# Frequency of variants of hereditary cancer risk syndrome in 1682 Brazilian patients genotyped by next-generation sequencing

Short Title: Variants of hereditary cancer risk in 1682 Brazilian patients

Jarbas Maciel de Oliveira<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Nuria Bengala Zurro<sup>3</sup>, Antonio Victor Campos Coelho<sup>3</sup>, Marcel Pinheiro Caraciolo<sup>3</sup>, Rodrigo Bertollo de Alexandre<sup>3</sup>, George de Vasconcelos Carvalho Neto<sup>3</sup>, Ivana Grivicich<sup>2</sup> and João Bosco de Oliveira Filho<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hospital Memorial Arcoverde, Avenida José Bonifácio 1121, Arcoverde, Pernambuco 56503-740, Brazil

<sup>2</sup> Programa de Pós Graduação em Biologia Celular e Molecular Aplicada à Saúde, Universidade Luterana do Brasil, Av. Farroupilha 8001, Canoas - Rio Grande do Sul 92425-020, Brazil

<sup>3</sup> Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, Avenida Albert Einstein 627, São Paulo 05652-900, Brazil

\* Corresponding author

jarbasmaciel@yahoo.com.br (JMO) or joao.bosco@einstein.br (JBOF)

**Funding:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1

# 1 Abstract

2 Hereditary cancer risk syndromes are a group of disorders caused by germline 3 variants in a growing number of genes. Most studies on hereditary cancer have 4 been conducted in white populations. Here we report the largest study in 5 Brazilian individuals with multiple, self-reported, ethnicities. We genotyped 1682 6 individuals from all regions of the country who were referred to genetic testing 7 for hereditary cancer risk with multigene Next-generation sequencing (NGS) 8 panels. Most were women, and had a personal and/or family history of cancer. 9 The majority of cancer cases were breast and ovarian. We identified a total of 10 321 pathogenic/likely pathogenic (P/LP) variants in 305 people (18.1%), 11 corresponding to 166 unique variants. These variants were distributed among 12 32 genes, and most were detected on BRCA1 and BRCA2 (129 patients, 26.2% 13 and 14.3% of all P/LP hits, respectively). The prevalence of any genes 14 transheterozygosity in our sample was 0.89% (15/1682). The BRCA1/BRCA2 double heterozygosity rate was 0.78% (1/129) for BRCA variants carriers and 15 16 0.06% (1/1682) overall. We classified patients according to the NCCN and 17 Brazilian National Health Agency (ANS) genetic testing recommendation 18 criteria. We found that the criteria had false negative rates of 17.3% and 44.2%, 19 meaning that both failed to detect a substantial part of P/LP positive patients. 20 Therefore, our results show that NGS adds to knowledge on the Brazilian 21 spectrum of germline variants associated with cancer risk and indicate that 22 Brazilian testing guidelines should be improved.

23

2

Keywords: breast cancer, cancer genomics, familial cancer history, populationgenetics, colorectal cancer.

# 26 Introduction

Hereditary cancer risk syndromes are a group of disorders caused by germline pathogenic variants in a growing number of genes. They are the main predisposing factor in about 5-10% of all diagnosed cancers. Accurate genetic diagnosis in patients with hereditary cancer risk syndromes may reduce morbidity and mortality by allowing the adoption of specific preventative and therapeutic measures. Additionally, family members at risk can be tested and counseled, extending the clinical benefits to many individuals <sup>1</sup>.

34 Currently, there are over 30 hereditary cancer syndromes already 35 described, the most prevalent being hereditary breast and ovarian cancer 36 syndrome (HBOC). Other syndromes include Li-Fraumeni, Cowden, Lynch, 37 Familial Adenomatous Polyposis (APC), multiple Endocrine Neoplasia Type 1 38 or Wermer's Syndrome (MEN1), multiple Endocrine Neoplasia Syndrome - Type 39 2 (RET), and Von Hippel-Lindau Syndrome (VHL), to cite the most common. Most syndromes are inherited in an autosomal-dominant manner, with variable 40 41 penetrance, and are caused by mutations in oncogenes or tumor suppressor 42 genes<sup>2</sup>. Although initially hard to diagnose genetically, the advent of next-43 generation sequencing (NGS) has allowed for testing using panels with dozens 44 to hundreds of genes simultaneously and inexpensively <sup>3</sup>. This has caused a 45 great increase in the clinical use of these NGS panels, while a growing body of evidence show their clinical utility as compared to single-gene testing <sup>4, 5</sup>. 46

3

Although large studies have been published on the diagnostic utility of
such panels, these are mostly restricted to white populations. The aim of this
study was to describe the frequency and type of germline pathogenic variants in
cancer susceptibility genes in patients with clinical criteria of hereditary cancer
syndrome by NGS in the genetically admixed Brazilian population.

## 52 Materials and methods

#### 53 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The cohort to the retrospective study included 1682 Brazilian patients 54 55 who received a multi-gene NGS panel for risk of hereditary cancer in the Genomika diagnostics unit, a genetics laboratory of the Albert Einstein Israeli 56 57 Hospital (Genomika-Einstein hereafter). As this study took place in a private 58 diagnostic laboratory this cohort was not specifically selected for any sex, age, 59 ethnicity, or history of cancer. Both patients with or without criteria for hereditary 60 risk cancer syndrome were considered. After genetic assessment we classified 61 patients according to the USA National Comprehensive Cancer Network 62 (NCCN, www.nccn.org) guidelines: genetic/familial high-risk assessment 63 versions 3.2019 and 1.2020. Non-Brazilian patients were excluded. 64

#### 65 Research ethics statement

66 This project was approved by the Institutional review board from the
67 Research Ethics Committee of the Institute of Integral Medicine Professor
68 Fernando Figueira (CEP-IMIP) in Recife, Pernambuco and all individuals

4

69	provided written	consent for	multi-gene testing	(protocol number	CAAE
----	------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------------	------

- 70 29567220.4.1001.0071).
- 71

#### 72 Multigene genotyping panel

- 73 Genotyping was performed through panels that covered the entire coding
- region including 20 bp flanking each exon and noncanonical splice region.
- 75 Patients were sequenced with panels that ranged from 27 to 78 genes,
- including genes mostly associated with hereditary cancer risk, such as APC,
- 77 ATM, BARD1, BMPR1A, BRCA1, BRCA2, CDH1, CDK4, CHEK2, EGFR,
- 78 EPCAM, GREM1 HOXB13, MEN1, MITF, MLH1, MRE11A, MSH2, MSH6,
- 79 MUTYH, NBN, PALB2, PMS2, POLD1, POLE, PTEN, RAD50, RAD51C,
- 80 RAD51D, RB1, RET, SMAD4, STK11, TP53, VHL. The complete list of genes is
- 81 available in the Table A.1).
- 82

#### 83 Library preparation for NGS

84 Laboratory procedures were performed at Genomika-Einstein units 85 (Recife - PE and São Paulo - SP). Genomic DNA was extracted from peripheral 86 blood or saliva by automation (QIASymphony platform, QIAGEN, Hilden, 87 Germany) using the DNA Mini Kit extraction kit (QIAGEN). The quality and 88 quantity of the extracted DNA were assessed by fluorometry (Qubit, Thermo 89 Fisher, Waltham, Massachusetts). The genomic DNA was enzymatically 90 fragmented and enriched. The fragments were barcoded via multiplexed PCR 91 technology by QIAseq Targeted DNA Panels (CDHS 174272-2274 QIAGEN). 92 The genes were sequenced on MiSeg or Next-Seg 550 instruments (Illumina,

