

# HEAD-TO-HEAD COMPARISON OF TWO COMMERCIALY AVAILABLE NEXT-GENERATION SEQUENCING TECHNOLOGIES THAT DETECT GENE FUSIONS IN NON-SMALL CELL LUNG CANCER

Richard Blidner, Shobha Gokul, Brian C Haynes, and Gary J Latham  
Asuragen, Inc., Austin, Texas USA

## SUMMARY

- The accurate detection of cancer-associated RNA fusions and other variants by next-generation sequencing requires reliable and integrated methods that can support a range of FFPE RNA inputs and quality.
- We compared two kits, the QuantideX® NGS RNA Lung Cancer Kit (RUO) (QX) and FusionPlex® ALK, RET, ROS1 v2 Kit (RUO) (FP), using 30-288 ng FFPE lung tumor RNA and admixtures down to ≤5% variant.
- Although both kits correctly identified all fusions when QC requirements were met, QX permitted >5-fold lower RNA inputs and achieved twice the rate of samples passing QC compared to FP.

## INTRODUCTION

The reliable assessment of cancer-associated gene fusions by next-generation sequencing (NGS) is often challenged by low sample input quantity and quality, necessitating rigorous QC assessments to lend confidence to test results. Integration of these QC results with standardized reagents and bioinformatics is critical to assure consistent results from one laboratory to the next. Here we present a head-to-head comparison of two commercially available NGS kits that include reagents and software and are designed to detect non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)-related fusions.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Total nucleic acid was isolated from 20 residual FFPE NSCLC biopsies using FormaPure™ FFPE Extraction Kit (Beckman Coulter), and RNA was quantified using the Qubit® RNA HS Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The isolates were processed into 24 unique samples, and NGS analysis was performed by an independent laboratory using the QuantideX® NGS RNA Lung Cancer Kit RUO (QX) and the FusionPlex® ALK, RET, ROS1 v2 Kit (RUO) (FP) (using updated FusionPlex chemistries and protocols available Q4 2016, ArcherDX). Libraries were sequenced on the MiSeq® System (Illumina) and analyzed using each kit's bioinformatics software suite.



**Figure 1. Workflow for both QX and FP assays.** Due to the difference in enrichment strategies (targeted enrichment versus anchored multiplex PCR), the QX system requires fewer workflow steps (orange). However, the FP system provides components in premixed lyophilized form. Orange and blue fields represent steps with reagents provided in the respective kits, whereas green fields represent steps that require external reagents/systems. Quantification steps in the FP workflow require 3rd party qPCR buffers to be purchased and are, therefore partially supplied (blue/green bands).

## RESULTS

Sample ID	QuantideX NGS RNA Lung Cancer Kit			FusionPlex ALK, RET, ROS1 v2 Kit			Sample ID	QX Copies/μL	FP PreSeq Cq
	Pre-analytical	Copies/μL	Post-analytical	Pre-analytical	PreSeq Cq	Post-analytical			
NGS01	PASS	477	PASS	PASS	25.3	PASS	QC01	177	30.1
NGS02	PASS	426	PASS	PASS	25.9	PASS	QC02	139	30.7
NGS03	PASS	358	PASS	PASS	26.8	PASS	QC03	164	31.1
NGS04	PASS	285	PASS	PASS	28.2	PASS	QC04	61	32.0
NGS05	PASS	250	PASS	PASS	28.4	FAIL	QC05	142	29.9
NGS06	PASS	398	PASS	PASS	28.2	FAIL	QC06	197	29.4
NGS07	PASS	373	PASS	PASS	26.7	FAIL	QC07	60	32.2
NGS08	PASS	381	PASS	PASS	26.7	FAIL	QC08	89	32.0
NGS09	PASS	608	PASS	PASS	25.6	PASS			
NGS10	PASS	717	PASS	PASS	25.1	PASS			
NGS11	PASS	649	PASS	PASS	27.3	PASS			
NGS12	PASS	152	PASS	PASS	29.2	FAIL			
NGS13	PASS	112	PASS	PASS	28.9	FAIL			
NGS14	PASS	118	PASS	PASS	30.2	FAIL			
NGS15	PASS	92	PASS	PASS	30.2	FAIL			
NGS16	PASS	285	PASS	PASS	27.9	PASS			

**Table 3. Pre- & post-analytical QC results for both QX and FP assays.** The QX and FP pre-analytical QC results demonstrated a dose response agreement for sample quality. However, post-analytical QC pass rates were lower for FP than for QX. FP failed samples included samples with sufficiently high mass input and samples with pre-analytical QC scores of less than 28 Cq.

QuantideX NGS RNA Lung Cancer Kit (QX) Content			Archer FusionPlex ALK, RET, ROS1 v2 Kit (FP) Content	
3' Fusion Genes	# of Fusions	mRNA Expression Targets	Fusion Driver Gene	Imbalance
ALK	53	ABCB1	ALK	ALK
ROS1	22	BRCA1	ROS1	ROS1
RET	12	CD274 (PDL1)	RET	RET
FGFR3	7	CDKN2A		
NTRK3	3	CTLA4		
NTRK1	4	ERCC1		
NRG1	2	ESR1		
FGFR1	1	FGFR1		
FGFR2	1	FGFR2		
MBIP	1	IFNGR		
PDGFRA	1	ISG15		
3'-5' Imbalance			Anchored Multiplex PCR does not require knowledge of fusion partner	
ALK		MET		
ROS1		MSLN		
RET		PDCD1		
NTRK1		PDCD1LG2 (PDL2)		
PDGFRA		PTEN		
Exon Skipping Event				
MET e13:e14		RRM1		
MET e14:e15		TDP1		
MET e13:e15		TERT		
		TLE3		
		TOP1		
		TUBB3		
		TYMS		
		EndogenousCtrls.		

