THE SCIENTIFIC LANDSCAPE **OF BREAST CANCER:**

RAMATHIBODI SCHOOL OF NURSING AND THAINAKARIN HOSPITAL BREAST CANCER CONFERENCE

Genomics of Breast Cancer

Basic Knowledge of Hereditary Cancer,

Kanin Sriudomporn, MD

Division of Medical Genetic and Molecular Biology, **Department of Internal Medicine**

Genetic Determinants of Breast Cancer & Genetic Counseling



Mahidol University Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital





Disclosure

- Thailand Medical Genetics and Genomics Association (TMGGA)
- Ramathibodi School of Nursing
- Thainakarin Hospital







ไรงเรียนพยาบาลรามาธิบดี คณะแพทยศาสตร์โรงพยาบาลรามาธิบดี มหาวิทยาลัยมหิดล

Division of Medical Genetics and Molecular Biology, Department of Internal Medicine, Faculaty of Medicine, Ramathibodi Hospital







Identification of persons at increased risk for cancer **before** its development

Total estimated national expenditures for cancer care around **\$208.9 billion in 2020**

Cancer Epidemic Biomarkers Prev. 2020;29(7):1304-12.



30

Proportion of Inherited Cancer Sporadic VS Familial VS Inherited Cancer



NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE Adapted from NIH



Common Cancer Common Hereditary & Non-Hereditary Cancer

Common Hereditary Cancer

Breast Cancer Ovarian Cancer Endometrial Cancer Colorectal Cancer Thyroid Cancer

Common Non-Hereditary Cancer

Hepatobilliary Cancer Lung Cancer Cervical Cancer Head & Neck Cancer Germ Cell Tumor Leukemia





Initiation of Cancer Development Two-hit Hypothesis

Two-hit hypothesis



The Role of Cyclin E in Cell Cycle Regulation and Genomic Instability ;Sep 17, 2020









Initiation of Cancer Development Two-hit Hypothesis



The Role of Cyclin E in Cell Cycle Regulation and Genomic Instability ;Sep 17, 2020, Jean L. Bolognia Dermatology 4th Edition



Loss of Heterozygosity







General Considerations Terminology

Mutation

A permanent change in the nucleotide sequence





Genet Med 17, 405–423 (2015).





General Considerations Variant Modifiers; 5-tier System of Classification

- **1. Pathogenic**
- 2. Likely Pathogenic
- **3. Uncertain Significance**
- 4. Likely Benign
- 5. Benign

Clinicians and patients were willing to tolerate a slightly higher chance of error, leading to the 90-95% decision

- > 95% certainty of pathogenicity
- > 90% certainty of pathogenicity

- > 90% certainty of benign
- > 95% certainty of benign

Genet Med 17, 405–423 (2015).







Review Guideline

Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast, Ovarian, and Pancreatic NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guideline®)

Version 1.2024

Kanin Sriudomporn, MD

Division of Medical Genetic and Molecular Biology, Department of Internal Medicine



Mahidol University Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital

NCCN National Comprehensive Cancer Network®





Breast Cancer

Overview

Estimated New Cases

Estimates are rounded to the nearest 10, and cases exclude basal cell and squamous cell skin cancers and in situ carcinoma except urinary bladder. Estimates do not include Puerto Rico or other US territories. Ranking is based on modeled projections and may differ from the most recent observed data.

Male						
Prostate	288,300	29%				
Lung & bronchus	117,550	12%				
Colon & rectum	81,860	8%				
Urinary bladder	62,420	6%				
Melanoma of the skin	58,120	6%				
Kidney & renal pelvis	52,360	5%				
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	44,880	4%				
Oral cavity & pharynx	39,290	4%				
Leukemia	35,670	4%				
Pancreas	33,130	3%				
All sites	1,010,310					





Femal	e
-------	---

Breast	297,790	31%
Lung & bronchus	120,790	13%
Colon & rectum	71,160	8%
Uterine corpus	66,200	7%
Melanoma of the skin	39,490	4%
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	35,670	4%
Thyroid	31,180	3%
Pancreas	30,920	3%
Kidney & renal pelvis	29,440	3%
Leukemia	23,940	3%
All sites	948,000	

American Cancer Society. Cancer Facts & Figures 2023.







Breast Cancer

Overview

Estimated Deaths

Estimates are rounded to the nearest 10, and cases exclude basal cell and squamous cell skin cancers and in situ carcinoma except urinary bladder. Estimates do not include Puerto Rico or other US territories. Ranking is based on modeled projections and may differ from the most recent observed data.

Male							
Lung & bronchus	67,160	21%					
Prostate	34,700	11%					
Colon & rectum	28,470	9%					
Pancreas	26,620	8%					
Liver & intrahepatic bile duct	19,000	6%					
Leukemia	13,900	4%					
Esophagus	12,920	4%					
Urinary bladder	12,160	4%					
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	11,780	4%					
Brain & other nervous system	11,020	3%					
All sites	322,080						





Lung & bronchus	59,910	21%
Breast	43,170	15%
Colon & rectum	24,080	8%
Pancreas	23,930	8%
Ovary	13,270	5%
Uterine corpus	13,030	5%
Liver & intrahepatic bile duct	10,380	4%
Leukemia	9,810	3%
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	8,400	3%
Brain & other nervous system	7,970	3%
All sites	287,740	

American Cancer Society. Cancer Facts & Figures 2023.