San Diego, CA) using MiSeq Reagent Kit v2 (300-cycles) or Next-Seq 550

94	High-throughput kit (300 cycles) with 100% coverage and 50X minimum depth.
95	
96	Sanger sequencing
97	In cases where variant confirmation was deemed necessary (low read
98	depth, complex indels), the genotype was determined by conventional PCR
99	followed by Sanger sequencing on an ABI 3500 (Thermo Fisher, Waltham,
100	Massachusetts) automatic sequencer. The variant call was made via the
101	reference transcript from the ATG initiation codon aligned against the GRCh37 /
102	hg19 reference genome.
103	
104	Alu insertion identification
105	Relevant genetic screenings of breast/ovarian cancer families of
106	Portuguese ancestry demonstrate that the c.156_157insAlu variant is the most
107	frequent BRCA2 rearrangement. Detection of this variant was performed as
108	published elsewhere <sup>6</sup> . Briefly, PCR of <i>BRCA2</i> exon 3 was performed and the
109	Alu insertion is detected by differential agarose gel electrophoresis.
110	
111	Variant classification and bioinformatic analysis
112	Bioinformatic analysis was performed using GATK 3.0 best practices.
113	VCFs were annotated using Annovar and in-house databases. The clinical
114	significance of the variants was determined according to the criteria of the

- 115 American College of Genomics and Genetics (ACMG) 2015 guidelines for
- 116 sequence variant interpretation and 2018 guideline update <sup>7, 8</sup>. Each variant

6

117 classification were	performed independently b	y two specialists. Allelic frequency
-------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------------------

- 118 was examined through access to population databases as Genome
- 119 Aggregation Database (gnomAD) <sup>9</sup>, Exome Aggregation Consortium (ExAC) <sup>10</sup>,
- 120 and The 1000 Genomes Project <sup>11</sup>. Disease information were upload form
- 121 ClinVar<sup>12</sup> and the Leinden Open Variation Database (LOVD)<sup>13</sup>. All variant
- 122 information used for classification were updated and upgraded in an in-house
- 123 local knowledgebase.

### 124 **Results**

#### 125 Study sample characteristics and cancer histories

- 126 Between July 2016 and July 2019, we collected samples and
- 127 clinical/demographic characteristics from 1682 Brazilian individuals referred to a

128 private laboratory to undergo genotyping with a cancer hereditary risk

129 multigenic panel (Table 1).

Among the individuals, 1557 (92.6%) were women with mean age of 47.4  $\pm$  12.3 (range 11-88) years and 125 (7.4%) were men with mean age of 51.4  $\pm$ 15.2 (range 14-91) years. Regarding ethnic ancestry, 1007 (59.9%) individuals reported unknown background, 330 (19.6%) reported having multiple ethnicities (admixed), 259 (15.4%) white, 26 (1.5%) black, 22 (1.3%) Ashkenazi Jewish, 21 (1.2%) native indigenous and 17 Asian (1.0%) (Table 1). Personal cancer history was reported by 1126 (66.9%) individuals, with

137 breast or ovary cancers identified in 971 individuals (57.7%); colorectal cancer

138 in 71 (4.2%); thyroid/parathyroid in 36 (2.1%); prostate cancer in 15 (0.9%);

139 stomach cancer in 14 (0.8%); uterus, kidney, and sarcomas in 13 each (0.8%);

140 leukemia in 11 (0.6%); non-melanoma skin and pancreas cancers in 9 each

7

141	(0.5%); and melanoma in 6 (0.4%). Other types of cancer (lung, liver, bladder,
142	larynx etc.) were identified in 17 individuals (1.0%). Overall, 268 individuals
143	(15.9%) did not present malignant neoplasms and for 293 individuals (17.4%)
144	the history information was not available.

- 145 Family cancer history (considering first-, second- or third-degree
- relatives) was reported by 1182 (70.3%) individuals: 806 (47.9%) reported
- 147 breast cancer family history; 310 (23.0%) colorectal cancers; 339 (20.2%)
- 148 prostate cancer; 219 (13.0%) head and neck tumors; 172 (10.2%) lung cancer;
- 149 155 (9.2%) stomach cancer; 119 (7.1%) breast and ovarian and 48 (2.9%)
- 150 ovarian cancer exclusively. No family history was reported by 163 (9.7%)
- 151 individuals and 337 (20.0%) did not provide information regarding family history
- 152 (Table 1, Table A.2).
- 153

#### 154 Genetic findings

Pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants were found in 305 (18.1%) of the
1682 individuals. Additionally, 1252 variants of uncertain significance (VUS)
were found in 753 (44.8%) individuals (Fig. 1A, Table A.3). The remaining 624
(37.1%) patients did not present any variants of clinical interest whatsoever
(negatives).

The 305 individuals collectively had 321 pathogenic/likely pathogenic
variant hits (corresponding to 166 unique variants) in 32 genes: *APC, ATM, BARD1, BRCA1, BRCA2, BRIP1, CDH1, CDK4, CHEK2, EPCAM, FANCC,*

163 MEN1, MITF, MLH1, MRE11A, MSH2, MSH6, MUTYH, NBN, PALB2, PMS2,

- 164 POLD1, PTCH2, PTEN, RAD50, RAD51, RAD51C, RAD51D, RB1, RECQL,
- 165 *RET* and *TP53*.

8

166	The genes that most commonly presented pathogenic or likely
167	pathogenic variants were BRCA1 (84/321 = 26.2%), BRCA2 (46, 14.3%) and
168	PALB2 (25, 7.8%). Lynch syndrome genes (MLH1, MSH2, MSH6 and PMS2)
169	came next with 17 (5.3%) and were tied with TP53, also with 17 (5.3%) hits.
170	Next came ATM (15, 4.7%), CHEK2 (14, 4.4%), RAD51C (9, 2.8%), RAD51 (8,
171	2.5%), RAD50 (7, 2.2%), BRIP1 (6, 1.9%), BARD1 (4, 1.2%), PTEN (4, 1.2%),
172	RAD51D (4, 1.2%) and APC (3, 0,9%). Other genes amounted 17 (3.0%)
173	variants (NBN, RET, biallelic MUTYH, MITF, CDH1, EPCAM, FANCC, MRE11,
174	POLD1, RB1, RECQL, MEN1, CDK4 and PTCH2). Moreover, monoallelic
175	MUTYH variants, considered to have low penetrance, were detected in 42
176	(13.1%) cases (Fig. 1B).
177	In terms of unique variants, we detected 24 in BRCA1, 32 in BRCA2, 16
178	in PALB2, 16 in the Lynch syndrome genes, eight in TP53, 14 in ATM, eight in
179	CHEK2, six in RAD51C, nine in RAD51, two in RAD50, six in BRIP1, four in
180	PTEN, two in RAD51, three in APC, two in NBN, eight in MUTYH, two in CDH1
181	and one each in BARD1, RET, MITF, EPCAM, FANCC, MRE11, POLD1, RB1,
182	RECQL, MEN1, CDK4 and PTCH2.
183	Among the 321 pathogenic/likely pathogenic variant hits, 84 (26.2%)
184	were point mutations in conserved splice sites, 73 (22.7%) were frameshift
185	deletions, 65 (20.2%) were missense point mutations, 58 (18.1%) were
186	nonsense point mutations, 22 (6.9%) were frameshift duplications, 10 (3.1%)
187	were frameshift insertions, four (1.3%) were frameshift indels, four inframe
188	deletions (1.3%), and a single inframe insertion (0.3%) (Fig. 1C).
189	Most of the 1252 VUS hits (corresponding to 886 unique variants) were

identified in ATM (198 hits, 15.8%), followed by BRCA2 (86, 6.9%), MHS6 (63,

190

9

- 191 5.0%), BRIP1 (55, 4.4%), RAD50 (52, 4.2%), CHEK2 (38, 3.0%), PALB2 (34,
- 192 2.7%), MHS2 (31, 2.5%), MLH1 (17, 1.4%), TP53 (17, 1.4%), BRCA1 (17,
- 193 1.4%). Other genes amounted to 644 (51.4%) VUS (Fig. 1D).

