ESMO recommendations on the standard methods to detect NTRK fusions in daily practice and clinical research
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Background: NTRK1, NTRK2 and NTRK3 fusions are present in a plethora of malignancies across different histologies. These fusions represent the most frequent mechanism of oncogenic activation of these receptor tyrosine kinases, and biomarkers for the use of TRK small molecule inhibitors. Given the varying frequency of NTRK1/2/3 fusions, crucial to the administration of NTRK inhibitors is the development of optimal approaches for the detection of human cancers harbouring activating NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes.

Materials and methods: Experts from several Institutions were recruited by the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) Translational Research and Precision Medicine Working Group (TR and PM WG) to review the available methods for the detection of NTRK gene fusions, their potential applications, and strategies for the implementation of a rational approach for the detection of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes in human malignancies. A consensus on the most reasonable strategy to adopt when screening for NTRK fusions in oncologic patients was sought, and further reviewed and approved by the ESMO TR and PM WG and the ESMO leadership.

Results: The main techniques employed for NTRK fusion gene detection include immunohistochemistry, fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), RT-PCR, and both RNA-based and DNA-based next generation sequencing (NGS). Each technique has advantages and limitations, and the choice of assays for screening and final diagnosis should also take into account the resources and clinical context.

Conclusion: In tumours where NTRK fusions are highly recurrent, FISH, RT-PCR or RNA-based sequencing panels can be used as confirmatory techniques, whereas in the scenario of testing an unselected population where NTRK1/2/3 fusions are uncommon, either front-line sequencing (preferentially RNA-sequencing) or screening by immunohistochemistry followed by sequencing of positive cases should be pursued.
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Introduction

Neurotrophic tropomyosin-related kinases (NTRKs, or the commonly used alias TRKs) constitute a receptor tyrosine kinase family of neurotrophin receptors involved in neuronal development, including the growth and function of neuronal synapses and memory development [1]. After embryogenesis, TRK expression is limited primarily to the nervous system, where these kinases help regulate pain, proprioception, appetite and memory, and participate in the protection of neurons after ischaemia or other...
types of injury [1, 2]. The three TRK family members described, namely NTRK1 (also known as TRKA), NTRK2 (also known as TRKB) and NTRK3 (also known as TRKC), can be found in multiple tissue types (supplementary Table S1, available at Annals of Oncology online) and are encoded by the NTRK1, NTRK2 and NTRK3 genes, respectively. The TRK receptors are composed of an extracellular domain for ligand binding, a transmembrane portion and an intracellular domain with a kinase domain. Oligomerisation of the receptors and phosphorylation of specific tyrosine residues in the intracytoplasmic kinase domain are triggered when the ligand binds to the receptor, thus leading to the activation of signal transduction pathways, which results in proliferation, differentiation and survival in normal and neoplastic neuronal cells [3].

NTRK point mutations and indels have been described in various tumour types, including ovarian, colorectal, and lung cancers, as well as melanomas and myeloid leukaemia [4–8]. It should be noted, however, that the potential role of these mutations in promoting tumorigenesis and cancer progression is poorly understood. In fact, the vast majority of NTRK mutations are not known to be clinically actionable; however, some may constitute mechanisms of resistance to TRK inhibitors [9]. One in-frame deletion (ATRKA) and a splice variant (TRKAI1II) in NTRK1 have been reported as oncogenic in acute myeloid leukaemia and neuroblastoma, respectively [10, 11]. On the other hand, oncogenic fusions involving NTRK1, NTRK2 and NTRK3 have been reported in a plethora of malignancies across different histologies and represent the key mechanisms of oncogenic TRK activation [12]. These oncogenic fusions create chimeric genes in which the 3' region of the NTRK gene is joined with a 5' sequence of a fusion partner gene, and may stem from intra-chromosomal or inter-chromosomal rearrangements [12, 13]. Despite the multitude of 5' fusion gene partners, NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes share key characteristics, including the fact that the resulting genetic chimera uniformly contains the NTRK kinase domain with the critical tyrosine docking sites (Figure 1), and results in a constitutively activated and overexpressed TRK kinase [12]. These fusion genes have been shown to possess oncogenic properties, including the induction of cancer cell proliferation and activation of critical cancer-related downstream signalling, such as the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) and PI3K/AKT pathways [12, 17–19]. Many 5' gene partners (at least 25) have been described; nevertheless, all rearrangements share an in-frame, intact TRK kinase domain [12, 20, 21].