Breast Cancer in Thailand The Most Common Top 10 Cancer of Thai Women

ทะเบียนมะเร็ง ระดับโรงพยาบาล พ.ศ.2564 HOSPITAL-BASED 2021







Hospital-Based Cancer Registry 2021







Breast Cancer in Thailand Number of New Breast Cancer Patients by Staging

ทะเบียนมะเร็ง ระดับโรงพยาบาล พ.ศ.2564 HOSPITAL-BASED 2021



สถาบันมะเร็งแห่งชาติ กรมการแพทย์ กระทรวงสาธารณสข NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL SERVICES MINISTRY OF PUBLIC HEALTH THAILAND

Stage	Female					
Slage	Number	%				
Stage 1	144	23.4				
Stage 2	175	28.4				
Stage 3	143	23.2				
Stage 4	146	23.7				
Unknow Stage	8	1.3				
Total	616	100.0				

Hospital-Based Cancer Registry 2021







Breast Cancer in Thailand



Hospital-Based Cancer Registry 2021





THE ANGELINA EFFECT

Angelina Jolie's double mastectomy puts genetic testing in the spotlight. What her choice reveals about calculating risk, cost and peace of mind

BY JEFFREY KLUGER & ALICE PARK



MAY IT. TOLD



The New York Times

"MY CHANCES OF DEVELOPING BREAST CANCER HAVE DROPPED FROM 87 PERCENT TO UNDER 5 PERCENT."

> Angelina Jolie in "My Medical Choice" Published on May 14, 2013

ANGELINA JOLIE UNDERGOES DOUBLE MASTECTOMY Reveals she carries gene that increases cancer risk

"THE ANGELINA EFFECT" BRCA GENE TESTING IN AMERICA BEFORE ANGELINA'S 2013 ANNOUNCEMENT:

350 PER WEEK

40%

CNN

7:44 AM ET

NEW DAY

WASHINGTON ____ 57°

AFTER ANGELINA'S 2013 ANNOUNCEMENT: 500 PER WEEK

CHARLOTTE ____ 64°



HERRETORI

Details of her emotional decision and how Brad helped her heal: 'All I want is for her to have a long and healthy life'







The Angelina Effect Family History of Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer



On May 14th 2013, Angelina Jolie shared with the world her experience of bilateral risk reducing mastectomy based on her inheriting a maternally derived pathogenic variant mutation in the **BRCA1** gene.

In **2015**, Angelina Jolie wrote about her experience with risk reducing salpingo-oophorectomy.

Sci Rep 11, 2847 (2021).







BRCA1 gene:

- Chromosome 17q21.31
- Triple-negative predisposing

BRCA2 gene:

- Chromosome 13q13.1
- ER+ predisposing

Repair of replication-mediated dsDNA breaks (Homologous Recombination)

Overall prevalence:



Obstet Gynecol 2009;113:957-966.





DNA Repair Mechanism PARP inhibitor



Annals of Oncology 25: 32–40, 2014











DNA Repair Mechanism Double Strand Break Repair



Essential Cell Biology 5th Edition (2018).







DNA Repair Mechanism Double Strand Break Repair and Normal PARP Function





Nymus 3D: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2yl_SoOWFMU







Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Kaplan-Meier of Cumulative Risks of Breast and Ovarian Cancers



J Natl Cancer Inst 2006;98:1694-1706.









Oxford Desk Reference: Clinical Genetics and Genomics 2nd Edition







Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Proportion of Predisposing Genes



BRCA2	37 %
BRCA1	19 %
PALB2	7 %
TP53	5 %
ATM	4 %



Clin Cancer Res 2017;15;23(20):6113-6119.

























Genetic Risk Assessment & Counselling Formal Risk Assessment

Evaluation of Patient's Needs and Concerns

- Assess the patient's concerns and reasons for seeking counselling
- Address their personal needs and priorities in the counselling process
- Highly exaggerated perception of risk among women with family history who seek cancer risk counselling
- Assess patients knowledge about benefits, risks, and limitations of genetic testing
- Positive supportive interaction

Journal of Clinical Oncology, Vol 17, No 3 (March), 1999: pp 1040-1046





Genetic Risk Assessment & Counselling Formal Risk Assessment



Women's estimates versus model estimates of mutation risk. Fig 1.

Journal of Clinical Oncology, Vol 17, No 3 (March), 1999: pp 1040-1046

Fig 3. Comparison of women's own estimates of having a BRCA1 and **BRCA2** mutation with the BRCAPRO model.





Genetic Risk Assessment & Counselling

Genetic Counselling

Odds Ratio (95% CI)	
Genetic Test Results (reference group: no mutation)	
BRCA 1/2 or other gene increasing risk of breast cancer	
BRCA I/2 variant of uncertain significance	
Race (reference group: white)	
Asian	
Black	—
Hispanic	
Other	•
Age, years (reference group: > 50)	
≤ 50	
Insurance (reference group: private)	
Medicaid	
Medicare	
None	
Pretest risk of pathogenic mutation carriage (reference group: average risk)	
Higher risk	
	
	0.10 1.0 10.0
	<less blm="" blm≻<="" more="" td=""></less>

Many patients undergoing genetic testing do not receive proper counselling



J Clin Oncol 2017. 35:2232-2239.