#### 194 Individuals with multiple variants (transheterozygotes)

- 195 Among the 305 individuals with pathogenic/likely pathogenic variants,
- 196 290 (95.1%) were single heterozygotes, 14 (4.6%) presented two variants in
- 197 different genes (any two of these: APC, ATM, BRCA1, BRCA2, CDK4, CHEK2,
- 198 MEN1, MUTYH, PALB2, PMS2, RAD51, RAD51C or TP53) and a single patient
- 199 (0.3%) presented three pathogenic variants in different genes (*BRCA1*, *MSH6*
- and *MUTYH*). The most common combination in the patients with two variants
- was a variant in a high-penetrance gene, such as BRCA1 and BRCA2,
- alongside a variant with lower penetrance, such as monoallelic *MUTYH* or in
- 203 CHEK2. No patients presented more than one pathogenic/likely pathogenic
- variants in the same gene (Fig. 2, Table A.4). We observed a single individual
- 205 BRCA1/BRCA2 double heterozygote, making the double heterozygotes
- prevalence among BRCA variants carriers about 0.78% (1/129) and 0.06%
- 207 (1/1682) overall. Thus, the overall transheterozygosity prevalence was about
- 208 0.89% (15/1682) in our sample.
- 209

#### 210 **Positivity profiles according to testing criteria of the USA**

- 211 National Comprehensive Cancer Network and Brazilian National
- 212 Health Agency

213 The sampled individuals were assessed for hereditary cancer testing 214 indication according to two sets of clinical criteria: the NCCN for hereditary

10

breast/ovarian, colorectal, stomach or pancreas cancer syndromes, version
3.2019 and 1.2020 and the criteria of the Brazilian National Health Agency
(ANS).

218 Among the 1682 individuals in study, 1008 (59.9%) met NCCN 3.2019 219 and 1.2020 criteria for testing, 368 (21.9%) did not meet the criteria and 306 did 220 not have sufficient information for classification. Forty-five patients among the 221 305 that presented pathogenic/likely pathogenic (positive patients) were in the 222 last group, leaving 260 classifiable patients. The true positive rate of NCCN 223 criteria was 215/260 (82.7%) and the false negative rate was 45/260 (17.3%). 224 The F1-measure was 33.9%. Regarding ANS criteria, 660 (39.2%) met the 225 criteria for testing, 691 did not meet and 331 did not have sufficient information 226 for classification. The true positive rate of ANS was 145/260 (55.7%) and the 227 false negative rate was 115/260 (44.2%), and F1-measure was 31.5% (Table 228 2).

The group of 215 patients fulfilling testing criteria according to the NCCN
had the following genetic profiles: 72 (36.4%) individuals having variants in *BRCA1*, 29 (14.6%) in *BRCA2*, 16 (8.1%) in *PALB2*, 14 (7.1%) in *TP53*, 11
(5.6%) in *ATM*, 9 (4.5%) in *CHEK2*, 7 (3.5%) in *RAD50* and *RAD51*, 6 (3.5%) in *RAD51C*, 4 (2.0%) in *MSH6*, 3 (1.5%) in *BRIP1*, *MSH2* and *RAD51D*, 2 (1.0%)
in *APC*, *BARD1* and *CDH1* e 8 (4.0%) in other genes (*MEN1*, *MITF*, *MLH1*, *NBN*, *PMS2*, *POLD1*, *PTEN* and *RECQL*).

The group of 45 patients who did not meet the NCCN criteria had the following profiles: 9 (20.0%) individuals with variants in *MUTYH*, 7 (16.7%) in *BRCA2*, 6 (14.3%) in *BRCA1*, 5 (11.9%) in *PALB2*, 2 (4.8%) in *ATM*, *CHEK2*, *MLH1*, *MSH6*, *PTEN*, *RET* and *TP53*, besides 10 (23.8%) in other genes

11

240 (BARD1, BRIP1, CDK4, FANCC, MRE11A, MSH2, PMS2, PTCH2, RAD51 and
241 RAD51C).

In summary, both NCCN 1.2020/3.2019 and ANS criteria failed to detect
a substantial part of positive patients. The Brazilian criteria fared even worse,
missing about 44% of positive patients, versus approximately 17% with NCCN
1.2020/3.2019.

246

#### 247 Geographic distribution of variants

We stratified our data according to each Brazilian state. The results areavailable in the Table A.5.

## 250 **Discussion**

251 Cancers were the second most common cause of death worldwide in 252 2018, with 9.6 million deaths (1 every 6 deaths). Lung, prostate, colorectal, 253 stomach and liver are the most common in men, whereas women are more 254 affected by breast, colorectal, lung, cervix and thyroid <sup>14</sup>. The Brazilian National 255 Cancer Institute (INCA) estimates 450,000 new cancer cases per year 256 (excluding non-melanoma skin cancers) for the 2020-2022 triennium <sup>15</sup>. 257 Most tumors are sporadic, caused by somatic genetic events. However, 258 about 10% of the patients carry germline pathogenic variants in cancer 259 predisposition genes such as *BRCA1* or *BRCA2*<sup>1</sup>. The identification of these 260 patients is of utmost clinical importance because early diagnosis of hereditary 261 cancer risk syndromes may improve vigilance and treatment. Therefore, genetic 262 investigation is already a tool of modern oncology <sup>16</sup>.

