colon Rectum* 45:1588-94, 2002

20. Vasen HF, Moslein G, Alonso A, et al: Guidelines for the clinical management of Lynch syndrome (hereditary non-polyposis cancer). *J Med Genet* 44:353-62, 2007
21. Mecklin JP, Aarnio M, Laara E, et al: Development of colorectal tumors in colonoscopic surveillance in Lynch syndrome. *Gastroenterology* 133:1093-8, 2007
22. Engel C, Vasen HF, Seppala T, et al: No Difference in Colorectal Cancer Incidence or Stage at Detection by Colonoscopy Among 3 Countries With Different Lynch Syndrome Surveillance Policies. *Gastroenterology* 155:1400-1409 e2, 2018
23. Moller P, Seppala T, Bernstein I, et al: Cancer incidence and survival in Lynch syndrome patients receiving colonoscopic and gynaecological surveillance: first report from the prospective Lynch syndrome database. *Gut* 66:464-472, 2017
24. Rutter MD, Beintaris I, Valori R, et al: World Endoscopy Organization Consensus Statements on Post-Colonoscopy and Post-Imaging Colorectal Cancer. *Gastroenterology* 155:909-925 e3, 2018
25. Moller P, Seppala TT, Bernstein I, et al: Cancer risk and survival in path_MMR carriers by gene and gender up to 75 years of age: a report from the Prospective Lynch Syndrome Database. *Gut* 67:1306-1316, 2018
26. Bonadona V, Bonaiti B, Olschwang S, et al: Cancer risks associated with germline mutations in MLH1, MSH2, and MSH6 genes in Lynch syndrome. *JAMA* 305:2304-10, 2011
27. Dowty JG, Win AK, Buchanan DD, et al: Cancer risks for MLH1 and MSH2 mutation carriers. *Hum Mutat* 34:490-7, 2013
28. Ten Broeke SW, van der Klift HM, Tops CMJ, et al: Cancer Risks for PMS2-Associated Lynch Syndrome. *J Clin Oncol* 36:2961-2968, 2018
29. Latchford A: How Should Colonoscopy Surveillance in Lynch Syndrome Be Performed? *Gastroenterology* 158:818-819, 2020
30. Sawhney MS, Farrar WD, Gudiseva S, et al: Microsatellite instability in interval colon cancers. *Gastroenterology* 131:1700-5, 2006
31. Ahadova A, von Knebel Doeberitz M, Blaker H, et al: CTNNB1-mutant colorectal carcinomas with immediate invasive growth: a model of interval cancers in Lynch syndrome. *Fam Cancer* 15:579-86, 2016
32. Kloor M, Huth C, Voigt AY, et al: Prevalence of mismatch repair-deficient crypt foci in Lynch syndrome: a pathological study. *Lancet Oncol* 13:598-606, 2012
33. Staffa L, Echterdiek F, Nelius N, et al: Mismatch repair-deficient crypt foci in Lynch syndrome--molecular alterations and association with clinical parameters. *PLoS One* 10:e0121980, 2015
34. Pai RK, Dudley B, Karloski E, et al: DNA mismatch repair protein deficient non-neoplastic colonic crypts: a novel indicator of Lynch syndrome. *Mod Pathol* 31:1608-1618, 2018
35. Argillander TE, Koornstra JJ, van Kouwen M, et al: Features of incident colorectal cancer in Lynch syndrome. *United European Gastroenterol J* 6:1215-1222, 2018
36. Ahadova A, Gallon R, Gebert J, et al: Three molecular pathways model colorectal carcinogenesis in Lynch syndrome. *Int J Cancer* 143:139-150, 2018
37. Jesinghaus M, Pfarr N, Endris V, et al: Genotyping of colorectal cancer for cancer precision medicine: Results from the IPH Center for Molecular Pathology. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 55:505-21, 2016
38. Wang K, Li M, Hakonarson H: ANNOVAR: functional annotation of genetic variants from high-throughput sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Res* 38:e164, 2010
39. Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdottir H, Winckler W, et al: Integrative genomics viewer. *Nat Biotechnol* 29:24-6, 2011
40. Findeisen P, Kloor M, Merx S, et al: T25 repeat in the 3' untranslated region of the CASP2 gene: a sensitive and specific marker for microsatellite instability in colorectal cancer. *Cancer Res* 65:8072-8, 2005