Genetic Risk Assessment & Counseling Principles of Genetic Risk Assessment and Counseling

The decision to offer genetic testing involves **3 related stages**:



It is recommended that a genetic counselor, clinical geneticist, oncologist, surgeon, oncology nurse, or other health professional with expertise and experience in cancer genetics be involved at each stage whenever possible.







Genetic Risk Assessment & Counseling Principles of Genetic Risk Assessment and Counseling

The decision to offer genetic testing involves **3 related stages**:



Testing should be considered in appropriate individuals where it is likely to impact the risk management and/or treatment of the tested individuals and/or their at-risk family members who also have increased risk.







Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Genetic Testing Process









- Individuals with any blood relative with a known pathogenic/likely pathogenic variant in cancer susceptibility gene
- Individuals meeting the criteria but tested negative with previous limited testing (eg, single gene and/or absent deletion duplication analysis) pursuing multi-gene testing
- A pathogenic/likely pathogenic variant identified on tumor genomic testing that has clinical implications if also identified in the germline
- To aid in systemic therapy and surgical decision-making
- Individual who meets Li-Fraumeni syndrome testing criteria or PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome testing criteria or Lynch syndrome























50

For Personal or Family History of Breast Cancer with specific features:

Age \leq 50 years

Breast cancer diagnosed at age \leq 50 years

Age









For Personal or Family History of Breast Cancer with specific features:



- Ashkenazi Jewish
- Male Breast Cancer

Any Age

50

Age





For Personal or Family History of Breast Cancer with specific features:

Pathology/Histology

- Triple-negative Breast Cancer
- Multiple Primary Breast Cancer (Synchronous or Metachronous)
- Lobular Breast cancer with family history of diffuse gastric cancer

Any Age







For Personal or Family History of Breast Cancer with specific features:

Family History \geq 1 close blood relative with

- Breast Cancer at age ≤ 50 years
- Male Breast Cancer
- Ovarian Cancer (include fallopian) high- or very-high-risk group tube or peritoneal cancer)

- Any Age
 - - Pancreatic Cancer
 - Prostate Cancer with metastatic, or







For Personal or Family History of Breast Cancer with specific features:

Family History

same side of the family including the patient with breast cancer

Any Age

• \geq 3 total diagnoses of breast and/or prostate cancer (any grade) on the



Age





- An individual affected with breast cancer (not meeting testing criteria) or unaffected individual with a first- or second-degree blood relative meeting any of the criteria (except unaffected individuals whose relatives meet criteria only for systemic therapy decision-making)
- An affected or unaffected individual who otherwise does not meet the criteria above but has a probability >5% of a BRCA 1/2 pathogenic variant based on prior probability models (eg, Tyrer-Cuzick, BRCAPro, CanRisk)







Hereditary Cancer Testing Criteria General Testing Criteria: Mnemonic





Risk Assessment, Counselling, and Management:

Breast awareness; starting at 18 years Ο



Organizational Principles to Guide and Define the Child

American Academy Outside of newborn screening, genetic testing of children is less of Pediatrics commonly performed. Diagnostic genetic testing may be performed on a child with signs or symptoms of a potential genetic condition or for DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN" treatment decisions made on the basis of results of pharmacogenetic assays. Genetic testing may also be performed on an Health Care System and/or Improve the Health of all Children asymptomatic child with a positive family history for a specific genetic condition, particularly if early treatment may affect morbidity or mortality. The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and **Adult Onset** the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) provide the following recommendations regarding genetic testing and screening of minors. An accompanying technical report pro-

POLICY STATEMENT Ethical and Policy Issues in Genetic Testing and Screening of Children No impacted medical management

Pediatrics 2013;131:620-622





Woman Screening Recommendation:

- Clinical breast exam every 6 12 months; starting at 25 years Ο
- Breast Cancer Screening Individualized based on family history if CA breast diagnosed before age of 30 Ο
 - Age 25-29 years: Annual breast MRI with contrast Days 7-15 of menstrual cycle (or Mammogram only if MRI unavailable)

High-quality Breast MRI Screening

- Regional availability Ability to perform biopsy under MRI guidance
- Dedicated breast coil Experienced radiologist in breast MRI



