12

263 Next generation sequencing (NGS) technologies reduced sequencing 264 costs allowing rapid, precise, and simultaneous analysis of a great quantity of 265 genetic material. NGS has been used to identify genetic causes of rare 266 diseases and cancers, in clinical and research settings. Previously, patients in 267 investigation of HBOC or Lynch syndrome risk would be genotyped by limited, 268 specific panels. Nowadays, as NGS is being largely utilized by clinical 269 laboratories, the patients may undergo genotyping by multigenic panels that 270 allow a better stratification as well as personalized oncologic management <sup>17</sup>. 271 Here, we report the results of our study, the largest conducted in Brazil, 272 with 1682 individuals that underwent genotyping with 27- to 78-genes panels 273 intended to detect germinative variants in cancer predisposition genes. Women 274 are the majority in our sample (92.6%). Consequently, the most prevalent 275 cancers were breast and ovarian (57.7%), colorectal (4.2%) and 276 thyroid/parathyroid (2.1%). 277 The overall positivity rate was 18.1% (305/1682 individuals); 16.0% 278 (269/1682) if individuals with monoallelic MUTYH variants are excluded. 279 Considering just BRCA1/BRCA2 pathogenic/likely pathogenic variants, the 280 positivity rate was only 7.7% (129/1682 individuals). This demonstrates the 281 importance of NGS multigene panels: it reduces the rate of false negatives, 282 providing more information for oncologic management and prognosis. 283 The BRCA pathogenic variants positivity rate from our study seems low, 284 but it is not unexpected since our cohort was not specifically selected for any 285 sex, age, ethnicity, or history of cancer. Indeed, since there is significant allelic

286 heterogeneity in BRCA genes, there is great variability in positivity rates in other

287 studies <sup>18</sup>. In Brazil, studies of HBOC patients observed positivity rates between

13

1.3% <sup>19</sup> and 27.3% <sup>20</sup>. In other countries, the positivity rate among sporadic and 288 high-risk hereditary cancer cases varied between 2.6% in the USA <sup>21</sup> and 27.9% 289 290 in Japan<sup>22</sup> (reviewed in <sup>23</sup>). Therefore, our positivity rate is indeed within these 291 ranges. 292 We compared the mutational profile of BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes we 293 observed with other 20 Brazilian studies. Among the 56 variants we detected, 294 33 (19 in BRCA1 and 14 in BRCA2) were recurrent in other studies. The five 295 most recurrent variants were: BRCA1:c.5266dupC, found by other 18 studies <sup>18,</sup> <sup>20, 24-39</sup>. BRCA1:c.3331 3334delCAAG, found in other 12 studies <sup>18, 20, 24, 27, 29, 31,</sup> 296 <sup>32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40</sup>, BRCA2:c.2808\_2811delACAA found in other seven studies <sup>18,</sup> 297 298 <sup>29-31, 34, 35, 39</sup>, BRCA1: c.1687C>T found in six studies <sup>26, 31, 32, 34, 35</sup> and 299 BRCA1:c.211A>G found in other five studies <sup>35-38, 40</sup>. 300 The five most prevalent BRCA1 mutations among the individuals 301 sampled by our study were c.5266dupC, c.5074+2T>C, c.3331 3334delCAAG, 302 c.1687C>T and c.211A>G. These results partially agree with a worldwide 303 survey that included Brazilian families of women carriers of BRCA pathogenic variants. Rebbeck et al. (2018) <sup>41</sup> surveyed 101 Brazilian families and observed 304 305 c.5266dupC, c.3331 3334delCAAG and c.1687C>T among the five most 306 prevalent *BRCA1* mutations. Therefore, our results agree with three variants. 307 The five most prevalent BRCA2 variants in our patients were 308 c.2808\_2811delACAA, c.9382C>T, c.6024dupG, c.8488-1G>A and 309 c.5216dupA. Only c.2808\_2811deIACAA was in common with the Rebbeck et 310 al. results <sup>41</sup>. Interestingly, they observed c.156 157insAlu among the five most 311 prevalent variation among 49 Brazilian families, but our results place it in sixth 312 place, tied with other variants.

14

313	The recurrence in independent samples from Brazil indicate the variants
314	are representative of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutational spectrum in Brazil.
315	Indeed, the BRCA1:c.5266dupC and BRCA2:c.156_157insAlu (found in other
316	four studies <sup>31, 34, 35, 42</sup> ) variants are considered as founder mutations coming
317	from European populations and may be found in the individuals from all regions
318	of Brazil <sup>35</sup> . Indeed, we detected BRCA1: c.5266dupC in individuals from
319	Pernambuco and Alagoas, Northeast Brazil states, as well as in São Paulo
320	(Southeast) and Paraná (South) and BRCA2:c.156_157insAlu was detected in
321	an individual from Piauí, also a Northeast state.
322	We also observed some recurrent pathogenic variants in other genes:
323	TP53:c.1010G>A, found in four other studies <sup>20, 38-40</sup> , CHEK2:c.349A>G, found
324	in two other studies <sup>38, 43</sup> ; <i>MUTYH</i> :c.1147delC <sup>43</sup> ; <i>MUTYH</i> :c.1187G>A <sup>38</sup> ,
325	<i>MSH</i> 2:c.2152C>T <sup>44</sup> ; <i>MSH6</i> :c.3848_3862del <sup>45</sup> , <i>MLH1</i> :c.677G>A <sup>44</sup> and
326	PALB2:c.2257C>T $^{46}$ . These observations could mean that these variants are
327	important co-players alongside the recurrent BRCA variants in the risk of
328	hereditary cancers in Brazilian populations.
329	Transheterozygosity, i.e. heterozygosity at two different loci <sup>47</sup> , is rare
330	among patients at risk of hereditary cancers. The prevalence of double
331	heterozygosity among BRCA1/BRCA2 carriers ranges between 1.8% and
332	1.85% <sup>48, 49</sup> in the Jewish Ashkenazi populations. Among non-Ashkenazi
333	Europeans, the prevalence is lower, between 0.22% and 0.87% $^{ m 48}$ . An Italian
334	study reported 0.62% $^{50}$ and a Korean study reported 1.2% $^{51}$ . Therefore, our
335	estimate of 0.78% in the Brazilian sample seems plausible.
336	There has been controversy regarding the consequences over the
337	phenotype of BRCA1/BRCA2 double heterozygote. Earlier reports suggest that

15

338 they do not have worse phenotypes when comparing to single-variant carriers <sup>52, 53</sup>. Bell et al. (2002) <sup>54</sup> analyzed three independent samples of tumor tissue 339 340 from the same BRCA1/BRCA2 double heterozygote patient and observed that 341 either one or other gene had suffered loss of heterozygosity (LOH) genetic 342 events, suggesting that both genes are functionally equivalent in initiating 343 tumorigenesis in breast tissue. Therefore, double heterozygote status would be 344 equivalent to single-carrier status. Other case reports, case series and review of 345 case reports also suggested that double heterozygote status was not associated with more severe phenotype <sup>48, 55, 56</sup>. In contrast, Randall et al. 346 347 (1998) <sup>57</sup> observed LOH in both genes in ovarian tumors, perhaps signaling that 348 the pathogenic events in each tissue are different and not always BRCA1 349 mutations are equivalent to BRCA2 counterparts. 350 However, more recent large surveys have been suggesting that double

heterozvoote have different phenotypes when compared to single heterozygote 351 352 individuals. A large survey of 8162 German families with breast/ovarian cancer 353 cases found eight double heterozygote individuals. They observed that they 354 were younger at the onset of their first cancer episode when compared with 355 their single heterozygote relatives and had more severe disease <sup>58</sup>. A worldwide 356 survey of 32,295 women compared the clinical history of double heterozygote 357 individuals with breast cancer to their single heterozygote counterparts. The 358 same was done for ovarian cancer cases. They observed that clinical 359 characteristics of double heterozygote individuals resemble phenotypes from 360 BRCA1-only single heterozygotes, but tumor LOH microsatellite markers 361 patterns are intermediate to the patterns of *BRCA1*-only single heterozygote 362 and BRCA2-only single heterozygote. Thus, the authors suggest that the joint

