

SLOP Ependymoma I: Final results, long term follow-up and molecular analysis of the trial cohort: A BIOMECA Consortium Study

Timothy A Ritzmann^{1,2}, Rebecca J Chapman¹, John-Paul Kilday^{3,4}, Nicola Thorp^{5,6}, Piergiorgio Modena⁷, Robert A Dineen^{1,2}, Donald Macarthur^{1,2}, Conor Mallucci⁹, Timothy Jaspán², Kristian W Pajtler^{10,11,12}, Marzia Giagnacovo⁷, Thomas S Jacques^{13,14}, Simon ML Paine^{1,2}, David W Ellison¹⁵, Eric Bouffet¹⁶ and Richard G Grundy^{1,2} on behalf of the BIOMECA consortium

Affiliations:

- (1) Children's Brain Tumour Research Centre, University of Nottingham, UK
- (2) Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, UK
- (3) Children's Brain Tumour Research Network (CBTRN), Royal Manchester Children's Hospital, UK.
- (4) The Centre for Paediatric, Teenage and Young Adult Cancer, Institute of Cancer Sciences, University of Manchester, UK
- (5) The Clatterbridge Cancer Centre, Liverpool, UK
- (6) The Christie Hospital Proton Beam Therapy Centre, Manchester, UK
- (7) Genetics Unit, ASST Lariana General Hospital, Como, Italy
- (8) NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre
- (9) Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust
- (10) Hopp Children's Cancer Center Heidelberg (KiTZ), Germany
- (11) Division of Pediatric Neuro-oncology, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ) and German Cancer Consortium (DKTK), Heidelberg, Germany
- (12) Department of Pediatric Oncology, Hematology, and Immunology, University Hospital Heidelberg, Germany
- (13) UCL GOS Institute of Child Health, London, UK
- (14) Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
- (15) Department of Pathology, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Memphis, USA
- (16) The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada

Corresponding Author: Professor Richard Grundy, University of Nottingham Biodiscovery Institute, NG7 2RD. Richard.grundy@nottingham.ac.uk.

Funding: The study was supported by CRUK Children's Cancer Trials Team at the University of Birmingham. Funding from Fighting Ependymoma, Children with Cancer UK, The Joe Foote Research Foundation and Brainstrust also supported this research. TAR received funding from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) in the form of an Academic Clinical Lectureship. TAR and RG received funding from the James Tudor Foundation. TSJ also received funding from the Brain Tumour Charity, Great Ormond Street Hospital Children's Charity, Olivia Hodson Cancer Fund, Cancer Research UK and the NIHR. Research at GOSH and UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health is made possible by the NIHR GOSH Biomedical Research Centre. PM and MG received funding from Associazione Bianca Garavaglia.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest.

Authorship: All authors contributed to manuscript writing.

Experimental Design: TAR,DM,DWE,EB,RGG

Implementation: TAR,RJC,DM,JPK,CM,NT,PM,TJ,TSJ,SMLP,DWE,EB,RGG

Data Analysis: TAR,RJC,DM,JPK,CM,NT,PM,RD,TJ,TSJ,SMLP,KWP,DWE,EB, MG,RGG

Data Interpretation: TAR,RJC,DM,JPK,CM,NT,PM,RD,TJ,TSJ,SMLP,KWP,DWE,ED,RGG

Data Sharing: The DNA methylation profiles described in this study are deposited in the gene expression omnibus as GSE182707.

Abstract

Background: SIOP Ependymoma I was a non-randomised trial assessing event free and overall survival (EFS/OS) from non-metastatic intracranial ependymoma in children aged 3 to 21 years, treated with a staged management strategy. Chemotherapy efficacy in ependymoma is debated and therefore the response rate (RR) of subtotally resected (STR) ependymoma to vincristine, etoposide and cyclophosphamide (VEC) was an additional primary outcome. We report final results with 12-year follow-up and *post hoc* analyses of recently described biomarkers.

Methods: 74 participants were eligible. Children with gross total resection (GTR) received radiotherapy, whilst those with STR received VEC before radiotherapy. DNA methylation and 1q status were evaluated, alongside *hTERT*, ReLA, Tenascin-C, H3K27me3 and pAKT expression.

Results: Five- and ten-year EFS was 49.5% and 46.7%, OS was 69.3% and 60.5%. GTR was achieved in 33/74 (44.6%) and associated with improved EFS ($p=0.003$, HR=2.6, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.4-5.1). Grade 3 tumours were associated with worse OS ($p=0.005$, HR=2.8, 95%CI 1.3-5.8). 1q gain and *hTERT* expression were associated with poorer EFS ($p=0.003$, HR=2.70, 95%CI 1.49-6.10 and $p=0.014$, HR=5.8, 95%CI 1.2-28 respectively) and H3K27me3 loss with worse OS ($p=0.003$, HR=4.6, 95%CI 1.5-13.2). DNA methylation profiles showed expected patterns. 12 participants with STR did not receive chemotherapy; a protocol violation. However, chemotherapy RR was 65.5% (19/29, 95%CI 45.7-82.1), exceeding a prespecified 45% RR.

Conclusions: RR of STR to VEC exceeded the pre-specified criterion for efficacy. However, cases of inaccurate treatment stratification highlighted the need for rapid central review. Prognostic associations for 1q gain, H3K27me3 and *hTERT* were confirmed.

Keywords: Ependymoma, Chemotherapy, Resection, Recurrence, Radiotherapy

Introduction

Paediatric ependymomas are associated with poor outcomes^{1,2}. Five-year overall survival (OS) above 70% is rarely reported whilst event free survival (EFS) is around 55%³⁻⁶.

Surgical gross total resection (GTR) is associated with improved outcomes⁷⁻⁹. Post-operative radiotherapy of doses up to 59.4Gy using 1.8 Gy per fraction to the tumour bed is now recommended as a standard of care for children over 18 months (54 Gy between 12 and 18 months)⁹. The optimal role for chemotherapy is disputed¹⁰. Some researchers report benefits of chemotherapy, particularly in younger children¹¹⁻¹⁵, whilst others report no benefit, or benefits confined to specific intracranial locations^{16,17}.