529	Consitivity	Mamn	nography	Ultra	Ultrasound Ultrasound Ultrasound		1	MRI		Mammography + MRI	
asymptomatic	Sensitivity	Sensitivity (%)	TP/TP + FN	Sensitivity (%)	TP/TP + FN	Sensitivity (%)	TP/TP + FN	Sensitivity (%)	TP/TP + FN	Sensitivity (%)	TP/TP + FN
women	All women	32.6	14/43	39.5	17/43	48.8	21/43	90.7	39/43	93.0	40/43
	With personal history of breast cancer	33.3	4/12	41.7	5/12	41.7	5/12	66.6	8/12	75.0	9/12
suspected or	Without personal history of breast cancer	32.3	10/31	38.7	12/31	51.6	16/31	100.0	31/31	100.0	31/31
proven to	Risk 20%	50.0	3/6	67.7	4/6	83.3	5/6	100.0	6/6	100.0	6/6
carry BRCA	Risk 21%-40%	25.0	5/20	30.0	6/20	45.0	9/20	100.0	20/20	100.0	20/20
	Nutation carriers	25.0	2/8	25.0	2/8	37.5	3/8	100.0	8/8	100.0	8/8
Mean follow-		Mammography		Ultrasound		Mammography + Ultrasound		MRI		Mammography + MRI	
up time = 5.3	Specificity	Specificity (%)	TN/TN + FP	Specificity (%)	TN/TN + FP	Specificity (%)	TN/TN + FP	Specificity (%)	TN/TN + FP	Specificity (%)	TN/TN + FP
years	All women	96.8	1,364/1,409	90.5	1,275/1,409	89.0	1,254/1,409	97.2	1,370/1,409	96.1	1,354/1,409
	With personal history of breast cancer	95.5	252/264	88.3	233/264	87.1	230/264	96.2	254/264	95.1	251/264
University of	Without personal history of breast cancer	97.1	1,112/1,145	91.0	1,042/1,145	89.4	1,024/1,145	97.5	1,116/1,145	96.3	1,103/1,145
Bonn,	Risk 20%	96.5	302/313	90.4	283/313	88.2	276/313	97.4	305/313	95.5	299/313
Germany	Risk 21-40% Mutation carriers	97.4 96.9	676/694 154/159	91.2 91.2	633/694 145/159	89.9 88.7	624/694 141/159	97.7 97.5	678/694 155/159	97.0 94.4	673/694 150/159
					,		,				

False negative mammogram correlate with high breast tissue density.

J Clin Oncol 2005;23:8469-8476





0_2176

GENE-RAD-RISK stu	Jdy	Until diag	gnosis o	f breast cancer	During 5-year period		ear period		
GENEPSO (France) EMBRANCE (UK)		Entire c	ohort (n=1	1,993; 747 cases)	Subcohort (n=955; 144 cases)				
		Person- years	Cases	HR (95%CI) ^a	Person- years	Cases	HR (95%CI) ^b		
HEBON (Netherland) Before a Never Ever	Before age 30 Never Ever	27,160 28,110	263 333	1.00 1.33 (1.12-1.57)	1,679 1,412	57 58	1.00 1.65 (1.11-2.46)		
1,993 female carriers of BRCA1/2 mutation (2006-2009)	Dose category <0·0020 0·0020-0·0066 0·0066-0·0174 ≥0·0174	14,442 6,031 3,965 3,671	164 73 45 51	1.29 (1.06-1.57) 1.35 (1.04-1.77) 1.22 (0.89-1.67) 1.56 (1.15-2.11)	874 280 147 109	33 12 6 7	1.48 (0.94-2.33) 1.55 (0.81-2.98) 1.90 (0.69-5.21) 4.16 (2.01-8.62)		

Exposure to diagnostic radiation prior to 30 years was associated with increased risk of breast cancer in women with BRCA1/2 mutation

MRI reduces radiation exposure

BMJ 2012;345:e5660















Woman Screening Recommendation:

- Clinical breast exam every 6 12 months; starting at 25 years 0
- Breast Cancer Screening Individualized based on family history if CA breast diagnosed before age of 30 Ο
 - Age 25-29 years: Annual breast MRI with contrast Days 7-15 of menstrual cycle (or Mammogram only if MRI unavailable)
 - Age 30-75 years: Annual Mammogram & Breast MRI with contrast
 - Age > 75 years: consider on individual basis
 - BRCA P/LP variant: annual mammogram & Breast MRI with contrast







Woman Screening Recommendation:

- **Ovarian & Peritoneal Cancer Screening** 0
 - Annual Transvaginal Ultrasound
 - CA-125 every 3-4 months
 - ROCA (risk of ovarian cancer algorithm) score
- Starting at 30-35 years of age

UK Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS)





Risk Reduction Surgery: Bilateral Total Mastectomy Ο Meta-analysis (n = 2,555) Rebbeck TR (2004) Domchek SM (2010) **All-Cause Mortality** Skytte AB (2011) HR (95% CI) Ingham SL (2013) 0.25 (0.03–1.81) 53.87 Ingham SL (2013) Heemskerk-Gerritsen BA (2013) 0.22 (0.02–1.68) 46.13 Overall ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, P = 0.885) 0.23 (0.05-1.02) 100.00

50

0.02



Clin Cancer Res 2016;22:3971-3981.









Risk Reduction Surgery:

- **Nipple-sparing Mastectomy**
 - 346 patients with 548 procedures with 56-month mean follow-up: No breast cancer developed in the study (p<0.001)

		Women	Women Expected New Primary Breast Cancers, No.							
Prediction Model	Group	No.	0.25	0.50	0.75	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00
BOADICEA ¹²	BRCA1 mutation carriers	201	10.6	11.7	12.8	13.9	15.0	16.1	17.2	18.3
	BRCA2 mutation carriers	145	5.7	6.4	8.2	7.9	8.7	9.5	10.2	11.0
Chen and Parmigiani ¹³	Women aged 20-70 y at NSM	343	16.4	18.3	20.2	22.1	24.0	25.9	27.8	29.7
van den Broek et al ¹⁴	Women aged <50 y with primary breast cancer and contralateral NSM	103	NA	NA	NA	9.7	NA	NA	NA	NA



JAMA Surg 2018;153:123-129.