16

effect of BRCA1/BRCA2 variants are compatible with an additive model 47. 363 364 Another recent study also suggests that the double heterozygote phenotype 365 more closely resembled that of *BRCA1* mutation carriers with poor prognosis 366 factors and proposed a co-dominant model for the joint effects <sup>59</sup>. 367 In summary, BRCA1/BRCA2 double heterozygote may have early onset 368 of disease and the phenotype is perhaps similar to the "severe end of spectrum of *BRCA1* mutation carriership"<sup>48</sup>. We found a single *BRCA1/BRCA2* double 369 370 heterozygote woman in our sample. She presented personal history of breast 371 cancer. Since she is in her late 40s, her first cancer case must have happened 372 much earlier, however, detailed data on her phenotype is currently lacking. 373 Literature on BRCA/other genes double heterozygotes is sparser. Thus, 374 comparison with our results was difficult due to the possible different combinations of variants. For example, Sokolenko et al. (2014) <sup>60</sup> found seven 375 376 digenic combinations double heterozygotes among *BRCA1* and other DNA 377 double-strand repair genes (BRCA1/CHEK2, BRCA1/ATM, BRCA1/BLM, 378 CHEK2/BLM, CHEK2/ATM, NBS1/ATM, and NBS1/BLM) in Russian patients: 379 none were observed in our study. They did not observe differences from single 380 heterozygote individuals. In contrast, a case series including a German 381 BRCA1/PALB2 double heterozygous patient had no early onset but had severe 382 disease (multifocal triple negative ductal carcinoma) <sup>61</sup>. Another case report 383 presented a case of a double heterozygote APC/MLH1 man with Kashmir/Egyptian ancestry, which had a history of six jejunal cancers <sup>62</sup>. 384 385 Therefore, double heterozygosity may have unusual effects on cancer 386 phenotypes. However, we did not find APC/MLH1 double heterozygous, but

17

found an individual *APC/TP53* double heterozygote, so it is another case
warranting further investigation.

Perhaps the joint effects of non-*BRCA* variants can be explained in an
additive manner as well. Thus, some combinations will result in severe
phenotypes while others will not, due to the specific penetrance of each variant.
It seems that non-*BRCA* double heterozygotes will need to be analyzed on a
case-by-case basis.

394 We found that NCCN 1.2020 criteria missed a substantial proportion of 395 patients that had pathogenic/likely pathogenic variants. Other authors observed 396 the same. We found that NCCN criteria missed a substantial proportion of 397 patients that had pathogenic/likely pathogenic variants. Other authors observed the same. For example, Grindedal et al. (2017) <sup>63</sup> investigated BRCA mutations 398 399 in a Norwegian breast cancer cohort and assessed some testing criteria, 400 including NCCN, and found a false negative rate of 15.8%. Yang et al. (2018) <sup>64</sup> 401 investigated 4196 patients genotyped with 40- to 80- genes panels and showed 402 a false negative rate of 13.5% with NCCN criteria. Both were not much far from 403 our estimate of 17% with NCCN 1.2020/3.2019.

404 Other authors proposed changes to NCCN criteria. Alemar et al. (2017) 405 <sup>34</sup> found that adding criteria that are not included in the NCCN and ANS criteria 406 (e.g. some ASCO criteria <sup>65, 66</sup>) achieved a higher predictive value, while other authors compared other four algorithms (BOADICEA 67, 68, BRCAPRO, Myriad 407 <sup>69</sup> and Manchester score <sup>70</sup>) and observed that the pedigree-based BOADICEA 408 409 most accurately predicted BRCA1/BRCA2 variant carrier status in a 410 Southeastern Brazilian population <sup>71</sup>. Although NCCN criteria were imperfect, 411 ANS criteria fared worse and a reformulation is warranted.

18

412 Recently, a panel of Brazilian experts proposed recommendations for 413 improving testing criteria for HBOC risk patients in Brazil. Besides modifying 414 testing criteria, the expert panel also recommended offering risk-reducing 415 surgeries for positive patients. For negative patients, investigating both maternal 416 and paternal lineages is warranted, so the result of models estimating cancer 417 risk can be communicated to the patient. They also suggested that VUS should 418 always be reported and periodically reassessed, but no urgent clinical action is 419 justified since most VUS are constantly reclassified to benign/likely benign 420 categories. Furthermore, patients should be contacted whenever any update in 421 testing protocols or management options should appear <sup>72</sup>. 422 Our study had some limitations. The NGS panel detects small deletions 423 and duplications up to 17 base-pairs, but large deletions and duplications are 424 not detected by this methodology. Other structural chromosomal changes, such 425 as inversions and translocations are not detected either. If some of these 426 changes are suspected, we recommend using methodologies like array CGH, 427 MLPA, qPCR or FISH to confirm the variant found. Expansion variants of 428 trinucleotide repeats, deep intronic variants or regulatory regions such as 429 promoters are not detectable in the present test. Epigenetic changes are also 430 not detectable by this test. At least for BRCA genes though, large 431 rearrangements seem to be uncommon in Brazilian populations <sup>35, 42</sup>. Moreover, 432 further phenotype information was missing for several patients, precluding 433 further analyses.

# 434 Conclusion

435	In conclusion, we genotyped 1682 Brazilian individuals with clinical
436	criteria of hereditary cancer syndrome from all regions of the country with NGS
437	multigenic panels suited for the detection of germline pathogenic variants
438	associated with cancer susceptibility, making it the largest Brazilian study of this
439	nature to date. We observed several BRCA1 and BRCA2 recurrent mutations,
440	confirming their presence in the Brazilian mutational spectrum and generated
441	data for other 30 genes and 110 variants with modest penetrance. We also
442	estimated the prevalence of BRCA as well as non-BRCA double heterozygotes
443	in the Brazilian population. More studies are necessary to discover the
444	implication of transheterozygosity over the phenotype of affected individuals.
445	
446	Appendix

447 **Table A.1.** Genotyped genes.

- **Table A.2.** Ancestry, genetic findings summary, testing criteria, personal and
- 449 family history.
- 450 **Table A.3.** Genetic Findings.
- 451 **Table A.4.** Positivity rate per gene or combination of genes, alongside number
- 452 of unique pathogenic/likely pathogenic variants detected in each gene. The
- 453 variants are detailed for transheterozygotes.
- 454 **Table A.5.** Patients per Brazilian state.

# 455 **References**

Samadder NJ, Giridhar KV, Baffy N, Riegert-Johnson D, Couch FJ.
 Hereditary Cancer Syndromes-A Primer on Diagnosis and Management: Part 1:
 Breast-Ovarian Cancer Syndromes. *Mayo Clin Proc.* Jun 2019;94(6):1084-1098.
 doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.02.017

460 2. Nagy R, Sweet K, Eng C. Highly penetrant hereditary cancer syndromes.
461 Oncogene. 2004;23(38):6445-6470. doi:10.1038/sj.onc.1207714

3. Zelli V, Compagnoni C, Cannita K, et al. Applications of Next Generation
Sequencing to the Analysis of Familial Breast/Ovarian Cancer. *High Throughput*.
Jan 10 2020;9(1)doi:10.3390/ht9010001

465 4. Xuan J, Yu Y, Qing T, Guo L, Shi L. Next-generation sequencing in the 466 clinic: Promises and challenges. *Cancer Letters*. 2013;340(2):284-295. 467 doi:10.1016/j.canlet.2012.11.025

468 5. Yohe S, Thyagarajan B. Review of Clinical Next-Generation Sequencing.
469 Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine. 2017;141(11):1544-1557.
470 doi:10.5858/arpa.2016-0501-ra