Progress has been made in understanding the molecular basis of ependymoma. Posterior Fossa A (PFA) and *ZFTA*-fusion (formerly *RELA*-fusion¹⁸) supratentorial ependymomas are associated with the poorest outcomes^{18,19}. Additionally, chromosome 1q gain is a reproducible poor prognostic indicator^{13,20-23}. Other proposed prognostic markers include telomerase activity via *hTERT*^{22,24,25}, Tenascin-C (TNC)²⁶, H3K27me3 loss^{27,28}, and pAKT expression²⁹.

We present previously unreported findings of the International Society of Paediatric Oncology (SIOP) Ependymoma I protocol, recruited between 1999 and 2007, with long-term follow up and retrospective analysis of molecular markers.

The primary aims were:

- (1) To determine EFS and OS of participants with ependymoma when treated with a staged management strategy to achieve maximum local control;
- (2) To establish the response rate (RR) of intracranial ependymoma to a combination of vincristine, cyclophosphamide and etoposide (VEC).

Methods

Eligibility criteria and outcome measures

Eligible patients were aged 3 to 21 years with untreated non-metastatic, intracranial, histologically confirmed ependymoma. Written informed consent was required. Patients with myxopapillary ependymoma, subependymoma or ependymoblastoma were excluded. Tissue availability for molecular analysis was not mandated for trial entry.

Outcome measures were: EFS and OS, surgical operability and RR to chemotherapy.

Trial design

Extent of resection was categorised, according to contemporary standards^{30,31}, as either subtotal resection (STR) (greater than 1.5cm² tumour residuum on a single cross sectional image) or GTR (no visible residuum, or residuum measuring no greater than 1.5cm²) and was determined by radiological consensus, based initially on local opinion before central review. Second look surgery was recommended for those with operable residuum.

Participants with GTR underwent focal radiotherapy of 54 Gy in 30 daily fractions of 1.8Gy per fraction over six weeks.

Participants with STR received chemotherapy with four cycles of VEC with MRI assessments after cycles two and four. Response assessments were centrally reviewed and recorded according to contemporary SIOP recommendations³⁰. Percentage response was determined by calculating the product of the perpendicular diameters of the tumour relative to the baseline, post-operative, evaluation.

- Complete Response (CR): no disease;
- Partial Response (PR): 50% reduction;
- Objective Response (OR): 25-50% reduction;
- Stable Disease (SD): <25% reduction;
- Progressive Disease (PD): >25% increase in tumour size.

Following chemotherapy, the protocol specified that all participants receive focal radiotherapy (**Figure 1A**).

The trial was approved by the UK Children's Cancer Study Group (CSSG) and SIOP. Participants were monitored through the Children's Cancer and Leukaemia Group (CCLG) data centre until censoring or death. The clinicaltrials.gov identifier was NCT00004224. The study received ethical approval from the Trent multicentre research ethics committee (MREC99/02/11, CTA reference MF8000/13710).

Molecular Analysis

DNA was extracted from paraffin embedded samples using the AllPrep FFPE DNA/RNA extraction kit (Qiagen) and from frozen samples using the QIAamp DNA mini kit (Qiagen). RNA from frozen samples was extracted using mirVana (ThermoFisher).

DNA methylation profiles were generated using Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip arrays (Illumina) with ependymoma subgroups assigned as previously described¹. Classifier scores of 0.7 or above were used to support clinical diagnosis, although 31/35 cases had a score >0.9. DNA methylation .IDAT files are accessible at GSE182707.

1q status was evaluated by DNA methylation profiling, fluorescent in-situ hybridisation (FISH) and multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA) as previously described¹. There was good correlation between 1q assessment methods. The Fleiss-Kappa statistic was 0.615 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.708 ($p = 0.008$) where two and three tests were performed respectively.

Quantitative real-time PCR was used to determine *hTERT* expression as previously described²⁵.

Immunohistochemistry was performed in triplicate on four micrometre tissue microarray sections for ReLA, TNC, H3K27Me3 and pAKT. Antigen retrieval was with sodium citrate buffer (pH6). Protein blocking was with normal goat or horse serum (Vector Labs) before five minute peroxidase blocking (DAKO). H3K27me3 (Tri-Methyl-Histone H3, Rabbit mAb, 1:500; Cell Signalling Technology), pAKT (Phospho-Akt, ser473, Rabbit mAb, 1:50; Cell Signalling Technology), and TNC (Tenascin-C, E-9, Mouse mAb, 1:50; Santa Cruz Biotec)

primary antibodies were incubated for one hour at room temperature. Positive controls were human tonsil (H3K27me3, RelA), breast carcinoma (pAKT), and epidermoid carcinoma (TNC). Target antigens were detected using the DAKO Envision Detection Kit. For TNC, biotinylated universal antibody anti-rabbit/mouse (Vector, UK) diluted in horse serum was applied, followed with Vectastain avidin/biotin complex reagent (Vectastain-Elite ABC kit, Vector, UK). For all target antigens, diaminobenzidine chromogen was applied for five minutes. H3K27me3, RelA, pAKT and TNC were scored as either negative or positive.

Statistics

Previous studies indicated five-year OS for those with primary GTR and STR ranges from 30 to 85% and 0 to 45% respectively³². This study assumed five-year OS of 70% with GTR and 35% with STR, implying hazard ratio, HR = 0.34 favouring GTR. It was assumed that 3/8 would achieve GTR. Using a two-sided 5% significance level and 80% power, a study of 65 participants was proposed (GTR 24, STR 41)³³. It was anticipated that if RR to chemotherapy in the STR group was under 25% there would be no interest in the combination. In contrast, RR 45% or more would suggest worthwhile efficacy and was set as the criterion for assessment of chemotherapy response. A one-stage Fleming-A'Hern design required 32 STR participants with a minimum of 13 responses to claim sufficient activity³⁴.

Analysis

EFS was defined as the time from surgery to first recurrence, PD or death. OS was defined as time from surgery to death. Surviving participants were censored at date last seen.