41. Woerner SM, Yuan YP, Benner A, et al: SelTarbase, a database of human mononucleotide-microsatellite mutations and their potential impact to tumorigenesis and immunology. *Nucleic Acids Res* 38:D682-9, 2010
42. Jurtz V, Paul S, Andreatta M, et al: NetMHCpan-4.0: Improved Peptide-MHC Class I Interaction Predictions Integrating Eluted Ligand and Peptide Binding Affinity Data. *J Immunol* 199:3360-3368, 2017
43. Ballhausen A PM, Jendrusch M, Haupt S, Pfaffendorf E, Draxlbauer M, Seidler F, Krausert S, Ahadova A, Kalteis MS, Heid D, Gebert J, Bonsack M, Schott S, Bläker H, Seppälä TT, Mecklin J, ten Broeke SW, Nielsen M, Heuveline V, Krzykalla J, Benner A, Riemer AB, von Knebel Doeberitz M, Kloor M.: The shared neoantigen landscape of MSI cancers reflects immunoediting during tumor evolution. *BioRxiv* 691469, 2019
44. Pfuderer PL, Ballhausen A, Seidler F, et al: High endothelial venules are associated with microsatellite instability, hereditary background and immune evasion in colorectal cancer. *Br J Cancer* 121:395-404, 2019
45. Kloor M, Sutter C, Wentzensen N, et al: A large MSH2 Alu insertion mutation causes HNPCC in a German kindred. *Hum Genet* 115:432-8, 2004
46. Janikovits J, Muller M, Krzykalla J, et al: High numbers of PDCD1 (PD-1)-positive T cells and B2M mutations in microsatellite-unstable colorectal cancer. *Oncoimmunology* 7:e1390640, 2018
47. Team RC: R: A language and environment for statistical computing. . R Foundation for Statistical Computing. R version 3.6. 0, 2019
48. Team R: RStudio: Integrated Development for R., 2018
49. Engel C, Ahadova A, Seppala T, et al: Associations of Pathogenic Variants in MLH1, MSH2, and MSH6 With Risk of Colorectal Adenomas and Tumors and With Somatic Mutations in Patients With Lynch Syndrome. *Gastroenterology*, 2020
50. Binder H, Hopp L, Schweiger MR, et al: Genomic and transcriptomic heterogeneity of colorectal tumours arising in Lynch syndrome. *J Pathol* 243:242-254, 2017
51. Kloor M, Michel S, Buckowitz B, et al: Beta2-microglobulin mutations in microsatellite unstable colorectal tumors. *Int J Cancer* 121:454-8, 2007
52. Seppala TT, Ahadova A, Dominguez-Valentin M, et al: Lack of association between screening interval and cancer stage in Lynch syndrome may be accounted for by over-diagnosis; a prospective Lynch syndrome database report. *Hered Cancer Clin Pract* 17:8, 2019
53. Seppala T, Pylvanainen K, Evans DG, et al: Colorectal cancer incidence in path_MLH1 carriers subjected to different follow-up protocols: a Prospective Lynch Syndrome Database report. *Hered Cancer Clin Pract* 15:18, 2017
54. Hartman DJ, Nikiforova MN, Chang DT, et al: Signet ring cell colorectal carcinoma: a distinct subset of mucin-poor microsatellite-stable signet ring cell carcinoma associated with dismal prognosis. *Am J Surg Pathol* 37:969-77, 2013
55. Dominguez-Valentin M, Seppala TT, Sampson JR, et al: Survival by colon cancer stage and screening interval in Lynch syndrome: a prospective Lynch syndrome database report. *Hered Cancer Clin Pract* 17:28, 2019
56. Shia J, Schultz N, Kuk D, et al: Morphological characterization of colorectal cancers in The Cancer Genome Atlas reveals distinct morphology-molecular associations: clinical and biological implications. *Mod Pathol* 30:599-609, 2017
57. Alexandrov LB, Nik-Zainal S, Wedge DC, et al: Signatures of mutational processes in human cancer. *Nature* 500:415-21, 2013
58. Oliveira C, Westra JL, Arango D, et al: Distinct patterns of KRAS mutations in colorectal carcinomas according to germline mismatch repair defects and hMLH1 methylation status. *Hum Mol Genet* 13:2303-11, 2004
59. Zauber P, Marotta S, Sabbath-Solitare M: KRAS gene mutations are more common in colorectal villous adenomas and in situ carcinomas than in carcinomas. *Int J Mol Epidemiol Genet* 4:1-10, 2013

60. Juarez M, Egoavil C, Rodriguez-Soler M, et al: KRAS and BRAF somatic mutations in colonic polyps and the risk of metachronous neoplasia. *PLoS One* 12:e0184937, 2017
61. Hoffmeister M, Bläker H, Jansen L, Alwers E, Amitay EL, Carr PR, Kloor M, Herpel E, Roth W, Chang-Claude J, Brenner H: Colonoscopy and reduction of colorectal cancer risk by molecular tumor subtypes: a population-based case-control study. medRxiv doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.10.20017137>, 2020
62. Shaukat A, Arain M, Anway R, et al: Is KRAS mutation associated with interval colorectal cancers? *Dig Dis Sci* 57:913-7, 2012
63. Fearon ER, Vogelstein B: A genetic model for colorectal tumorigenesis. *Cell* 61:759-67, 1990
64. Roeckel N, Woerner SM, Kloor M, et al: High frequency of LMAN1 abnormalities in colorectal tumors with microsatellite instability. *Cancer Res* 69:292-9, 2009
65. Lai EJ, Calderwood AH, Doros G, et al: The Boston bowel preparation scale: a valid and reliable instrument for colonoscopy-oriented research. *Gastrointest Endosc* 69:620-5, 2009
66. Lappalainen J, Holmstrom D, Lepisto A, et al: Incident colorectal cancer in Lynch syndrome is usually not preceded by compromised quality of colonoscopy. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 54:1473-1480, 2019
67. Haanstra JF, Vasen HF, Sanduleanu S, et al: Quality colonoscopy and risk of interval cancer in Lynch syndrome. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 28:1643-9, 2013