Risk Reduction Surgery:

Bilateral Salpingo-oophorectomy Ο

Association between Oophorectomy and All-cause mortality

			BRCA1			BRCA2			All Patients	
Variable	No. of Patients	HR	95% CI	Р	HR	95% CI	Р	HR	95% CI	Р
Age group at study entry, years										
≤ 40	2,104	0.27	0.15 to 0.48	< .001	0.44	0.17 to 1.09	.08	0.30	0.19 to 0.49	< .001
41-50	1,906	0.23	0.16 to 0.33	< .001	0.29	0.14 to 0.59	< .001	0.24	0.17 to 0.33	< .001
51-60	1,189	0.28	0.19 to 0.43	< .001	0.19	0.08 to 0.43	< .001	0.27	0.18 to 0.38	< .001
≥ 61	584	0.43	0.25 to 0.71	.001	0.89	0.33 to 2.43	.84	0.49	0.31 to 0.76	.002
Total	5,783	0.30	0.24 to 0.38	< .001	0.33	0.22 to 0.50	< .001	0.31	0.26 to 0.38	< .001
Previous breast cancer										
Yes	2,561	0.31	0.24 to 0.39	< .001	0.34	0.22 to 0.52	< .001	0.32	0.26 to 0.39	< .001
No	2,633	0.21	0.12 to 0.37	< .001	0.67	0.08 to 5.35	.70	0.23	0.13 to 0.39	< .001

J Clin Oncol 2014;32:1547-1553.







Risk Reduction Surgery:

Bilateral Salpingo-oophorectomy Ο Association between Oophorectomy and Breast Cancer

		Unadjusted			Adjusted		
Mutation	OR	Р	95% CI	OR	Р	95% CI	
BRCA1 or BRCA2	0.46	.00001	0.32 to 0.65	0.46	.00001	0.32 to 0.65	
BRCA1	0.43	.00006	0.29 to 0.65	0.44	.00006	0.29 to 0.66	
BRCA2	0.57	.11	0.28 to 1.15	0.57	.11	0.28 to 1.15	



Decrease hormonal exposure ??

J Clin Oncol 2005;23:7491-7496.







Risk Reduction Surgery:

Bilateral Salpingo-oophorectomy Ο

Association between Oophorectomy and Breast Cancer

Age at Opphorectomy	No. With C	Dophorectomy		Unadjus	sted		Adjust	ed*
Years	Patient Case	Patient Control	OR	Р	95% CI	OR	Р	95% CI
BRCA1/2								
No oophorectomy	1,388	1,751	1.0	—	—	1.0	—	—
≤ 40	23	59	0.41	.0004	0.25 to 0.68	0.41	.0005	0.25 to 0.68
41-50	21	47	0.47	.005	0.28 to 0.79	0.47	.005	0.28 to 0.80
51+	7	9	0.71	.53	0.25 to 2.06	0.70	.51	0.24 to 2.03
BRCA1								
No oophorectomy	1,021	1,320	1.0	—	—	1.0	—	—
≤ 40	17	50	0.36	.0004	0.20 to 0.63	0.36	.0005	0.20 to 0.64
41-50	16	34	0.49	.02	0.27 to 0.91	0.50	.02	0.27 to 0.92
51+	5	7	0.67	.50	0.21 to 2.13	0.66	.48	0.21 to 2.09
BRCA2								
No oophorectomy	360	426	1.0	—	—	1.0	—	—
≤ 40	6	9	0.70	.49	0.25 to 1.96	0.69	.49	0.25 to 1.95
41-50	5	12	0.43	.12	0.15 to 1.23	0.44	.12	0.15 to 1.24
51+	2	2	1.00	1.00	0.06 to 16.0	1.00	1.00	0.06 to 16.1

BRCA1 age < 40

J Clin Oncol 2005;23:7491-7496.







Risk Reduction Surgery:

Bilateral Salpingo-oophorectomy Ο

Variable	Age-adjusted HR (95% CI)	Р	Multivariable* HR (95% CI)	Р
Oophorectomy†				
No	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Yes	0.91 (0.71 to 1.16)	.43	0.89 (0.69 to 1.14)	.35
Family history of breast cancer‡				
0 family members	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
1 family member	1.38 (1.06 to 1.76)	.01	1.36 (1.06 to 1.75)	.02
≥2 family members	1.34 (0.93 to 1.94)	.12	1.38 (0.95 to 2.00)	.09
Oral contraceptive use				
Never	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Ever	1.08 (0.87 to 1.35)	.48	1.38 (0.95 to 2.00)	.16
BRCA mutation				
BRCA1§	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
BRCA2§	0.81 (0.62 to 1.08)	.15	0.86 (0.62 to 1.20)	.38
Country of residence				
Poland	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Canada	0.78 (0.59 to 1.03)	.08	0.77 (0.54 to 1.08)	.13
Other	1.00 (0.73 to 1.36)	.98	0.80 (0.48 to 1.34)	.41
United States	0.99 (0.74 to 1.34)	.96	0.97 (0.69 to 1.38)	.88