Fusion genes affecting NTRK1/2/3 are highly recurrent in certain rare malignancies. The best-known form of NTRK fusion gene is the ETV6-NTRK3, which is present in >95% of secretory carcinomas of the breast [22] and of the salivary glands (i.e. mammary analogue secretory carcinoma of the salivary glands) [23], congenital fibrosarcoma [24] and cellular mesoblastic nephromas [25]. This fusion gene is the product of the t(12;15)(p13q25) chromosomal translocation, which results in a chimeric transcript encompassing exon 4, 5 or 6 of ETV6 and the kinase domain of NTRK3 [22]. The ETV6-NTRK3 fusion gene leads to constitutive activation of the TRKC kinase domain, with downstream activation of the PI3K/AKT and MAPK pathways [18, 26]. The ETV6-NTRK3 fusion gene is also found in a small subset of acute myeloid leukaemia [27, 28], but the breakpoints are distinct from those found in solid malignancies. NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes have also been detected in small subsets of common tumour types, and, in this context, the fusions typically occur in a mutually exclusive fashion with other strong mitogenic drivers, i.e. genetic alterations affecting the most common driver genes belonging to the MAPK signalling pathway (e.g. KRAS, NRAS and BRAF) [29–32]. They have also been reported as significantly more frequently encountered in microsatellite instability (MSI)-high tumours in the context of colorectal carcinoma patients [31]. Interestingly, a recent study has shown that the association between NTRK fusions with MSI-high colorectal carcinomas seems to be strictly connected with MLH1 deficiency associated with MLH1 promoter hypermethylation in the context of a non-Lynch syndrome scenario [32].

NTRK1/2/3 gene fusions have emerged as new targets for cancer therapy as they can be successfully inhibited by targeted kinase inhibitors [20, 21, 33, 34]. Of note, responses have been documented irrespective of the 5' gene partner and in a histology-driven fashion [9, 20, 33, 34]. Several compounds targeting TRKs are currently being explored in clinical trials and, notably, one of these compounds, larotrectinib (VITRAKVI®), has received accelerated approval by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for adult and paediatric solid tumours with an NTRK fusion without known resistance mutations [35]. In addition, entrectinib has received breakthrough designation status by the United States FDA for the treatment of cancers harbouring NTRK fusions. Hence, there is an active interest in clinical oncology for NTRK fusions, which has prompted an urgent need to define the routine diagnostic testing to identify gene fusions as a companion diagnostic method to support clinical decision in this context. Therefore, the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) Translational Research and Precision Medicine Working Group (TR and PM WG) launched a collaborative project to review the available methods that can be used to detect NTRK1/2/3 gene fusions.

### NTRK1/2/3 fusion gene detection

A wide array of different techniques can be employed in the detection of NTRK1/2/3 fusions (supplementary Figure S1, available at Annals of Oncology online). Historically, gene fusions have been assayed by fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH) and reverse transcriptase (RT)-PCR, and FISH assays for the detection of the ETV6-NTRK3 fusion gene are commercially available. However, given the multitude of 5' partners involved in NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes, assays that allow for the detection of multiple variants in a single test, including next-generation sequencing (NGS)-based RNA and DNA approaches, have been widely used in large academic centres in North America. The adoption of these NGS-based methods in other contexts has proven challenging, given the costs for the implementation and running of the assay, limited reimbursement by public or private payors, need for bioinformatics expertise and relatively longer turnaround time (1–3 weeks).

As a general approach, one could consider that in those malignancies where the NTRK fusions are described as pathognomonic or highly recurrent genetic alterations, such as the ETV6-NTRK3 fusion gene in secretory carcinoma of the breast and of the salivary glands, congenital fibrosarcomas and cellular mesoblastic...
nephromas [22] (supplementary Table S1, available at Annals of Oncology online), the detection of the fusion gene could be accomplished by FISH or RT-PCR. Conversely, in those neoplasms where a limited proportion of cases is expected to harbour an NTRK1/2/3 fusion and the gene partner is unknown (supplementary Table S1, available at Annals of Oncology online), assays allowing for the detection of fusion genes in an agnostic manner would be indicated, either in the form of front-line NGS testing or by using a two-step approach involving a screening by immunohistochemistry (IHC) followed by NGS of cases expressing TRKA/B/C.

From a technical standpoint, all the techniques have strengths and weaknesses (Table 1), as discussed in detail here below.

### In situ assays

**Immunohistochemistry.** Different antibodies are available to detect TRK expression in tissue samples. There are antibodies directed against specific NTRK proteins (TRKA or TRKB) [16, 30, 36], antibodies targeting an amino acid sequence common to TRKA, TRKB and TRKC [37–40] or a pan-TRK antibody cocktail [41]. Positive controls for IHC include the cell lines KM12 (TPM3-NTRK1) [36], MO-91 (ETV6-NTRK3) and CUTO-3.29 (MPRIP-NTRK1) [42], and formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) cell pellets can be used as external controls in immunohistochemical runs [43]. Peripheral nerves can serve as internal control, if present in the sample.

---

**Table 1. Summary of main features, strengths and weaknesses of all available techniques to detect NTRK rearrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>Detection of all fusion genes</th>
<th>Detection of partner</th>
<th>Detection of expression</th>
<th>Screening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>High&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>High&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>One per probe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA seq NGS</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA seq&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>False negatives reported mainly in NTRK3 fusions.