Data analysis was conducted in the R statistical environment³⁵. Survival probabilities were calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method³⁶. The influences of tumour resection, WHO grade and molecular parameters were investigated prospectively. Molecular analyses were *post hoc*. Multivariate analyses were conducted using the Cox Proportional Hazards Model.

RR was calculated as the proportion of CR plus PR from all those with STR receiving chemotherapy. 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) for the RR were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson approach³⁷.

Due to poor compliance with chemotherapy in the STR arm of the study an “as-treated” analysis was performed for chemotherapy treated participants to better understand the true RR to VEC.

Results

Cohort Summary

89 participants with intracranial ependymoma from 25 participating centres in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Spain, Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands were registered between 17th May 1999 and 1st November 2007. Four participants had metastatic disease at presentation. A further 11 did not have ependymoma on histopathology and DNA methylation review (three medulloblastomas, three glioblastomas and one each of atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour, choroid plexus carcinoma, high grade glioma, papillary glioneuronal tumour and high grade neuroepithelial tumour with *MN1* alteration). This left 74 with non-metastatic intracranial ependymoma, 35 with a DNA methylation result (**Figures 1B & 2A**).

Thirty-eight of seventy-four (51%) participants were male. Median age at diagnosis was 7.8 years (range 3.1-18.8). Forty-seven of seventy-four (64%) had posterior fossa (PF) tumours and 39/74 (53%) were WHO Grade 2. Twenty-nine (39%) participants achieved GTR after first surgery. Of the 45 with initial STR, ten (22%) had early second-look surgery, four of these (40%) achieved GTR and six (60%) still had STR, leaving 41/74 (55.4%) with STR prior to adjuvant therapy and GTR rate of 33/74 (44.6%) (**Figure 1B**). There was no difference in the extent of resection between centres with high numbers of cases (five or more) compared to centres with low numbers of cases (four or fewer) (High volume = 18/39 (46.2%) GTR, Low volume = 15/35 (42.9%) GTR, $p=0.776$, Chi-square test). There was no difference in age, tumour volume or location between those achieving GTR versus STR. Resection rate improved over time; the GTR rate between 1999-2002 was 12/37 (32.4%), rising to 21/37 (56.8%) between 2003 – 2007 ($p=0.035$, Chi square test).

To assess second look surgery, a surgical panel retrospectively reviewed post-operative scans following STR to independently consider whether they would have attempted further early resection. There were limitations to availability of complete sets of imaging, but where such review was possible the surgical panel would have attempted an early second resection in 10/25 (40%).

Thirty-five of seventy-four (47%) participants had a DNA methylation result and in 60/74 (81%) 1q status was known. Protein expression was measured in 40/74 (54%) for TNC, 50/74 (68%) for pAKT, 54/74 (73%) for H3K27me3 and 51/74 (69%) for RelA. 16/74 (22%) had *hTERT* expression measured.

Seventeen of thirty-five of DNA methylation profiled tumours were PFA (49%) and 10/35 (29%) were ZFTA-fusion (formerly EPN_RELA¹⁸). 7/35 (20%) were PFB and 1/35 (3%) were YAP. There was no difference in STR between PFA (n=11, 65%) and ZFTA-fusion (n=5, 50%) (p=0.730). Eighteen of sixty (30%) had 1q gain (**Table 1**). Twenty-four of sixty were assessed by three methods (FISH, MLPA and methylation array), 16 with two methods and 20 with one method. 1q gain was identified in 8/17 (47%) of PFA and 3/10 (30%) ZFTA-fusion. 1q gain was not seen in PFB or YAP. There was no difference in 1q gain between GTR and STR cases (p=0.611). *hTERT* was only expressed in PFA and ZFTA-fusion tumours. RELA was expressed in all tumour subtypes apart from PFB. In PF tumours, H3K27Me3 was only expressed in PFB. pAKT positivity was seen in all subtypes whilst TNC expression was restricted to PFA (**Figure 2B**).

Survival Outcomes (Table 2)

Median follow-up for the surviving participants was twelve years (range 1.2 to 19 years). 32/74 (43%) died: 22/41 (54%) with STR and 10/33 (30%) with GTR. 41/74 (55%) relapsed at least once, 28/41 (66%) with STR and 13/33 (40%) with GTR.

Five- and ten-year EFS was 49.5% and 46.7% whilst OS was 69.3% and 60.5%. GTR was associated with improved EFS compared to STR (Five-year EFS 69.1% Vs 33.8%, p=0.003, HR=0.38) (**Figure 3A**) but not OS (Five-year OS 81.3% Vs 59.5.0%, p=0.071, HR=0.50).

Tumour grade was not associated with EFS but WHO grade 3 tumours were associated with worse OS (Five-year OS 52.2% Vs 84.2%, $p=0.005$, HR=2.8) (**Figure 3B**).

1q gain was associated with poorer EFS (Five-year EFS 33.3% Vs 59.0%, $p=0.003$, HR=2.71) and OS (Five-year OS 55.6% Vs 75.5%, $p=0.042$, HR=2.22) (**Figure 3C&D**). When further stratified by tumour location, 1q gain was only prognostic in PF tumours (five-year EFS 33.3% Vs 70.8%, $p=0.002$, HR=3.94 and OS 58.3% Vs 75%, $p=0.023$, HR=3.07) ($n=36$). No difference in survival was seen for supratentorial tumours in relation to 1q gain ($n=24$) (**Supplementary Figure S1**).

Consistent with its association with loss of expression in PFA, H3K27me3 positivity was associated with better OS (Five year OS 46.9% Vs 90.2%, $p=0.003$, HR=0.22) but no significant difference in EFS ($p=0.200$) (**Figure 3E**). *hTERT* positivity was associated with worse EFS (Five-year EFS 20.0% Vs 83.3%, $p=0.014$, HR=5.8) but not OS ($p=0.092$) (**Figure 3F**). RELA protein, TNC and pAKT expression were not associated with outcome in any group. DNA Methylation classification was not significantly associated with outcome, possibly due to small numbers of cases, but patterns of survival were consistent with previous reports^{1,19} (**Figures 3G&H**).