471 6. Machado PM, Brandao RD, Cavaco BM, et al. Screening for a BRCA2
472 rearrangement in high-risk breast/ovarian cancer families: evidence for a founder
473 effect and analysis of the associated phenotypes. *J Clin Oncol.* May 20
474 2007;25(15):2027-34. doi:10.1200/JCO.2006.06.9443

475 Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, et al. Standards and guidelines for the 7. 476 interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the 477 American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for 478 Pathology. Genet Med. Molecular Mav 2015;17(5):405-24. 479 doi:10.1038/gim.2015.30

8. Biesecker LG, Harrison SM, ClinGen Sequence Variant Interpretation
Working G. The ACMG/AMP reputable source criteria for the interpretation of
sequence variants. *Genet Med.* Dec 2018;20(12):1687-1688.
doi:10.1038/gim.2018.42

484 9. Karczewski KJ, Francioli LC, Tiao G, et al. The mutational constraint 485 spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans. *Nature*. 2020/05/01 486 2020;581(7809):434-443. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2308-7

487 10. Karczewski KJ, Weisburd B, Thomas B, et al. The ExAC browser:
488 displaying reference data information from over 60 000 exomes. *Nucleic Acids*489 *Research*. 2017;45(D1):D840-D845. doi:10.1093/nar/gkw971

490 11. A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature*. 491 2015;526(7571):68-74. doi:10.1038/nature15393

492 12. Landrum MJ, Lee JM, Benson M, et al. ClinVar: improving access to
493 variant interpretations and supporting evidence. *Nucleic Acids Research*.
494 2018;46(D1):D1062-D1067. doi:10.1093/nar/gkx1153

495 13. Fokkema IFAC, Taschner PEM, Schaafsma GCP, Celli J, Laros JFJ, Den
496 Dunnen JT. LOVD v.2.0: the next generation in gene variant databases. *Human*497 *Mutation*. 2011;32(5):557-563. doi:10.1002/humu.21438

498 14. Organization WH. WHO report on cancer: setting priorities, investing 499 wisely and providing care for all. 2020.

500 15. Instituto Nacional de Câncer José Alencar Gomes da Silva. Ministério da
501 Saúde. Estimativa 2020: incidência de câncer no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto
502 Nacional de Câncer José Alencar Gomes da Silva; 2019. p. 120.

503 16. Yoshida R. Hereditary breast and ovarian cancer (HBOC): review of its
504 molecular characteristics, screening, treatment, and prognosis. *Breast Cancer*.
505 Aug 29 2020;doi:10.1007/s12282-020-01148-2

506 17. Suwinski P, Ong C, Ling MHT, Poh YM, Khan AM, Ong HS. Advancing
507 Personalized Medicine Through the Application of Whole Exome Sequencing and
508 Big Data Analytics. *Front Genet.* 2019;10:49. doi:10.3389/fgene.2019.00049

509 18. Alemar B, Herzog J, Brinckmann Oliveira Netto C, et al. Prevalence of 510 Hispanic BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations among hereditary breast and ovarian 511 cancer patients from Brazil reveals differences among Latin American

512 populations. *Cancer Genet*. Sep 2016;209(9):417-422. 513 doi:10.1016/j.cancergen.2016.06.008

514 19. Dillenburg CV, Bandeira IC, Tubino TV, et al. Prevalence of 185delAG and 515 5382insC mutations in BRCA1, and 6174delT in BRCA2 in women of Ashkenazi 516 Jewish origin in southern Brazil. *Genet Mol Biol.* Jul 2012;35(3):599-602. 517 doi:10.1590/S1415-47572012000400009

518 20. Cipriano NM, Jr., de Brito AM, de Oliveira ES, et al. Mutation screening of 519 TP53, CHEK2 and BRCA genes in patients at high risk for hereditary breast and 520 ovarian cancer (HBOC) in Brazil. *Breast Cancer*. May 2019;26(3):397-405. 521 doi:10.1007/s12282-018-00938-z

522 21. Susswein LR, Marshall ML, Nusbaum R, et al. Pathogenic and likely 523 pathogenic variant prevalence among the first 10,000 patients referred for next-524 generation cancer panel testing. *Genet Med.* Aug 2016;18(8):823-32. 525 doi:10.1038/gim.2015.166

526 22. Sugano K, Nakamura S, Ando J, et al. Cross-sectional analysis of germline 527 BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations in Japanese patients suspected to have hereditary 528 breast/ovarian cancer. *Cancer Sci.* Oct 2008;99(10):1967-76. 529 doi:10.1111/j.1349-7006.2008.00944.x

- 530 23. Okano M, Nomizu T, Tachibana K, et al. The relationship between BRCA531 associated breast cancer and age factors: an analysis of the Japanese HBOC
  532 consortium database. *J Hum Genet*. Mar 2021;66(3):307-314.
  533 doi:10.1038/s10038-020-00849-y
- 534 24. Lourenço JJ, Vargas FR, Bines J, et al. BRCA1 mutations in Brazilian 535 patients. *Genetics and Molecular Biology*. 2004;27:500-504.
- 536 25. Dufloth RM, Carvalho S, Heinrich JK, et al. Analysis of BRCA1 and BRCA2
  537 mutations in Brazilian breast cancer patients with positive family history. Sao
  538 Paulo Med J. Jul 7 2005;123(4):192-7. doi:10.1590/s1516-31802005000400007
  539 26. Gomes MC, Costa MM, Borojevic R, et al. Prevalence of BRCA1 and
  540 BRCA2 mutations in breast cancer patients from Brazil. Breast Cancer Res Treat.
  541 Jul 2007;103(3):349-53. doi:10.1007/s10549-006-9378-6
- 542 27. Esteves VF, Thuler LC, Amendola LC, et al. Prevalence of BRCA1 and 543 BRCA2 gene mutations in families with medium and high risk of breast and 544 ovarian cancer in Brazil. *Braz J Med Biol Res.* May 2009;42(5):453-7. 545 doi:10.1590/s0100-879x2009000500009
- 546 28. Ewald IP, Izetti P, Vargas FR, et al. Prevalence of the BRCA1 founder 547 mutation c.5266dupin Brazilian individuals at-risk for the hereditary breast and 548 ovarian cancer syndrome. *Hered Cancer Clin Pract.* Dec 20 2011;9(1):12. 549 doi:10.1186/1897-4287-9-12
- 550 29. Carraro DM, Koike Folgueira MA, Garcia Lisboa BC, et al. Comprehensive 551 analysis of BRCA1, BRCA2 and TP53 germline mutation and tumor 552 characterization: a portrait of early-onset breast cancer in Brazil. *PLoS One*. 553 2013;8(3):e57581. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0057581
- 554 30. Silva FC, Lisboa BC, Figueiredo MC, et al. Hereditary breast and ovarian 555 cancer: assessment of point mutations and copy number variations in Brazilian 556 patients. *BMC Med Genet*. May 15 2014;15:55. doi:10.1186/1471-2350-15-55
- 557 31. Fernandes GC, Michelli RA, Galvão HC, et al. Prevalence of 558 BRCA1/BRCA2 mutations in a Brazilian population sample at-risk for hereditary 559 breast cancer and characterization of its genetic ancestry. *Oncotarget*. Dec 6 560 2016;7(49):80465-80481. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.12610