<sup>b</sup>In the absence of smooth muscle/neuronal differentiation.

<sup>c</sup>Detected rearrangements by DNA-based assays may not result in fusions, correlation with surgical pathology and predicted transcript (for sequencing) is needed.
The pattern of TRK expression detected by IHC can be variable in intensity and subcellular localisation (supplementary Figure S2, available at Annals of Oncology online). There are data supporting the notion that the subcellular distribution of the chimeric protein may vary with the 5’ fusion gene partner. For instance, when using a pan-TRK antibody five LMNA–NTRK1 fusion-positive neoplasms displayed nuclear membrane accentuation [39], which was also observed in an LMNA–NTRK1 fusion-positive uterine sarcoma assessed with an anti-TRKA antibody [37]. When using a panTRK antibody, TM3/4 fusion-positive tumours displayed cellular membrane accentuation [39], and an uterine sarcoma harbouring TPR–NTRK1 fusion displayed strong and diffuse cytoplasmic expression with dot-like aggregates as well as rare nuclear expression and accentuation of the nuclear envelope [37]. Finally, half (3/6) of ETV6–NTRK3 fusions displayed nuclear staining [39]. It should be emphasised, however, that further characterisation of the subcellular localisation according to the fusion gene partners is required before these patterns are adopted for diagnostic purposes.

Given the restricted expression of TRKA, TRKB and TRKC in adult tissues (i.e. smooth muscle, testes and neuronal components [44–46]), IHC has been proven highly sensitive (from 95% [39] to 100% [37]) and specific (from 93% [37] to 100% [39]) for the detection of NTRK fusions. It should be noted, however, that values for sensitivity and specificity reported so far derive from data on relatively small cohorts. Further validation in large cohorts will likely be more informative in the next future.

Hechtman et al. [39] analysed NTRK fusion-positive and NTRK fusion-negative cases, using DNAseq and RNAseq methods (see below). Pan-TRK IHC was positive in 20/21 cases with NTRK fusion transcripts. The discordant negative case was a mismatch repair-deficient colorectal carcinoma with an ETV6–NTRK3 fusion. For all 20 RNAseq-negative cases concordant IHC results were observed. In addition, Chiang et al. [37] reported on four NTRK fusion-positive uterine sarcomas that showed features of fibrosarcoma and all displayed pan-TRK staining, with three of them also showing concurrent TRKA staining. In that study, 97 uterine spindle cell leiomyosarcomas were analysed: four fusion-negative cases (as assessed by FISH and/or NGS) displayed weak and diffuse cytoplasmic TRKA expression, and 2 featured strong and diffuse cytoplasmic pan-TRK expression. Rudzinski et al. [38] observed a 97% sensitivity and a 98% specificity for the presence of an NTRK fusion when employing a pan-TRK antibody, whereas TRKA IHC (EP1058Y) was 100% sensitive and 63% specific. Consistent with Hechtman et al. [39], Rudzinski et al. [38] also identified a single false negative ETV6–NTRK3-rearranged tumour when using pan-TRK antibodies; however, this tumour displayed diffuse, strong positivity for TRKA. Due to the lack of monoclonal anti–TRKC antibodies, it is uncertain as to whether these ETV6–NTRK3 fusions that were independently detected in the two studies were indeed false negative IHC results rather than fusions that did not result in translation of the protein.

Taken together, these data suggest that pan-TRK IHC is a valuable tool to identify NTRK-rearranged neoplasms, and has several advantages as: (i) it has relatively high sensitivity and specificity; (ii) it represents a rapid method that can be easily employed in different laboratory environments with a quick turnaround time; (iii) it is able theoretically to detect only transcribed and translated fusion proteins; (iv) it is relatively inexpensive and requires limited material.

However, in addition to the known limitations of immunohistochemical analyses in general, that include also possible issues related to the pre-analytical phase, IHC for TRKA, TRKB and TRKC has important caveats. First, a subset of cases, in particular those with smooth muscle and neuronal differentiation, expressing TRK proteins lack any identifiable fusions. Secondly, the interpretation of IHC results may prove challenging in tissues where TRKs are physiologically expressed. Thirdly, a subset of fusion gene positive cases (mainly NTRK3) lack TRK protein expression as defined by IHC [39]. Fourthly, there are no monoclonal, c-terminus TRKC antibodies, i.e. specific to NTRK3 fusions, currently commercially available. Finally, the expression of the receptors is not diagnostic of an NTRK1/2/3 fusion gene; it merely suggests that a fusion gene is likely present. Hence, some further considerations are required. In general, tumours harbouring NTRK3 fusions have much weaker staining for pan-TRK than tumours with NTRK1/NTRK2 fusions. This differential expression, as well as the presence of nuclear staining in NTRK3-rearranged tumours, may be useful for directing subsequent molecular testing strategies [38]. A possible algorithm in the use of pan-TRK IHC as a surrogate marker for NTRK fusions has been proposed: moderate to strong diffuse cytoplasmic pan-TRK staining can be considered as a surrogate of the presence of NTRK1/NTRK2 fusions (in the absence of muscle or neural differentiation of the lesion) and nuclear pan-TRK IHC can be considered a surrogate of NTRK3 fusions. For tumours with only weak cytoplasmic expression of pan-TRK, an NTRK fusion should be confirmed by other molecular/cytogenetic methods to ensure that a fusion is present in patients being considered for targeted therapeutic agents [38].