On multivariate analysis of OS including 1q status and grade, only grade 3 tumours remained a predictor of poorer outcome ($p=0.015$, HR=2.81, 95%CI 1.22-6.47). For EFS, both 1q status and resection remained statistically significant (1q gain: $p=0.003$, HR=2.87, 95%CI 1.43-5.78, STR: $p=0.006$, HR=2.81, 95%CI 1.35-5.84).

Treatment outcomes

In the GTR group ($n=33$), 32 participants (97%) received focal radiotherapy. One participant, with supratentorial ependymoma lacking 1q gain, received no further treatment due to family choice and was still alive after ten-years (**Figure 1B**).

In the STR group ($n=41$), despite a clear protocol, 10 participants with residuum proceeded to radiotherapy without chemotherapy (**Figure 1B**). Of these, four resulted from family preference, and one was because resection was assessed locally as GTR, but STR on

subsequent central review. No reason was documented for the remaining five. Two participants received no therapy after STR; one dying within two months of diagnosis and the other progressing after 14 months.

26 STR group participants received chemotherapy followed by focal radiotherapy whilst a further three received chemotherapy alone. Of the 29 who received chemotherapy: 22 received four cycles of VEC; four received two cycles and proceeded to further treatment with progressive disease as per protocol; and three received two or three cycles but did not progress to four cycles due to toxicity.

The CR+PR response rates were 14/28 (50.0%) and 13/22 (59.1%) after VEC cycles two and four respectively. 19/29 (65.5%, 95% CI 45.7-82.1) participants achieved CR or PR during chemotherapy, exceeding the prespecified 45% RR criterion (**Table 3**).

In a *post hoc* analysis, the twelve participants in the STR group who did not receive chemotherapy had median OS of 64 months, whilst those who received chemotherapy did not fall below 50% survival during follow-up. However, there was no difference between the two groups for either OS ($p=0.35$) or EFS ($p=0.56$).

The main toxicities of chemotherapy were leucopenia (97%), thrombocytopenia (48%), nausea and vomiting (24%), and infection (21%).

Most second look surgeries (10/16, 63%) occurred prior to adjuvant therapy, but because later surgical decisions were taken at local centres, it has not been possible to determine detailed outcomes of second surgery for the remaining six participants.

Discussion

Whilst knowledge of the molecular basis of ependymoma has advanced since the trial was designed^{18,19,38,39}, our ability to treat ependymoma, in particular to prevent recurrence¹, has shown less progress. We report long-term outcomes for children treated with a staged treatment protocol for ependymoma and retrospectively apply molecular diagnostics to a

clinical trial cohort^{3,21,25}. We also report that chemotherapy meets a prespecified RR, confirming VEC as standard of care for inoperable childhood ependymoma.

A primary aim of this study was to assess the role of chemotherapy in inducing a tumour response for participants with STR. The RR of 65.5% suggests that VEC is associated with tumour response in this group. Whilst the number receiving chemotherapy was 29 rather than the targeted 32, the 19 responses exceeded the 13 prespecified for demonstration of efficacy. The study was designed to assess RR rather than survival as an outcome, and further work is required to establish whether chemotherapy provides either a direct survival benefit or an indirect benefit through the facilitation of additional surgery. The *post hoc* comparison between STR participants with and without chemotherapy was not designed to answer this question.

In 12 participants for whom STR was achieved, no chemotherapy was given, in breach of the protocol. This resulted from treatment decisions by local teams, as prospective central radiological review for stratification was not mandated. Additionally, there were four cases in which the family did not consent to chemotherapy. The challenge of protocol compliance for post-operative chemotherapy regimens in ependymoma is not a unique experience; a similar problem has been reported in ACNS0831⁴⁰ and the SIOPEP ependymoma II study is experiencing related difficulties (Personal Communication, R Grundy, 2021). We have included rapid central review within the current SIOPEP Ependymoma II study and based on our experience, we recommend the use of multidisciplinary meetings at trial registration in order to ensure correct stratification to treatment arms.

Whilst a number of studies have identified a role for chemotherapy in children under three years, aiming to avoid or at least delay radiotherapy^{12,13,15,21}, others have disagreed^{4,6,14}. Our study demonstrated chemotherapy efficacy in older age groups. This is consistent with the findings of more recent US studies^{6,41}. Garvin used a combination of vincristine, cisplatin and etoposide and reported a RR of 57% in 35 evaluable participants, which is close to our RR of 65.5%⁶. Massimino reported a cohort of 160 children using VEC chemotherapy to bridge the gap to second resection, but did not directly report on the RR as assessed by post-chemotherapy imaging⁴. More recently, the ACNS0121 study investigated children with STR

and vincristine, carboplatin, cyclophosphamide and oral etoposide, followed by radiotherapy and second look surgery with combined CR and PR of 67%⁴¹. Additionally, recent results from the ACNS0831 study indicate a role for chemotherapy in some patients with totally, or near totally, resected ependymoma⁴⁰. Our results add to the body of evidence advocating the post-surgical use of chemotherapy prior to further therapy in children with STR. The VEC chemotherapy regimen in SIOP ependymoma I did not include a platinum based drug. Given the evidence of response of tumour residuum to VEC, future studies need to consider the benefits of platinum chemotherapy against the risk of nephrotoxicity and ototoxicity. Unfortunately, SIOP ependymoma I was not designed to answer this important research question.

Although not a primary aim, it was hoped that this trial would answer questions related to surgery. The importance of GTR in obtaining good outcomes was previously known and has been emphasised again in this study, with improved EFS. This study was powered for a 38% GTR rate and bettered this with 45% of participants having GTR prior to adjuvant therapy. At the end of the trial, a retrospective review of scans attempted to elucidate factors behind complete or incomplete surgery. This was hampered by limited availability of complete sets of pre- and postoperative scans and access to operative notes. However, as reported, no differences between GTR or STR were identified.

Trial participation can influence practice and it is notable that GTR rates rose from 32.4% to 56.8% between the first and second halves of the trial. In the years since trial inception, surgeons have become increasingly aware of the prognostic impact of GTR on outcomes for ependymoma. However, they are frequently not aware of the diagnosis at the time of operation. Review of a subgroup of operation notes in this study revealed that smear or frozen section results were frequently uninformative in determining tumour type, being non-committal or incorrect. In less than half of cases in which operation notes were reviewed was there either confident suggestion of ependymoma or confirmed pre-operative histology. Improvements in imaging techniques and magnetic resonance spectroscopy may help to address this challenge in the future⁴².