J Natl Cancer Inst 2017;109





Risk Reduction Surgery:

Bilateral Salpingo-oophorectomy Ο

Variable	Age-adjusted HR (95% CI)	Р	Multivariable* HR (95% CI)	
All women				
BRCA1† mutation carriers				
Oophorectomy‡				
No	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Yes	0.96 (0.73 to 1.26)	.76	0.97 (0.73 to 1.29)	
BRCA2† mutation carriers				
Oophorectomy‡				
No	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Yes	0.65 (0.37 to 1.16)	.14	0.68 (0.38 to 1.21)	
Breast cancer diagnosed prior t	o age 50 y§			
BRCA1 ⁺ mutation carriers				
Oophorectomy‡				
No	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Yes	0.79 (0.55 to 1.13)	.51	0.84 (0.58 to 1.21)	
BRCA2† mutation carriers				
Oophorectomy‡				
No	1.00 (Referent)		1.00 (Referent)	
Yes	0.18 (0.05 to 0.63)	.007	0.17 (0.05 to 0.61)	

BRCA2 age < 50

J Natl Cancer Inst 2017;109





Risk Reduction Surgery:

Bilateral Salpingo-oophorectomy

NCCN Guidelines Panel Recomme pathogenic/likely pathogenic variant

- Age 35-40 years for BRCA1
- Age 40-45 years for BRCA2
- Unless age of diagnosis in family

NCCN Guidelines Panel Recommendation for women with known BRCA1/2

Salpingectomy alone is not the standard of care for risk reduction.

Clinical Significance of Concurrent Hysterectomy at the time of RRSO is unclear. (Limited data about serous uterine cancer in *BRCA1*)





<u>Gene</u>	<u>Breast Cancer Risk and Management</u> (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks
ATM	 Absolute risk: 20%–30%^{3,4,5,6} Management:^b Screening: Annual mammogram at age 40 y and consider breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 30–35 y^{c,d,e} Risk reduction: Evidence insufficient for risk-reducing mastectomy (RRM); manage based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Comments: Heterozygous ATM P/LP variants should not sh	 Absolute risk: 2%–3%¹⁰⁻¹² Management:^f Risk reduction: Evidence insufficient for risk-reducing salpingo oophorectomy (RRSO); manage based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: ~5%-10%^{9,23} Management: Screen P/LP variant carriers with a family history of pancreatic cancer, see PANC-A. Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Prostate cancer Emerging evidence for association with increased risk.²⁴ Consider prostate cancer screening starting at age 40 years (Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection)
	the c.7271T>G variant, which is associated with greate	r risk of breast cancer. See <u>GENE-B</u> for repro	oductive implications/recessive disease.
BARD1	 Absolute risk:17%-30%⁷ Management: Screening: Annual mammogram and consider breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 40 y^{c,d,e} Risk reduction: Evidence insufficient for RRM, manage based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong⁷⁻⁹ 	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	Other cancers • Unknown or insufficient evidence





<u>Gene</u>	Breast Cancer Risk and Management (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks
BRCA1	 Absolute risk: >60%^{5,25-29} Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong <u>Male breast cancer</u> Absolute risk: 0.2%–1.2% by age 70 y^{30,31} Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Absolute risk: 39%–58%³³ Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic</u> <u>Variant-Positive Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong 	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: ≤5%³¹ Management: Screen P/LP variant carriers with a family history of pancreatic cancer, see PANC-A. Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Prostate cancer Absolute risk: 7%–26%³⁴ Management: See BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management
	Comment: See GENE-B for reproductive implication	ns/recessive disease.	
BRCA2	 Absolute risk: >60%^{5,21-25} Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong <u>Male breast cancer</u> Absolute risk: 1.8%–7.1% by age 70 y^{30,31,32} Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Absolute risk: 13%–29%³³ Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic</u> <u>Variant-Positive Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong 	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: 5%–10%³¹ Management: Screen P/LP variant carriers with a family history of pancreatic cancer, see <u>PANC-A</u>. Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong Prostate cancer Absolute risk: 19%–61%^{34,35} Management: See <u>BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management</u>. Melanoma See <u>BRCA Pathogenic Variant-Positive Management</u>