One of the approaches that has emerged consists of using IHC first, as a screening tool, followed by a RNA-based NGS approach to detect the specific fusion [40, 41]. The purpose of IHC screening is to distinguish in a rapid manner between patient specimens that are pan-negative for NRTKs and those that demonstrate a weak to strong level of tumour staining, which may harbour gene fusions. However, the overall cost-effectiveness of this method is debated, due to the rarity of NTRK fusions (<0.5% of cancers overall), in particular if additional targets are investigated. Outside of the rare tumour types with high-prevalence of ETV6–NTRK3 fusions, up-front screening with NGS panels are ultimately the least expensive approach to uncover actionable driver alterations including the investigation of possible NTRK fusions. Nonetheless, this two-step approach has allowed for the enrolment of patients in basket trials, such as the STARTRK trials [20]. In the context of STARTRK-2, a basket study of entrectinib for the treatment of patients with solid tumours harbouring NTRK1/2/3, ROS1 or ALK fusion genes (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02568267), it is specified that for patients enrolled via local molecular testing, an archival or fresh tumour tissue was required to be submitted for independent central molecular testing at a central CLIA-certified laboratory. There are preliminary data reported by Potts et al. on the detection of NTRK, ROS1 and ALK gene fusions in gastrointestinal
tumour patients [40] with a pan-TRK antibody used to perform IHC locally and an AMP-based NGS assay (Archer FusionPlex™) used for confirmation of positives. The IHC positivity average rate was 8% across 15 tumour locations. Out of 157 gastrointestinal samples, no instances were detected where IHC yielded a negative result and fusion genes were detected by NGS (100% negative predictive value). In a study evaluating a cohort of samples of multiple histologies (n = 636) Murphy et al. [41] used an antibody cocktail consisting of monoclonal antibodies targeting Pan-TRK, ROS1 and ALK with confirmation using anchored multiplex PCR (AMP) targeted RNAseq (Archer FusionPlex™ gene fusion assay). Approximately 30% showed positive staining and were tested by NGS. In a subgroup of 192 samples of colorectal, thyroid and lung cancers the pan-TRK IHC test had a 100% negative predictive value for gene fusion detection and the overall prevalence of the fusion gene within the IHC positive population was 9%, demonstrating an enrichment of fusion-positive samples within a population of clinical samples (versus the 4% frequency without the application of IHC screening).

As the prevalence reported here in these two studies is higher than that reported in the literature for these histologies (supplementary Table S1, available at Annals of Oncology online), we cannot exclude that somehow the cohorts analysed were a priori ‘pre-enriched’ for fusions.

**Fluorescence in situ hybridisation.** FISH is a commonly used method for detecting chromosomal rearrangements and has been effectively used to detect ALK, ROS1 and RET fusions in solid tumours. Either fusion or break-apart probes (supplementary Figure S3, available at Annals of Oncology online) can be used to investigate for the presence of NTRK1, NTRK2 or NTRK3 fusions; nevertheless, split-apart fusion probes are invariably easier in FFPE samples. Similar to IHC, FISH cannot ascertain the 5' partner or whether the fusion results in a productive in-frame chimeric transcript. Given that a multiplex FISH requires a great deal of experience in its interpretation, three separate FISH assays would have to be run in parallel, which become expensive and time consuming. FISH, however, can be very effective at identifying the presence of the ETV6–NTRK3 fusion gene in the tumour types where it is highly prevalent.

The studies reported so far have used a wide array of probes detecting NTRK fusions, some constructed as home-brew assays [17, 29, 37, 47], others being commercially available specific break-apart probe kits mainly for NTRK1 [16, 42] or NTRK3. When investigating ETV6–NTRK3 fusions, there is also the possibility to use a mixed break-apart probe allowing detection of ETV6, NTRK3 and other 13 genes breaks [48]. For instance, this approach was used in a study analysing ETV6–NTRK3 fusion transcripts in 25 cases of secretory carcinoma of the salivary glands and the split-apart signals of the NTRK3 gene were detected in 16 of the 25 cases [48]. In three cases, the tissue was not analysable, and in two other cases analysis could not be carried out because of lack of FFPE tissue. In the four remaining cases lacking NTRK3 split-apart signals and ETV6 split-positive, the fusion of ETV6 gene to a non-NTRK3 gene was suggested. To pursue possible fusion partners in these cases, involvement of NTRK1 and NTRK2 genes was examined, however, neither NTRK1 nor NTRK2 split-apart signals were identified.