The small number of participants undergoing further early resection makes it hard to assess the added value of attempting to convert STR to GTR with a second operation. The retrospective surgical panel felt that twice as many participants may have been suitable for second look surgery as actually occurred (40% versus 22%). As a result of this experience, earlier consideration of further surgery by an independent panel alongside close assessment of the morbidity associated with repeat surgery is a focus of the current SIOP Ependymoma II trial⁴³. A weekly panel review aims to deliver a more definitive answer on the benefits and morbidity of exhaustively pursuing GTR with repeated surgeries. This is critical, as surgery for cerebellopontine angle ependymoma is associated with high morbidity⁴⁴.

The protocol requested radiotherapy information including: baseline imaging used to determine gross tumour volume; copies of the radiotherapy plan and treatment chart; and copies of the simulator and machine verification films for quality assurance. However, there was no established process in place to facilitate this and hence full radiotherapy dosimetric data was not available for analysis. The trial was carried out during a time of transition from 2D simulator planning, to CT assisted 3D planning and the technical details reflect this. In the 20 years since the design of this study, intensity-modulated radiation therapy, volumetric modulated arc therapy, helical tomotherapy and proton beam therapy have become standard of care for ependymoma and the radiotherapy techniques in this trial do not reflect contemporary practice. Additionally, there has been progress in image guidance and prospective trial quality assurance of both contours and plan parameters.

The prospective clinical trial was designed prior to recent molecular discoveries; however, it provided an opportunity to apply molecular analyses to a well-defined cohort to allow comparison with other ependymoma studies⁴⁵. The results of central histopathological review and DNA methylation classification aligned closely with one another, however around half of the cohort did not undergo DNA methylation profiling. Future studies may mandate the provision of tissue for molecular analyses, because they have the potential to provide more objective tumour classification for prognostication and therapeutic stratification; histopathological grading of ependymomas being subjective and in many studies not a robust prognostic indicator⁴⁶.

The finding that 1q gain was associated with poor outcome confirms previous reports^{22,24,25}. In line with ACNS0121 we assessed 1q gain across supratentorial and PF tumours and found it to only be associated with poorer outcomes in children with PF tumours⁴¹. The prevalence of 1q gain in our cohort was higher than reported by others^{20,47,48}. One possibility is that this is a result of inclusion of multiple methods of testing, detecting additional cases that may not have been identified by FISH alone. Alternatively, there may be a genuinely higher rate of 1q gain in our cohort, but we were unable to identify any abnormality that would make this more likely.

hTERT mRNA expression was associated with poorer outcomes. However, this analysis was conducted in a small subgroup of the whole cohort. Notwithstanding this, our finding is consistent with the previous reports for ependymoma expressing *hTERT*²². We also confirmed previous findings limiting *hTERT* expression to PFA and *ZFTA*-fusion^{23,26}.

Loss of H3K27me3 expression was associated with poorer OS, likely reflecting the strong association between loss of this marker and PFA tumours^{27,28}. TNC expression and absence of H3K27me3 was limited to PFA¹⁹. Given that TNC is a marker for PFA, based on the other samples tested with no DNA methylation result, there was likely to be at least a further nine PFA tumours in our cohort, indicating that 70% of our tumour cohort comprised of PFA. This is consistent with PFA being the most common childhood ependymoma subtype^{26,49}. RELA protein has also been reported as an immunohistochemical marker for *ZFTA*-fusion^{26,49}, however, we identified RELA expression across multiple subtypes, indicating that RELA expression alone is not suitable for identifying *ZFTA*-fusion tumours.

The retrospective nature of the methylation analysis resulted in low numbers of each subtype, highlighting the challenges of obtaining sufficient tissue and the risk of the sample either being inadequate or unclassifiable. When designing prospective studies with molecular stratification estimations of cohort sizes must be adjusted to account for this. It is also important to continue to identify reliable but robust markers for molecular subgroups which could be used in place of DNA methylation profiling⁵⁰.

Conclusions

We present evidence that amongst children with STR there is activity of VEC with a RR of 65.5% (95% CI 45.7-82.1) with an acceptable toxicity profile, supporting a potential beneficial role for chemotherapy in children with intracranial ependymoma. However, as this study was not designed to measure changes in EFS and OS, further data is required to determine whether there is an associated impact on survival. Further work is needed to establish whether this varies depending on the molecular designation of individual tumours. We confirm that 1q gain, *hTERT* expression and loss of H3K27me3 are poor prognostic factors for intracranial ependymoma. Future trials need to include prospective, molecularly stratified, approaches to better understand the clinical implications of recent molecular discoveries.

Acknowledgements: The authors acknowledge the CRUK clinical trials unit team including Andrew Raxworthy-Cooper for the support of this study. TR acknowledges the continued support of 'Fighting Ependymoma'.