22

561 32. Maistro S, Teixeira N, Encinas G, et al. Germline mutations in BRCA1 and 562 BRCA2 in epithelial ovarian cancer patients in Brazil. *BMC cancer*. Dec 3 563 2016;16(1):934. doi:10.1186/s12885-016-2966-x

33. de Oliveira ES, Soares BL, Lemos S, et al. Screening of the BRCA1 gene
in Brazilian patients with breast and/or ovarian cancer via high-resolution melting
reaction analysis. Article. *Fam Cancer.* Apr 2016;15(2):173-181.
doi:10.1007/s10689-015-9858-0

56834.Alemar B, Gregório C, Herzog J, et al. BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutational569profile and prevalence in hereditary breast and ovarian cancer (HBOC) probands570from Southern Brazil: Are international testing criteria appropriate for this specific571population?*PLOS*572doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0187630

573 35. Palmero EI, Carraro DM, Alemar B, et al. The germline mutational 574 landscape of BRCA1 and BRCA2 in Brazil. *Sci Rep.* Jun 15 2018;8(1):9188. 575 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-27315-2

36. Brianese RC, Nakamura KDM, Almeida F, et al. BRCA1 deficiency is a
recurrent event in early-onset triple-negative breast cancer: a comprehensive
analysis of germline mutations and somatic promoter methylation. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* Feb 2018;167(3):803-814. doi:10.1007/s10549-017-4552-6

- 580 Cotrim DP, Ribeiro ARG, Paixão D, et al. Prevalence of BRCA1 and 37. 581 BRCA2 pathogenic and likely pathogenic variants in non-selected ovarian 582 carcinoma patients in Brazil. BMC cancer. Jan 3 2019;19(1):4. 583 doi:10.1186/s12885-018-5235-3
- 584 38. Bandeira G, Rocha K, Lazar M, et al. Germline variants of Brazilian women 585 with breast cancer and detection of a novel pathogenic ATM deletion in early-586 onset breast cancer. *Breast Cancer*. Sep 28 2020;doi:10.1007/s12282-020-587 01165-1

39. Da Costa E Silva Carvalho S, Cury NM, Brotto DB, et al. Germline variants
in DNA repair genes associated with hereditary breast and ovarian cancer
syndrome: analysis of a 21 gene panel in the Brazilian population. *BMC Medical Genomics*. 2020;13(1)doi:10.1186/s12920-019-0652-y

40. Felix GE, Abe-Sandes C, Machado-Lopes TM, et al. Germline mutations in BRCA1, BRCA2, CHEK2 and TP53 in patients at high-risk for HBOC: characterizing a Northeast Brazilian Population. *Hum Genome Var.* 2014;1:14012. doi:10.1038/hgv.2014.12

41. Rebbeck TR, Friebel TM, Friedman E, et al. Mutational spectrum in a
worldwide study of 29,700 families with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations. *Hum Mutat.*May 2018;39(5):593-620. doi:10.1002/humu.23406

Ewald IP, Cossio SL, Palmero EI, et al. BRCA1 599 42. and BRCA2 600 rearrangements in Brazilian individuals with Hereditary Breast and Ovarian 601 Cancer Syndrome. Genet Mol Biol. Apr-Jun 2016;39(2):223-31. 602 doi:10.1590/1678-4685-gmb-2014-0350

603 43. Felicio PS, Grasel RS, Campacci N, et al. Whole-exome sequencing of 604 non-BRCA1/BRCA2 mutation carrier cases at high-risk for hereditary 605 breast/ovarian cancer. *Hum Mutat*. Dec 16 2020;doi:10.1002/humu.24158

44. Soares BL, Brant AC, Gomes R, et al. Screening for germline mutations in
mismatch repair genes in patients with Lynch syndrome by next generation
sequencing. *Fam Cancer*. Jul 2018;17(3):387-394. doi:10.1007/s10689-0170043-5

23

45. Rosa RCA, Santis JO, Teixeira LA, et al. Lynch syndrome identification in
a Brazilian cohort of endometrial cancer screened by a universal approach. *Gynecol Oncol.* Oct 2020;159(1):229-238. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2020.07.013

613 46. Gomes R, Spinola PDS, Brant AC, et al. Prevalence of germline variants
614 in consensus moderate-to-high-risk predisposition genes to hereditary breast and
615 ovarian cancer in BRCA1/2-negative Brazilian patients. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.*616 Oct 30 2020;doi:10.1007/s10549-020-05985-9

617 47. Rebbeck TR, Friebel TM, Mitra N, et al. Inheritance of deleterious
618 mutations at both BRCA1 and BRCA2 in an international sample of 32,295
619 women. *Breast Cancer Research*. Nov 11 2016;18112. doi:10.1186/s13058-016620 0768-3

48. Leegte B, van der Hout AH, Deffenbaugh AM, et al. Phenotypic expression
of double heterozygosity for BRCA1 and BRCA2 germline mutations. *J Med Genet*. Mar 2005;42(3):e20. doi:10.1136/jmg.2004.027243

49. Lavie O, Narod S, Lejbkowicz F, et al. Double heterozygosity in the BRCA1
and BRCA2 genes in the Jewish population. *Ann Oncol.* Apr 2011;22(4):964-966.
doi:10.1093/annonc/mdq460

50. Zuradelli M, Peissel B, Manoukian S, et al. Four new cases of double heterozygosity for BRCA1 and BRCA2 gene mutations: clinical, pathological, and family characteristics. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Nov 2010;124(1):251-8. doi:10.1007/s10549-010-0853-8

51. Noh JM, Choi DH, Nam SJ, et al. Characteristics of double heterozygosity
for BRCA1 and BRCA2 germline mutations in Korean breast cancer patients. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* Jan 2012;131(1):217-22. doi:10.1007/s10549-0111718-5

52. Friedman E, Bar-Sade Bruchim R, Kruglikova A, et al. Double
heterozygotes for the Ashkenazi founder mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes. *Am J Hum Genet*. Oct 1998;63(4):1224-7. doi:10.1086/302040

Moslehi R, Russo D, Phelan C, Jack E, Antman K, Narod S. An unaffected
individual from a breast/ovarian cancer family with germline mutations in both
BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Clin Genet.* Jan 2000;57(1):70-3. doi:10.1034/j.13990004.2000.570111.x

54. Bell DW, Erban J, Sgroi DC, Haber DA. Selective loss of heterozygosity in
multiple breast cancers from a carrier of mutations in both BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Cancer Res.* May 15 2002;62(10):2741-3.