Recommendations for scoring are those generally accepted for FISH for fusion gene detection. Sections should be 4 µm thick to avoid artefactual split-apart signals. Scoring should be carried out by counting the number of fluorescent signals in at least 50 randomly selected non-overlapping tumour cell nuclei. Scoring by more than one observer is recommended. A cut-off value for gene break is set at 10% or 15% (i.e. cases can be considered as harbouring a gene fusion if >10% or >15% of nuclei display ‘split-apart signals’; red and green signals should be separated by a distance greater than the size of two hybridisation probe signals [23, 49].

Albeit being a robust technology for the detection of highly recurrent known fusion genes and confirmation of potential fusion genes, the utility of FISH for screening cancers with NTRK1/2/3 fusions is limited, given the multitude of partners involved, the expertise required and its labour-intensive nature.

**In vitro nucleic acid-based assays**

In assays based on nucleic acids extracted from tumour tissues, an evaluation of tumour cellularity and specimen adequacy is of utmost importance. Additional pre-analytic parameters are equally important, including warm and cold ischaemia, length of fixation and chemical properties of the fixatives employed. Therefore, robust approaches tailored for FFPE tissue samples are essential. RNA and DNA NGS assays can detect de novo fusion genes involving NTRK1, NTRK2 and NTRK3, and define the 5' partner. It should be noted, however, that for most of these assays bioinformatics experience is required, and the turnaround times can be lengthier than those of more targeted molecular assays [39].

**Reverse transcription-PCR.** RT-PCR analyses of NTRK fusions have been reported in thyroid neoplasms [50, 51], glioblastomas [52], congenital fibrosarcomas [53], secretory carcinoma of the salivary glands [23, 48] and of the breast [54, 55]. Furthermore, RT-PCR has been used as an orthogonal validation method in studies exploring the genetic landscape of subgroups of neoplasms by high-throughput techniques [52].

Skalova et al. [48] analysed a series of 25 morphologically and immunophenotypically confirmed secretory carcinoma of the salivary glands with the absence of classical, exon 5–exon 15, ETV6–NTRK3 fusion transcript as detected by standard RT-PCR. The classical fusion transcript was analysed by a more sensitive nested RT-PCR. In addition, atypical exons 4–14 ETV6-NTRK3 fusion transcripts, as well as possible combinations of exons involved in classical and atypical junction, were analysed by nested RT-PCR and/or RT-PCR. In four cases, the classical fusion transcript was found by nested RT-PCR. Five other cases harboured atypical, exons 4–14 or exons 5–14, ETV6-NTRK3 fusion transcripts detected by both nested and/or standard RT-PCR. The rest of the cases remained negative on RT-PCR. FISH with NTRK3 break-apart probes was also carried out and a NTRK3 gene split was detected in 16/25 cases. For five cases, the tissue was not analysable due to technical issues, but in the four remaining cases no evidence of NTRK3 fusion was detected and ETV6 split-apart signals were observed, thus suggesting the fusion of ETV6 with a non-NTRK3 gene. Regrettably, these cases were not
subjected to NGS to elucidate the potential 3′ partners of these potential fusion genes.

**RNA NGS assays.** Given the chimeric nature of the transcripts stemming from gene fusions, RNA sequencing constitutes an approach for the *de novo* detection of fusion genes that are transcribed. The primary concern with handling RNA is related to its labile nature, especially when dealing with archival FFPE samples. Highly damaged RNA is composed of fragments that are too short to be informative and/or will hamper library preparation and subsequent sequencing. RNA quality assessment is therefore a crucial step in this process in order to discriminate possible false negative results and to enable reproducibility of the test [41].

Although studies where whole transcriptome RNA sequencing to detect fusions affecting the NTRK genes are on record [1, 56], more common is the use of targeted assays. In recent years, AMP, for which commercial ready-to-use kits as well customisable assays are available, has become a widely adopted methodology for fusion gene detection. Owing to the initial adapter ligation step that facilitates priming without a priori knowledge of the gene fusion partner, the AMP method has been shown to have high technical sensitivity and specificity even in FFPE-derived RNA samples. In these assays, the sequencing library targets known fusion exons in multiple oncogenes including *NTRK1* and/or *NTRK3* [29, 37, 39, 47], or all of the three members of the NTRK family [16, 37, 39].