References

1. Ritzmann TA, Rogers HA, Paine SML, et al. A retrospective analysis of recurrent pediatric ependymoma reveals extremely poor survival and ineffectiveness of current treatments across central nervous system locations and molecular subgroups. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*. 2020;67(9). doi:10.1002/pbc.28426
2. De B, Khakoo Y, Souweidane MM, et al. Patterns of relapse for children with localized intracranial ependymoma. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*. 2018;138(2):435-445. doi:10.1007/s11060-018-2815-7
3. Jünger ST, Mynarek M, Wohlers I, et al. Improved risk-stratification for posterior fossa ependymoma of childhood considering clinical, histological and genetic features - A retrospective analysis of the HIT ependymoma trial cohort. *Acta Neuropathologica Communications*. 2019;7(1). doi:10.1186/s40478-019-0820-5
4. Massimino M, Miceli R, Giangaspero F, et al. Final results of the second prospective AIEOP protocol for pediatric intracranial ependymoma. *Neuro-Oncology*. 2016;18(10):1451-1460. doi:10.1093/neuonc/now108
5. Godfraind C, Kaczmarek JM, Kocak M, et al. Distinct disease-risk groups in pediatric supratentorial and posterior fossa ependymomas. *Acta Neuropathologica*. 2012;124(2):247-257. doi:10.1007/s00401-012-0981-9
6. Garvin J, Selch MT, Holmes E, et al. Phase II Study of Pre-Irradiation Chemotherapy for Childhood Intracranial Ependymoma. Children's Cancer Group Protocol 9942: A Report From the Children's Oncology Group. *Pediatric blood & cancer*. 2012;59(7):1183-1189. doi:10.1002/pbc
7. Jaing T-H, Wang H-S, Tsay P-K, et al. Multivariate Analysis of Clinical Prognostic Factors in Children with Intracranial Ependymomas. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*. 2004;68(3):255-261. doi:10.1023/B:NEON.0000033383.84900.c1
8. Paulino AC, Wen B-C, Buatti JM, et al. Intracranial ependymomas: an analysis of prognostic factors and patterns of failure. *American journal of clinical oncology*. 2002;25(2):117-122. doi:10.1097/00000421-200204000-00003
9. Rudà R, Reifenberger G, Frappaz D, et al. EANO guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of ependymal tumors. *Neuro-Oncology*. Published online 2017:1-12. doi:10.1093/neuonc/nox166
10. Khatua S, Ramaswamy V, Bouffet E. Current therapy and the evolving molecular landscape of paediatric ependymoma. *European Journal of Cancer*. 2017;70:34-41. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2016.10.013
11. Duffner P, Horowitz M, Krischer J, et al. Postoperative chemotherapy and delayed radiation in children less than three years of age with malignant brain tumours. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 1993;328(24):1725-1731.
12. Strother DR, Lafay-Cousin L, Boyett JM, et al. Benefit from prolonged dose-intensive chemotherapy for infants with malignant brain tumors is restricted to patients with

- ependymoma: a report of the Pediatric Oncology Group randomized controlled trial 9233/34. *Neuro-oncology*. 2014;16(3):457-465. doi:10.1093/neuonc/not163
13. Geyer JR, Sposto R, Jennings M, et al. Multiagent Chemotherapy and Deferred Radiotherapy in Infants With Malignant Brain Tumors: A Report From the Children's Cancer Group. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2005;23(30):9-11. doi:10.1200/JCO.2005.09.095
 14. Grill J, le Deley MC, Gambarelli D, et al. Postoperative chemotherapy without irradiation for ependymoma in children under 5 years of age: a multicenter trial of the French Society of Pediatric Oncology. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2001;19(5):1288-1296. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11230470>
 15. Grundy RG, Wilne S a, Weston CL, et al. Primary postoperative chemotherapy without radiotherapy for intracranial ependymoma in children: the UKCCSG/SIOP prospective study. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2007;8(8):696-705. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(07)70208-5
 16. Venkatramani R, Ji L, Lasky J, et al. Outcome of infants and young children with newly diagnosed ependymoma treated on the "head Start" III prospective clinical trial. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*. 2013;113(2):285-291. doi:10.1007/s11060-013-1111-9
 17. Evans AE, Anderson JR, Lefkowitz-boudreaux IB. Adjuvant Chemotherapy of Childhood Posterior Fossa Ependymoma: Cranio-Spinal Irradiation With or Without Adjuvant CCN U, Vincristine, and Prednisone: A Childrens Cancer Group Study. *Medical and Pediatric Oncology*. 1996;27(1):8-14.
 18. Louis DN, Perry A, Wesseling P, et al. The 2021 WHO Classification of Tumors of the Central Nervous System: a summary. *Neuro-Oncology*. Published online June 29, 2021. doi:10.1093/neuonc/noab106
 19. Pajtler KW, Witt H, Sill M, et al. Molecular Classification of Ependymal Tumors across All CNS Compartments, Histopathological Grades, and Age Groups. *Cancer Cell*. 2015;27(5):728-743. doi:10.1016/j.ccell.2015.04.002
 20. Kilday JP, Mitra B, Domerg C, et al. Copy number gain of 1q25 predicts poor progression-free survival for pediatric intracranial ependymomas and enables patient risk stratification: A prospective european clinical trial cohort analysis on behalf of the Children's Cancer Leukaemia Group (CCLG). *Clinical Cancer Research*. 2012;18(3):2001-2011. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-2489
 21. Upadhyaya SA, Robinson GW, Onar-Thomas A, et al. Molecular grouping and outcomes of young children with newly diagnosed ependymoma treated on the multi-institutional SJYC07 trial. *Neuro-Oncology*. 2019;21(10):1319-1330. doi:10.1093/neuonc/noz069
 22. Gojo J, Lötsch D, Spiegl-Kreinecker S, et al. Telomerase activation in posterior fossa group A ependymomas is associated with dismal prognosis and chromosome 1q gain. *Neuro-Oncology*. 2017;(Xx):1-12. doi:10.1093/neuonc/nox027
 23. Araki A, Chocholous M, Gojo J, et al. Chromosome 1q gain and tenascin-C expression are candidate markers to define different risk groups in pediatric posterior fossa ependymoma. *Acta neuropathologica communications*. 2016;4(1):88. doi:10.1186/s40478-016-0349-9
 24. Tabori U, Wong V, Ma J, et al. Telomere maintenance and dysfunction predict recurrence in paediatric ependymoma. *British journal of cancer*. 2008;99(7):1129-1135. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6604652