**Table 1. Content covered by the QuantideX NGS RNA Lung Cancer Kit (RUO) and the FusionPlex ALK, RET, ROS1 v2 Kit (RUO).** The QX assay comprehensively covers known recurrent fusion breakpoints, whereas the FP assay is breakpoint agnostic and can detect novel fusions. The presence of a novel fusion can be detected with QX assay using 3'-5' imbalance markers, but information of the fusion partner will be lost. QX additionally covers MET exon 14 splice variants and expression data on 23 mRNA markers.

Sample ID	Qubit (ng/μL)	Input into RT (ng)	Annotation	Sample ID	Input into RT (ng)	Annotation
NGS01	57.6	288	ALK Positive	QC01	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS02	39.6	198	ALK Positive	QC02	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS03	25.5	127.5	Fusion Negative	QC03	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS04	15.0	75	Fusion Negative	QC04	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS05	15.3	76.5	ALK Positive (NGS01) 15%†	QC05	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS06	15.1	75.5	ALK Positive (NGS01) 5%†	QC06	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS07	23.4	117	ALK Positive (NGS02) 15†	QC07	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS08	23.1	115.5	ALK Positive (NGS02) 5%†	QC08	20	Pre-analytical QC only
NGS09	31.8	159	None			
NGS10	30.8	154	None			
NGS11	12.7	63.5	None			
NGS12	11.8	59	ALK Positive			
NGS13	8.9	44.4	ALK Positive			
NGS14	8.5	42.4	None			
NGS15	6.1	30.5	None			
NGS16	6.7	33.6	ALK Positive			

†Represents admixtures of fusion-positive FFPE into a fusion-negative FFPE.

**Table 2. Sample set evaluated by both QX and FP assays.** All samples met the minimum input requirements (>20 ng RNA input) as stated by each kit manufacturer. Sixteen FFPE samples were evaluated using inputs ranging from 30-288 ng RNA. Four of these 16 samples were admixtures of known fusion-positive and negative FFPE RNA formulated with 5-15% variant (measured by RNA mass) and 2-15% (measured by functional RNA copy number). An additional 8 FFPE samples were assessed by each kit's pre-analytical QC assay, but not NGS, using 20 ng RNA consistent with the minimum stated input requirements for both assays.

Sample ID	Reference Fusion	QuantideX NGS RNA Lung Cancer Kit		FusionPlex ALK, RET, ROS1 v2 Kit	
		Fusion Call	Imbalance	Strong Fusion Call	Weak Fusion Call
NGS01	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	ALK	EML4-ALK	None
NGS02	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	ALK	EML4-ALK	None
NGS03	None	None	-	None	None
NGS04	None	None	-	None	None
NGS05	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	Not Called (1910/0)*	None†	None†
NGS06	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	Not Called (1733/0)*	None†	None†
NGS07	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	Not Called (1612/0)*	None†	None†
NGS08	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	Not Called (359/37)*	None†	None†
NGS09	None	None	-	None	SPEG-RET
NGS10	None	None	-	None	LDLRAD2-RET
NGS11	None	None	-	None	None
NGS12	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	ALK	EML4-ALK†	None†
NGS13	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	ALK	None†	None†
NGS14	None	None	-	None†	None†
NGS15	None	None	-	None†	None†
NGS16	EML-ALK	EML-ALK	ALK	EML4-ALK	None

\*Supporting coverage for imbalance shown as: (3' expression reads / 5' expression reads)

†Libraries failed post analytical QC

Imbalances not called due to threshold, but evidence of imbalance is present (imbalance calls not required to confirm fusion calls)

Missed calls in admixtures and in low input sample

Weak evidence calls noted as mispriming event

**Table 4. Summary of NGS results using the QX and FP assays.** The QX NGS results were 100% concordant with the reference results. False-positive and false-negative results are highlighted with ORANGE text. FP NGS results included five false-negative results, four of which occurred in the admixture samples. All missed calls were associated with libraries flagged as failed by post-analytical QC (marked with †). FP NGS also showed weak evidence flagged as mispriming for spurious fusions in two samples.

## CONCLUSIONS

- Both kits included reagents for library prep, integrated multiple QC metrics to inform interpretations of results, and bioinformatics software for analysis.
- Both kits generated accurate calls when all QC criteria were satisfied.
- Using QX, all 16 sequenced sample libraries exceeded pre- and post-analytical QC requirements, and all fusions were correctly identified.
- For FP, only 8/16 samples passed post-analytical QC to generate reliable calls.
- Our results emphasize the importance of verifying minimum input requirements for each NGS technology and scrutinizing QC checkpoints to ensure reliable results.