The impact of RNA quality was assessed in one study analysing 44 archival cases (infantile fibrosarcoma, congenital mesoblastic nephroma, secretory carcinoma of the salivary glands and secretory breast carcinoma) with sufficient tissue to be tested with NGS by an Archer DX AMP assay. Only 23/44 passed presequencing quality control thresholds. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the likelihood that a case would fail quality control increased with sample aging, a feature expected to impact an assay using RNA extracted from FFPE tissue [29]. AMP has been employed also in larger studies aiming at screening for the presence of known fusion exons in multiple oncogenes: for instance, a panel including ALK, ROSI, RET and *NTRK1* fusion has been used in a phase I dose escalation study of entrectinib in adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung carcinomas (NCT02097810). In this study, out of the 1378 enrolled cases, two patients harboured *NTRK1* gene fusions (0.1%, 95% confidence interval 0.01%, 0.5%): a *TPM3–NTRK1* fusion previously described and a fusion transcript containing sequence from *SQSTM1* (sequestosome 1) and *NTRK1* [47].

In addition to the AMP technology, other NGS platforms can offer the possibility to test for *NTRK* fusions. These include the GeneTrails Solid Tumor Fusion Gene Panel (Knight Diagnostic Laboratories), designed to detect fusions involving 20 target genes including *NTRK1, NTRK2, NTRK3* [57]; the Universal Fusion/Expression Profile (Neogenomics), an assay capable of detecting different classes of genomic abnormalities such as fusion transcripts and transcriptomic gene expression levels in 1385 genes (*NTRK1, NTRK2, NTRK3* included); and the Oncomine assays (ThermoFisher Scientific), which cover fusion variants including *NTRK1, NTRK2* and *NTRK3* [58].

These panels require different amounts of RNA input. The choice of the technology must therefore take into account the amount of tissue available for testing.

**Targeted next-generation DNA sequencing assays.** Targeted NGS assays consist of panels of selected genes of interest where either all of the exons or hotspot regions only in selected exons for each gene are investigated. Several companies as well as academic centres have developed such assays, which can exploit distinct types of chemistry for sequencing. Some of the commercially available targeted sequencing panels offer the possibility to detect fusion genes and there are many examples where targeted DNA panels have been employed to detect *NTRK* fusions.

Some studies have been based on the Memorial Sloan Kettering Integrated Mutation Profiling of Actionable Cancer Targets (MSK-IMPACT™) assay, a deep-coverage hybridisation capture-based assay encompassing the entire coding regions and selected intronic and regulatory regions of >400 key cancer genes [30, 39]. This tumour-profiling multiplex panel has been recently cleared by the United States FDA as an *in vitro* diagnostic test that can identify somatic genetic alterations. MSK-IMPACT™ can detect missense mutations, indels, copy number alterations and selected gene fusions. In this panel, probes for introns 3, and 7–12 of *NTRK1*, and intron 15 of *NTRK2* are included to detect fusions involving these 2 genes. In addition, probes for *ETV6* introns 4 and 5 are included to detect *ETV6–NTRK3* fusions. Of note, other introns affected by *NTRK* fusions could not be included because they are too large for a DNA-based capture approach (approximate upper limit: 25 kb). Zehir et al. [13] have reported on the use of MSK-IMPACT in a prospective clinical sequencing of unselected metastatic patients and *NTRK1* and *NTRK3* fusions were detected in 18 patients (0.2%), a subgroup of whom were subsequently enrolled in targeted clinical trials.

A study focussed on MSK-IMPACT applied to the analysis of 449 melanoma patients revealed four cases (0.9%) harbouring *NTRK* fusion genes; in three of these cases, the 3′ partner was *NTRK1*, whereas in the remaining melanoma, *NTRK2* was rearranged [30].

There are other DNA-targeted sequencing assays that can be employed in the detecting of *NTRK* fusions. Some examples include the UW Oncoplex and the UCSF500 Cancer Gene Panel, both using probes for exons and selected introns of *NTRK1, NTRK2* and *NTRK3*. Additional probes for *ETV6* exons and selected introns are included to detect *ETV6–NTRK3* fusions; the UW Oncoplex includes additional probes for selected exons and introns of *EML4* to detect *EML4–NTRK3* fusions [38]. In addition, the SmartGenomics Complete—(PathGroup) Expanded Solid Tumor, includes 160 genes profiled for mutations and 126 gene fusions. Finally, the FDA-approved FoundationOneCDx test (Foundation Medicine) allows for *NTRK* detection: it analyses 315 genes and selected fusions including those involving *NTRK1, NTRK2* and *NTRK3*. *NTRK* fusions can also be detected by FoundationOne Heme, a DNA- and RNA-based NGS assay that analyses 236 cancer-related genes and 19 genes commonly rearranged in cancer. Foundation Medicine has reported their experience on 2031 tumour specimens from paediatric, adolescent and young adult patients affected by a variety of neoplastic conditions [leukaemia and solid tumours, including primary central nervous system (CNS) tumours] that were assayed with
FoundationOne Heme in the course of clinical care. From this dataset, nine unique patients (0.44%) were identified to harbour NTRK fusions [59]. For four cases where a diagnosis of infantile fibrosarcoma was considered, FISH for ETVT6-NTRK3 was carried out and showed negative results in three of them.