<u>Gene</u>	<u>Breast Cancer Risk and Management</u> (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks			
BRIP1	 Absolute risk: Insufficient data to define Management: Insufficient data; managed based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Limited; potential increase in female breast cancer⁸ 	 Absolute risk: 5%–15%^{10-12,39} Management: Risk reduction: Recommend RRSO starting at age 45–50 y^h Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	• Unknown or insufficient evidence			
	Comments: Based on estimates from available studies, the lifetime risk of ovarian cancer in carriers of P/LP variants in <i>BRIP1</i> justifies RRSO. The current evidence is insufficient to make a firm recommendation as to the optimal age for this procedure. Based on the current, limited evidence base, a discussion about surgery should be held around age 45–50 y or earlier based on a specific family history of an earlier onset of ovarian cancer. See <u>GENE-B</u> for reproductive implications/recessive disease.					
CDH1	 Absolute risk: 41%–60%³⁶⁻³⁸ Management:^b Screening: Annual mammogram and consider breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 30 y^{c,d} Risk reduction: Discuss option of RRM Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	 Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer (HDGC) Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong See <u>NCCN Guidelines for Gastric Cancer</u>: Principles of Genetic Risk Assessment for Gastric Cancer 			
	Comments: There is controversy over how to manage gastric cancer risk in individuals with P/LP variants in <i>CDH1</i> in the absence of a family history of gastric cancer. However, one small study found that >50% of such individuals had gastric cancer identified at the time of risk-reducing total gastrectomy (Jacobs MF, et al. Gastroenterology 2019;157:87-96), and penetrance for lifetime risk is increased with a positive family history of HDGC (Roberts ME, et al. JAMA Oncol 2019;5:1325-1331). Cleft lip with or without cleft palate has been associated with <i>CDH1</i> P/LP variants (Frebourg T, et al. J Med Genet 2006;43:138-142).					

ed association	 Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer (HDGC) Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong See <u>NCCN Guidelines for Gastric Cancer</u>: Principles of Genetic Risk Assessment for Gastric Cancer 				
stric cancer risk in individuals with P/LP variants in CDH1 in the absence of a family that >50% of such individuals had gastric cancer identified at the time of risk-					





<u>Gene</u>	Breast Cancer Risk and Management (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks
CDKN2A	Evidence of increased risk: No established association Comments: Comprehensive skin examination by a biannually for individuals with P/LP variants affect specifically disrupt the p14ARF protein cause a ur multidisciplinary cancer surveillance beyond panc and brain MRI based on the presentation in individ 2021;19:21).	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: >15% Management: Screening, see PANC-A. Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong Melanoma Absolute risk: 28%–76% depending on other risk factors, including family history, geographic location, and other genetic modifiers^{40,41} Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Management: See comment Other cancers See comment body photography and dermoscopy is recommended as (ie, p16INK4A and p14ARF). Because P/LP variants that prs, sarcomas, melanoma, and other cancers, increased as been recommended, which may include annual full-body hatol 2016;175:785-789; Chan et al. Hered Cancer Clin Pract
CHEK2	 Absolute risk: 20%–40%^{5,6,7,42,43,44} Management:^b Screening: Annual mammogram at age 40 y and consider breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 30–35 y^{c,d,e} Risk reduction: Evidence insufficient for RRM, manage based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong⁴⁵ Comments: Risk data are based only on frameshing as Ile157Thr, the risk for breast cancer appears to the strength of evidence of association with the strength of breast cancer appears to the strength of	Evidence of increased risk: No established association ft P/LP variants. The risks for most misse be lower. Additional cancer risk manage	 <u>Colorectal cancer</u> <u>NCCN Guidelines for Genetic/Familial High-Risk</u> <u>Assessment: Colorectal (GENE-1)</u> <u>Prostate cancer</u> Emerging evidence for association with increased risk.⁵⁴ Consider prostate cancer screening starting at age 40 years (<u>NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early</u> <u>Detection</u>)





Gene	Breast Cancer Risk and Management	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²²
	(First primary)	<u>Management</u>	and Other Cancer Risks
MSH2, MLH1, MSH6, PMS2, EPCAM f	 MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PMS2, and EPCAM Absolute risk: <15%^{46,47,48} Management: Insufficient data; managed based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Limited 	 MLH1 Absolute risk: 4%–20%^{49,50} Strength of evidence: Strong <u>MSH2 /EPCAM</u> Absolute risk: 8%–38%^{49,50,52,53} Strength of evidence: Strong <u>MSH6</u> Absolute risk: ≤1%–13%^{51,52} Strength of evidence: Strong <u>PMS2</u> Absolute risk: 1.3%–3%⁵³ Strength of evidence: Limited Management for all genes: <u>NCCN</u> <u>Guidelines for Genetic/Familial High- Risk Assessment: Colorectal</u> 	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: <5%–10% (excluding <i>PMS2</i>) Management: Screen P/LP variant carriers with a family history of pancreatic cancer (insufficient evidence for <i>PMS2</i>), see <u>PANC-A</u>. Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong <u>Colorectal, uterine, others</u> <u>NCCN Guidelines for Genetic/Familial High-Risk</u> <u>Assessment: Colorectal</u>
	Comments: Counsel for biallelic risk of P/LP variants Colorectal.	s that lead to CMMRD. See <u>NCCN Guidelir</u>	nes for Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment:
NF1	 Absolute risk: 20%–40%^{55,56} Management:^b Screening: Annual mammogram starting at age 30 y and consider breast MRI with and without contrast from ages 30–50 y^{c,d} Risk reduction: Evidence insufficient for RRM, manage based on family history Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	 Malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumors, gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GIST), others Recommend referral to NF1 specialist for evaluation and management
	Comments: At this time, there are no data to sugges results due to presence of breast neurofibromas.	st an increased breast cancer risk after age	e 50 y. Consider possibility of false-positive MRI