25. Modena P, Buttarelli FR, Miceli R, et al. Predictors of outcome in an AIEOP series of childhood ependymomas: A multifactorial analysis. *Neuro-Oncology*. 2012;14(11):1346-1356. doi:10.1093/neuonc/nos245
26. Andreiuolo F, le Teuff G, Bayar MA, et al. Integrating Tenascin-C protein expression and 1q25 copy number status in pediatric intracranial ependymoma prognostication: A new model for risk stratification. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12(6). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0178351
27. Bayliss J, Mukherjee P, Lu C, et al. Lowered H3K27me3 and DNA hypomethylation define poorly prognostic pediatric posterior fossa ependymomas. *Science Translational Medicine*. 2016;8(366):366ra161. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.05.007.Mapping
28. Panwalkar P, Clark J, Ramaswamy V, et al. Immunohistochemical analysis of H3K27me3 demonstrates global reduction in group-A childhood posterior fossa ependymoma and is a powerful predictor of outcome. *Acta Neuropathologica*. 2017;134(5):705-714. doi:10.1007/s00401-017-1752-4
29. Li AM, Dunham C, Tabori U, et al. EZH2 expression is a prognostic factor in childhood intracranial ependymoma: A Canadian Pediatric Brain Tumor Consortium study. *Cancer*. 2015;121(9):1499-1507. doi:10.1002/cncr.29198
30. Gnekow AK. Recommendations of the brain tumor subcommittee for the reporting of trials. *Medical and Pediatric Oncology*. 1995;24(2). doi:10.1002/mpo.2950240209
31. Robertson PL, Zeltzer PM, Boyett JM, et al. Survival and prognostic factors following radiation therapy and chemotherapy for ependymomas in children: a report of the Children's Cancer Group. *Journal of neurosurgery*. 1998;88(4):695-703. doi:10.3171/jns.1998.88.4.0695
32. Bouffet E, Perilongo G, Canete A, Massimino M. Intracranial ependymomas in children: A critical review of prognostic factors and a plea for cooperation. *Medical and Pediatric Oncology*. 1998;30(6). doi:10.1002/(SICI)1096-911X(199806)30:6<319::AID-MPO1>3.0.CO;2-H
33. Machin D, Campbell M, Tan S, Tan S. *Sample Sizes for Clinical Studies: Comparing Survival Curves*. 3rd ed. Wiley-Blackwell; 2009. doi:10.1002/9781444300710.ch8
34. Machin D, Campbell M, Tan S, Tan S. *Sample Sizes for Clinical Studies: Phase II Trials*. 3rd ed. Wiley-Blackwell; 2009. doi:10.1002/9781444300710.ch16
35. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria*. Published online 2014. <http://www.r-project.org/>
36. Machin D, Cheung YB, Parmar MK. *Survival Analysis*. 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2006. doi:10.1002/0470034572
37. Clopper CJ, Pearson ES. The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika*. Published online 1934:404-413. <https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article/26/4/404/291538>
38. Ellison DW, Aldape KD, Capper D, et al. cIMPACT-NOW update 7: advancing the molecular classification of ependymal tumors. *Brain Pathology*. 2020;30(5):863-866. doi:10.1111/bpa.12866
39. Pajtler KW, Wen J, Sill M, et al. Molecular heterogeneity and CXorf67 alterations in posterior fossa group A (PFA) ependymomas. *Acta Neuropathologica*. Published online 2018. doi:10.1007/s00401-018-1877-0

40. Smith A, Onar-Thomas A, Ellison D, et al. EPEN-54. ACNS0831, PHASE III RANDOMIZED TRIAL OF POST-RADIATION CHEMOTHERAPY IN PATIENTS WITH NEWLY DIAGNOSED EPENDYMOMA AGES 1 TO 21 YEARS. *Neuro-Oncology*. 2020;22(Supplement_3). doi:10.1093/neuonc/noaa222.187
41. Merchant TE, Bendel AE, Sabin ND, et al. *Conformal Radiation Therapy for Pediatric Ependymoma, Chemotherapy for Incompletely Resected Ependymoma, and Observation for Completely Resected, Supratentorial Ependymoma*. Vol 37.; 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1093/neuonc/noaa222.187>
42. Grist JT, Withey S, MacPherson L, et al. Distinguishing between paediatric brain tumour types using multi-parametric magnetic resonance imaging and machine learning: A multi-site study. *NeuroImage: Clinical*. 2020;25. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102172
43. Millward CP, Mallucci C, Jaspan T, et al. Assessing 'second-look' tumour resectability in childhood posterior fossa ependymoma—a centralised review panel and staging tool for future studies. *Child's Nervous System*. 2016;32(11):2189-2196. doi:10.1007/s00381-016-3225-9
44. Sanford RA, Merchant TE, Zwienerberg-Lee M, Kun LE, Boop FA. Advances in surgical techniques for resection of childhood cerebellopontine angle ependymomas are key to survival. *Child's Nervous System*. 2009;25(10):1229-1240. doi:10.1007/s00381-009-0886-7
45. Massimino M, Barretta F, Modena P, et al. The AIEOP 2nd series of children and adolescents intracranial Ependymoma. An integrated molecular and clinical characterization with a long-term follow-up. *Neuro-Oncology*. Published online November 2, 2020. doi:10.1093/neuonc/noaa257
46. Ellison DW, Kocak M, Figarella-Branger D, et al. Histopathological grading of pediatric ependymoma: reproducibility and clinical relevance in European trial cohorts. *Journal of negative results in biomedicine*. 2011;10(1):7. doi:10.1186/1477-5751-10-7
47. Carter M, Nicholson J, Ross F, et al. Genetic abnormalities detected in ependymomas by comparative genomic hybridisation. *British Journal of Cancer*. 2002;86(6):929-939. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6600180
48. Mendrzyk F, Korshunov A, Benner A, et al. Identification of gains on 1q and epidermal growth factor receptor overexpression as independent prognostic markers in intracranial ependymoma. *Clinical Cancer Research*. 2006;12(16):2070-2079. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-05-2363
49. Parker M, Mohankumar KM, Punchihewa C, et al. C11orf95-RELA fusions drive oncogenic NF-κB signalling in ependymoma. *Nature*. 2014;506(7489):451-455. doi:10.1038/nature13109
50. de Sousa GR, Lira RCP, de Almeida Magalhães T, et al. A coordinated approach for the assessment of molecular subgroups in pediatric ependymomas using low-cost methods. *Journal of Molecular Medicine*. 2021;99(8). doi:10.1007/s00109-021-02074-2




Figure 1: (A) Protocol defined flow through study. (B) Actual flow. 41 had STR and 33 had GTR. Of those with STR, 29 received chemotherapy, 10 received radiotherapy and two had no further therapy. 32/33 with GTR received radiotherapy and one had no further treatment. Grey boxes indicate protocol violations.