Other commercially available DNA- and RNA-based panels that can detect NTRK fusions are listed in supplementary Table S2, available at Annals of Oncology online.

Undoubtedly, DNA-based NGS has proven to be effective to detect gene rearrangements and predicted fusions; however, not all of the NTRK fusions can be practically detected using targeted assays, especially those fusions involving NTRK2 and NTRK3 where large intronic regions can render DNA-based detection challenging [9]. Furthermore, many of the NTRK fusions detected by DNA-based sequencing are of unknown functional significance, requiring confirmation by another assay [39]. Hence, DNA-based targeted sequencing assays are often supplemented with RNA-sequencing methods. As mentioned above, FoundationOne Heme incorporates both DNA- and RNA-based NGS approaches, and the Archer DX AMP assays is currently run in parallel with MSK-IMPACT™ for selected patients.

On the other hand, in a study comparing RNA- and DNA-based NGS, 23 tumours of various histology where NTRK fusions had been identified on MSK-IMPACT were subjected to Archer RNA testing, which detected NTRK fusion transcripts in 21/23 cases. The two negative cases, a lung adenocarcinoma and a glioblastoma, both harboured a DNA level fusion that did not result in an RNA level fusion transcript (involving NTRK1 exon 5/ P2RY8 exon2 and NTRK3 exon 14/ZNF710 exon1, respectively) nor show TRK protein expression as assessed by IHC with a Pan-TRK antibody [39]. This highlights the need for NTRK IHC or RNA-based confirmation in cases of unusual or atypical NTRK genomic fusions detected by DNA-based testing, as some of these may represent non-functional bystander fusions.

**NanoString technology.** This digital barcode technology allows direct multiplexed measurement of analytes by the detection of hundreds of unique transcripts in a single reaction with the ability to analyse DNA, RNA and protein even simultaneously [60]. No enzymes or library preparation are required to perform the assay. In terms of analysis of gene fusions, there is a commercially available ready-to-use nCounter Lung Fusion Panel, which includes 63 probes, namely 35 for specific fusion detection (including CD74-NTRK1 and MPRIP-NTRK1), 24 for positional gene expression imbalance detection, and 4 internal reference genes. As an alternative, it is possible to design custom panels. To the best of our knowledge, no studies specifically for the detection of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes have been conducted so far by using this technique.

**Circulating cell-free DNA/RNA testing for NTRK fusions**

Peripheral blood might represent an alternative source of tumour-derived nucleic acids when a tumour specimen is not available. A number of DNA- or RNA-based NGS panels for the analysis of liquid biopsy are available. However, in most cases the coverage of NTRK fusions provided by these panels are limited.

For example, the current versions of the DNA-based panels Guardant360 and AVENIO Extended ctDNA Analysis Kits cover only NTRK1 fusions. The Oncomine Pan-Cancer Cell-Free Assay uses a single library from circulating DNA and RNA, and can detect selected fusions of the NTRK1 and NTRK3 genes. The limitations of these assays must be taken into account when screening for NTRK fusions.

**Clinical perspectives and ongoing trials**

Identification of NTRK fusions across different tumour types allowed for therapeutic interventions that are ‘age- and tumour-agnostic’ and best exemplified by the design of 'basket trials’ for molecularly defined subsets of patients [61]. Several tyrosine kinase inhibitors for TRKA, TRKB and/or TRKC are available and show a varying degree of activity towards actionable NTRK fusions (i.e. harbouring an in-frame and intact kinase domain). There are selective TRK inhibitors (larotrectinib) and multi kinase-inhibitors with anti-TRK activity [entrectinib, TPX-0005 (repotrectinib), crizotinib, cabozantinib, altiratinib, foretinib, ponatinib, nintedanib, merestinib, BAY2731954 (formerly known as LOXO-195), MGD516, PLX7486, DS-6051b and TSR-011] (supplementary Table S3, available at Annals of Oncology online) [33].

Larotrectinib and entrectinib represent the two compounds that are furthest in clinical development so far. Larotrectinib (VITRAKVI®) has received accelerated approval by the United States FDA for adult and paediatric solid tumours with an NTRK fusion without known resistance mutations [35]. Entrectinib has received breakthrough designation status by the United States FDA for the treatment of cancers harbouring NTRK fusions.

Larotrectinib (LOX-101) is a potent and highly selective small molecule inhibitor of all three TRK proteins and has been developed in parallel in adult and paediatric populations. It has been investigated in a phase I study (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02637687) [62], which provided the first proof of concept of safety and high response rates (tumour regressions in >90%) in infants, children and adolescents with NTRK fusion cancers, thus establishing NTRK fusions as a tractable target in paediatric patients with solid or CNS tumours [62]. NTRK fusion gene testing was carried out locally before enrolment, in a CLIA-certified laboratory, by FISH, RT-PCR or NGS. No central testing was carried out in this protocol. Patients who did not have tumour samples available for such analyses were considered not to have NTRK fusions.