55. Thiffault I, Hamel N, Pal T, et al. Germline truncating mutations in both
MSH2 and BRCA2 in a single kindred. *Br J Cancer*. Jan 26 2004;90(2):483-91.
doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6601424

648 56. Musolino A, Naldi N, Michiara M, et al. A breast cancer patient from Italy
649 with germline mutations in both the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes. *Breast Cancer*650 *Res Treat*. May 2005;91(2):203-5. doi:10.1007/s10549-004-7704-4

651 57. Randall TC, Bell KA, Rebane BA, Rubin SC, Boyd J. Germline mutations
652 of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes in a breast and ovarian cancer patient. *Gynecol*653 *Oncol.* Sep 1998;70(3):432-4. doi:10.1006/gyno.1998.5081

58. Heidemann S, Fischer C, Engel C, et al. Double heterozygosity for
mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2 in German breast cancer patients: implications
on test strategies and clinical management. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*. Aug 2012;134(3):1229-1239. doi:10.1007/s10549-012-2050-4

658 59. Le Page C, Rahimi K, Rodrigues M, et al. Clinicopathological features of 659 women with epithelial ovarian cancer and double heterozygosity for BRCA1 and

660 BRCA2: A systematic review and case report analysis. *Gynecol Oncol.* Feb 2020;156(2):377-386. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.11.019

662 60. Sokolenko AP, Bogdanova N, Kluzniak W, et al. Double heterozygotes 663 among breast cancer patients analyzed for BRCA1, CHEK2, ATM, NBN/NBS1, 664 and BLM germ-line mutations. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Jun 2014;145(2):553-665 62. doi:10.1007/s10549-014-2971-1

666 61. Pern F, Bogdanova N, Schürmann P, et al. Mutation analysis of BRCA1,
667 BRCA2, PALB2 and BRD7 in a hospital-based series of German patients with
668 triple-negative breast cancer. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(10):e47993.
669 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0047993

670 62. Lindor NM, Smyrk TC, Buehler S, et al. Multiple jejunal cancers resulting 671 from combination of germline APC and MLH1 mutations. *Fam Cancer*. Dec 672 2012;11(4):667-9. doi:10.1007/s10689-012-9561-3

673 63. Grindedal EM, Heramb C, Karsrud I, et al. Current guidelines for BRCA
674 testing of breast cancer patients are insufficient to detect all mutation carriers.
675 *BMC cancer*. 2017;17(1):438-438. doi:10.1186/s12885-017-3422-2

676 64. Yang S, Axilbund JE, O'Leary E, et al. Underdiagnosis of Hereditary 677 Breast and Ovarian Cancer in Medicare Patients: Genetic Testing Criteria Miss 678 the Mark. *Ann Surg Oncol.* Oct 2018;25(10):2925-2931. doi:10.1245/s10434-679 018-6621-4

680 65. Statement of the American Society of Clinical Oncology: genetic testing 681 for cancer susceptibility, Adopted on February 20, 1996. *J Clin Oncol.* May 682 1996;14(5):1730-6; discussion 1737-40. doi:10.1200/JCO.1996.14.5.1730

683 66. Lu KH, Wood ME, Daniels M, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology 684 Expert Statement: collection and use of a cancer family history for oncology 685 providers. *J Clin Oncol.* Mar 10 2014;32(8):833-40. 686 doi:10.1200/JCO.2013.50.9257

687 67. Antoniou AC, Pharoah PD, McMullan G, et al. A comprehensive model for 688 familial breast cancer incorporating BRCA1, BRCA2 and other genes. *Br J* 689 *Cancer*. Jan 7 2002;86(1):76-83. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6600008

690 68. Antoniou AC, Pharoah PP, Smith P, Easton DF. The BOADICEA model of 691 genetic susceptibility to breast and ovarian cancer. *Br J Cancer*. Oct 18 692 2004;91(8):1580-90. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6602175

693 69. Parmigiani G, Berry D, Aguilar O. Determining carrier probabilities for 694 breast cancer-susceptibility genes BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Am J Hum Genet*. Jan 695 1998;62(1):145-58. doi:10.1086/301670

696 Evans DG, Eccles DM, Rahman N, et al. A new scoring system for the 70. 697 chances of identifying a BRCA1/2 mutation outperforms existing models including 698 BRCAPRO. J Med Genet. Jun 2004;41(6):474-80. doi:10.1136/jmg.2003.017996 699 71. Teixeira N, Maistro S, Del Pilar Estevez Diz M, et al. Predictability of 700 BRCA1/2 mutation status in patients with ovarian cancer: How to select women 701 for genetic testing in middle-income countries. Maturitas. Nov 2017;105:113-118. 702 doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2017.06.002

703 72. Achatz MI, Caleffi M, Guindalini R, Marques RM, Nogueira-Rodrigues A,
704 Ashton-Prolla P. Recommendations for Advancing the Diagnosis and
705 Management of Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer in Brazil. *JCO Glob Oncol.*706 2020;6:439-452. doi:10.1200/JGO.19.00170

707

Demographic	Ν	%
Sex	1682	100
Female	1557	92.6
Male	125	7.4
Age at diagnosis (years)		
<30	79	4.7
30-40	452	26.9
41-50	526	31.3
51-65	465	27.6
>65	160	9.5
Ethnicity		
Multiple ethnicities (admixed)	330	19.6
White	259	15.4
Black	26	1.5
Jewish Ashkenazi	22	1.3
Native indigenous	21	1.2
Asian	17	1.0
No information	1007	59.9
Personal cancer history <sup>a</sup>		
Overall	1126	66.9
Breast or ovarian	971	57.7
Colorectal	71	4.2
Thyroid/parathyroid	36	2.1
Prostate	15	0.9
Stomach	14	0.8
Uterus	13	0.8
Kidney	13	0.8
Sarcomas	13	0.8
Leukemia	11	0.6
Skin (non-melanoma)	9	0.5
Pancreas	9	0.5
Other	17	1.0
No cancer history	268	15.9
No information	293	17.4

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of Brazilian individuals tested genotyped with NGS hereditary cancer panel.

Family cancer history (first-, second- or third-degree relatives) a

Overall	1182	70.3
Breast or ovarian	973	57.8
Colorectal	310	18.4
Thyroid/parathyroid	108	6.4
Prostate	339	20.2
Stomach	155	9.2
Uterus	122	7.3
Kidney	45	2.7
Sarcomas	22	1.3
Leukemia	139	8.3
Skin (non-melanoma)	72	4.3
Pancreas	83	4.9
Other	235	14.0
No cancer history	163	9.7
No information	337	20.0

<sup>a</sup> Number of individuals with personal history exceeds 1682 because some individuals reported multiple cancer types.

	NGS t	esting	Pow
Decision	V Positive patients	VUS/Negative	ive
		patients	lotais
NCCN 3.2019/1.2020			
At risk	215	793	1008
No risk	45	323	368
Column totals	260	1116	1376
Insufficient information:			
306			
Brazilian ANS			
At risk	145	515	660
No risk	115	576	691
Column totals	260	1091	1351
Insufficient information:			
331			
NCCN: sensitivity = 82.7%, spe	cificity = 28.9%, false neg	gative rate = 17.3%, F1	-measure =

#### Table 2. NCCN 3.2019/1.2020 and Brazilian ANS testing criteria performance.

33.9%.

ANS: sensitivity = 55.8%, specificity = 52.8%, false negative rate = 44.2% F1-measure = 31.5%.

#### **Figure captions**

Figure 1. Variants profiles. (A) Distribution of patients according to genetic findings. P/LP = patients with pathogenic/likely pathogenic, VUS = patients with variants of uncertain significance (N = 1682). (B) Distribution of P/LP variants per gene. (C) P/LP variants functional annotation. (D) Distribution of VUS per gene. Lynch syndrome genes have been grouped together in (C) and (D).

Figure 2. Heatmap representing the distribution of pathogenic/likely pathogenic (P/LP) transheterozygotes in the sample. The top line represents the number of patients in each column. The single heterozygotes (n=290) are distributed in the main diagonal. Transheterozygotes (n=15) are distributed in the inferior half (14 double-heterozygotes and 1 triple-heterozygote). The total number of variants are 321 (290 × 1 + 14 × 2 + 1 × 3 = 321).









#### D

В