Figure 2: (A) Subdivision of methylation results. 35 participants had a diagnosis of ependymoma assessed by methylation array. Of these 17 were PFA, 10 ZFTA-fusion, 7 PFB and one YAP. Of the remaining 39 cases in the trial, 11 tumours did not have a sufficient classifier score to be assigned and 28 cases had no tissue for analysis. (B) Outcomes of molecular and immunohistochemical analyses stratified by methylation classification. 1q gain seen only in PFA and ZFTA-fusion and hTERT only in PFA and ZFTA-fusion. In posterior fossa tumours, Tenascin-C and H3K27me3 were only identified in PFA and PFB respectively. ReLA IHC was not a good marker for ZFTA tumours as five cases of PFA demonstrated RELA positivity, possibly demonstrating NfκB activation within the tumour microenvironment.




Figure 3: Kaplan-Meier estimators. (A) Participants with STR had poorer EFS than those with GTR. (B) Participant with grade 3 tumours had worse OS than those with grade 2 tumours. Participants with evidence of 1q gain had worse EFS (C) and OS (D). Participants with H3K27me3 loss had worse OS than those with no loss (E). Participants with *hTERT* expression had worse EFS than those with no expression (F). EFS (G) and OS (H) for participants stratified by methylation group did not differ significantly. However, patterns of survival reflect previously published data; lack of significance may relate to low numbers of cases.

Demographic Variable		Final Cohort (n=74)
Resection extent	GTR	33
	STR	41
Gender	Male	38
	Female	36
Age (years)	Median	7.8
	Range	3.1-18.8
Site	PF	47
	ST	27
WHO Grade	2	39
	3	35
DNA Methylation Analysis	PFA	17
	ZFTA	10
	PFB	7
	YAP	1
1q Status	Gain	18
	No gain	42
Follow up (years)	Median	10.0
	Range	0.17-19.00
Follow up survivors (years)	Median	12.4
	Range	1.16-19.00
Event Free Survival (%)	5-year	49.5
	95% CI	39.3-62.4
Overall Survival (%)	10-year	46.7
	95% CI	36.5-59.7
Overall Survival (%)	5-year	69.3
	95% CI	59.4-80.9
	10-year	60.5
	95% CI	50.1-73.1

Table 1: Summary of key cohort characteristics, overall and event free survival times. CI: Confidence Interval, GTR: Gross Total Resection, STR: Subtotal Resection, PF: Posterior fossa, ST: Supratentorial.

	n	EFS (95% CI)		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P	OS (95% CI)		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P	
		5 Year	10 Year			5 Year	10 Year			
Whole Cohort	74	49.5 (39.3-62.4)	46.7 (36.5-59.7)			69.3 (59.4-80.9)	60.5 (50.1-73.1)			
Resection	GTR	33	69.1 (54.9-87.1)	62.9 (48.2-82.0)	1	0.003	81.3 (68.9-96.0)	68.0 (53.4-86.6)	1	0.071
	STR	41	33.8 (22.0-52.0)	33.8 (22.0-52.0)	2.6 (1.4-5.1)		59.5 (45.9-77.0)	54.3 (40.7-72.4)	2.0 (0.93-4.2)	
Grade	2	39	59.0 (45.4-76.6)	56.4 (42.8-74.3)	1	0.061	84.2 (73.3-96.6)	78.8 (66.7-93.0)	1	0.005
	3	35	38.7 (25.2-59.2)	35.4 (22.4-56.1)	1.8 (0.96-3.3)		52.2 (37.7-72.3)	39.9 (26.2-60.7)	2.8 (1.3-5.8)	
Location	PF	47	55.3 (42.8-71.5)	51.1 (38.6-67.6)	1	0.178	69.6 (57.5-84.3)	62.9 (50.3-78.6)	1	0.585
	ST	27	38.8 (23.8-63.3)	38.8 (23.8-63.3)	1.5 (0.82-2.8)		68.5 (52.5-89.3)	55.6 (39.0-79.3)	1.2 (0.59-2.5)	
1q Status	Gain	18	33.3 (17.3-64.1)	22.2 (9.4-52.7)	1	0.003	55.6 (36.8-84.0)	44.4 (26.5-74.5)	1	0.042
	No Gain	42	59.0 (45.7-76.1)	59.0 (45.7-76.1)	0.37 (0.19-0.74)		75.5 (64.4-90.0)	68.0 (55.0-84.0)	0.45 (0.21-0.99)	
H3K27me3	Positive	22	67.6 (50.5-90.6)	62.8 (45.3-80.7)	1	0.165	90.2 (78.2-100)	85.2 (71.1-100)	1	0.003
	Negative	32	40.6 (26.7-61.8)	37.5 (24.0-58.7)	1.72 (0.77-3.9)		46.9 (32.4-67.8)	40.6 (26.7-61.8)	4.6 (1.5-13.2)	
hTERT	Negative	6	83.3 (58.3-100)	66.7 (37.9-100)	1	0.014	100	83.3 (58.3-100)	1	0.092
	Positive	10	20.0 (5.8-69.1)	20.0 (5.8-69.1)	5.8 (1.2-28)		50.0 (26.9-92.9)	40.0 (18.7-85.5)	5.2 (0.62-43)	

Table 2: Univariate survival analyses for key clinical and molecular features. Whilst clinical features were defined for analysis prospectively, the additional molecular analyses were *post hoc*. GTR: Gross Total Resection, STR: Subtotal resection, PF: Posterior Fossa, ST: Supratentorial, CI: Confidence Interval, EFS: Event Free Survival, OS: Overall Survival.

VEC Response		2-Cycle Response	4-Cycle response	Best Response
Complete Response	CR	6	5	9
Partial Response	PR	8	8	10
Objective Response	OR	2	0	0
Stable Disease	SD	6	3	4
Progressive Disease	PD	6	6	6
CR+PR (%)		14/28 (50.0)	13/22 (59.1)	19/29 (65.5)
95% CI		30.7-69.4	36.4-79.3	45.7-82.1

Table 3: Summary of responses to chemotherapy as assessed by MR imaging after 2- and 4-cycles and best response achieved within first four cycles of chemotherapy.