<u>Gene</u>	Breast Cancer Risk and Management (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks
PALB2	 Absolute risk: 41%–60%^{5,8,22,57} Management:^b Screening: Annual mammogram and breast MRI with and without contrast at 30 y^{c,d} Risk reduction: Discuss option of RRM Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Male breast cancer Absolute risk: 0.9% by age 70 y²² Management: See comment Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Absolute risk: 3%–5%^{10-12,22,65,66} Management:^f Risk reduction: Consider RRSO at age starting at 45–50 y^{h,67,68} Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: 2%–5% Management: Screen P/LP variant carriers with a family history of pancreatic cancer, see PANC-A Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Limited Other cancers Unknown or insufficient evidence
	Comments: See <u>GENE-B</u> for reproductive implications/re that for carriers of a <i>BRCA1</i> P/LP variant. See <u>BRCA-A</u>	ecessive disease. For males, it is reasonab	le to consider breast cancer screening similar to
PTEN	 Absolute risk: 40%–60% (historical cohort data), >60% (projected estimates)⁵⁸⁻⁶² Management:^b See <u>Cowden Syndrome</u> <u>Management</u> Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong^{63,64} 	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	 Thyroid, colorectal, endometrial, renal cancers See Cowden Syndrome Management





<u>Gene</u>	<u>Breast Cancer Risk and Management</u> (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks	
RAD51C	 Absolute risk: 17%–30%^{5,7,45} Management: Annual mammogram and consider breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 40 y Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Absolute risk: 10%–15%^{10-12,69,70} Management: Risk reduction: Recommend RRSO starting at 45–50 y^h Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	• Unknown or insufficient evidence	
	Comments: Based on estimates from available studies, the lifetime risk of ovarian cancer in carriers of P/LP variants in RAD51C justifies RRSO. The current evidence is insufficient to make a firm recommendation as to the optimal age for this procedure. Based on the current, limited evidence base, a discussion about surgery should be held around age 45–50 y or earlier based on a specific family history of an earlier onset ovarian cancer. See <u>GENE-B</u> for reproductive implications/ recessive disease.			
RAD51D	 Absolute risk: 17%–30%^{5,7,45} Management: Annual mammogram and consider breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 40 y Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	 Absolute risk: 10%–20%^{10-12,69,70} Management: Risk reduction: Recommend RRSO at starting at 45–50 y^h Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	• Unknown or insufficient evidence	
	Comments: Based on estimates from available studies, the lifetime risk of ovarian cancer in carriers of P/LP variants in RAD51D justifies RRSO. The current evidence is insufficient to make a firm recommendation as to the optimal age for this procedure. Based on the current, limited evidence base, a discussion about surgery should be held around age 45–50 y or earlier based on a specific family history of an earlier onset ovarian cancer.			





<u>Gene</u>	<u>Breast Cancer Risk and Management</u> (First primary)	Epithelial Ovarian Cancer Risk and Management	Pancreatic Cancer Risk and Management ¹³⁻²² and Other Cancer Risks	
STK11	 Absolute risk: 32%–54%^{71,72} Management: Screening: Annual mammogram and breast MRI with and without contrast starting at age 30 y NCCN Guidelines for Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Colorectal - Peutz-Jeghers syndrome (PJS) Risk reduction: Discuss option of RRM Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong 	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	Pancreatic cancer • Absolute risk: >15% • Management: Screening, see PANC-A • Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Non-Epithelial Ovarian Cancer (Sex cord with annular tubules) • Absolute risk: >10% ⁶⁵ • Management: NCCN Guidelines for Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Colorectal - (PJS) • Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Strong Other cancers • NCCN Guidelines for Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Colorectal - (PJS)	
	Comments: Case-control studies have consistently demonstrated germline STK11 PVs to be associated with high lifetime risks of pancreatic cancer. However, these variants are rare, and the risk estimates have wide confidence intervals.			
TP53	 Absolute risk: >60%^{5,73,74,75} Management: Li-Fraumeni Syndrome Management Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Very strong⁷⁶ 	Evidence of increased risk: No established association	 Pancreatic cancer Absolute risk: ~5%⁷⁴ Management: Screen P/LP variant carriers with a family history of pancreatic cancer, see <u>PANC-A</u>. Strength of evidence of association with cancer: Limited <u>Other cancersⁱ</u> Classical LFS spectrum cancers (in addition to breast): soft tissue sarcoma, osteosarcoma, CNS tumor, ACC Many other cancers have been associated with LFS, especially melanoma, colorectal, gastric, and prostate. Li-Fraumeni Syndrome Management 	
	Comment: See Discussion for information on hypomorphic variants.			





Disclosure

- Thailand Medical Genetics and Genomics Association (TMGGA)
- Ramathibodi School of Nursing
- Thainakarin Hospital







Division of Medical Genetics and Molecular Biology, Department of Internal Medicine, Faculaty of Medicine, Ramathibodi Hospital

ไรงเรียนพยาบาลรามาธิบดี คณะแพทยศาสตร์โรงพยาบาลรามาธิบดี มหาวิทยาลัยมหิดล