Parallel trials focussed on both adult and paediatric populations reported response rates of ~80% of cancers harbouring NTRK fusion genes (ClinicalTrials.gov numbers: NCT02122913, NCT02637687 and NCT02576431) [33] and NTRK fusion genes were detected by NGS following procedures and analytic pipelines established by each laboratory, or by FISH [33].

New data recently presented at ASCO further corroborate the tumour-agnostic efficacy and the favourable safety profile of larotrectinib in adult patients with NTRK fusion-positive cancers [63], as well as its efficacy in CNS disease [64].

The potent oral inhibitor of the tyrosine kinases TRKA/B/C, ROS1 and ALK, entrectinib (RXDX-101), has been evaluated in two phase I studies (ALKA-372-001 and STARTK-1) in patients...
with advanced or metastatic solid tumours, including patients with active CNS disease [20]. For patients enrolled via local molecular testing, an archival or fresh tumour tissue was required to be submitted for independent central molecular testing at Ignyta’s CLIA laboratory post-enrolment. Entrectinib was shown to be well tolerated and active against those gene fusions in solid tumours, including in patients with primary or secondary CNS disease, given that entrectinib can cross the blood–brain barrier. The analysis of the phase II-eligible population from ALKA-372-001 or STARTRK-1 (25 assessable patients) showed objective response rates (using RECIST) ranging from 57% to 100% [20]. More recently, pooled data from STARTRK-2, STARTRK-1 and ALKA-372-001 led to an integrated analysis of a global population ($n = 54$ patients in total) that has confirmed the clinically meaningful, deep and durable systemic responses in patients with and without CNS metastases, showing a 57.4% objective response rate [34]. Moreover, very recent data reported at ASCO also provide further evidence of efficacy of entrectinib in CNS neoplastic lesions [65].

Ongoing, actively recruiting interventional phase I and II trials assessing the response rates of anti-TRKs are summarised in supplementary Table S3, available at Annals of Oncology online.

Clinical trials assessing the efficacy of TRK inhibitors have also given the chance to investigate potential side-effects that may arise from inhibition of the full-length TRK receptors in normal tissues. In theory, loss of normal regulation of TRKA, TRKB or TRKC receptor activity can result in numerous human diseases [12]. Nevertheless, the limited side-effect profile of larotrectinib reported so far and the tolerability demonstrated for entrectinib suggest that long-term administration of these agents is feasible. The most common treatment-related adverse events of grade 3 in severity are fatigue/asthenia (reported for both larotrectinib and entrectinib) [20, 34], weight increase (reported for both larotrectinib and entrectinib) [20, 34] and anaemia (reported for entrectinib) [34]. Other side-effects include paresthesias, dizziness, dysgeusia, diarrhoea, nausea, myalgias and arthralgias. Importantly, all related adverse events were reversible with dose modifications [20, 34].

Despite durable responses to TRK kinase-directed therapy in patients with NTRK-rearranged tumours, it is expected that acquired resistance to therapy will ultimately emerge in most patients [66]. Consistent with this expectation, previous reports have described the acquisition of secondary mutations in the TRK kinase domain after treatment with entrectinib in two patients: NTRK1 G595R and G667C substitutions were identified in independent resistant clones from a patient with LMNA–NTRK1 fusion-positive colorectal cancer, and a NTRK3 G623R substitution (homologous to TRKA G595R) was identified in a patient with MET–NTRK3 fusion-positive secretory carcinoma of the salivary glands [67, 68]. In this scenario of resistance mediated by recurrent kinase domain mutations, BAY2731954 (LOXO-195) is a selective TRK TK1 whose activity against these acquired mutations was confirmed in enzyme- and cell-based assays and in vivo tumour models [66]. In addition, as clinical proof of concept, the first two patients with NTRK fusion-positive cancers who developed acquired resistance mutations on larotrectinib were treated with BAY2731954 on a first-in-human basis, utilising rapid dose titration guided by pharmacokinetic assessments [66]. Of note, this approach led to rapid tumour responses and extended the overall duration of disease control achieved with NTRK inhibition in both patients. As BAY2731954 seems to be able to circumvent therapy resistance in NTRK fusion-positive cancers that acquired NTRK solvent front mutations, sequential treatment with distinct TRK inhibitors may constitute a viable therapeutic option (see also supplementary Table S3, available at Annals of Oncology online).

Another emerging compound is TXP-0005 (repotrectinib), which was recently proved effective in overcoming resistance due to acquired solvent-front mutations involving ROS1, NTRK1-3 and ALK [69], thus representing a therapeutic option for patients who have progressed on earlier-generation TKIs.

In the scenario of lack of clinical response during first-line anti-NTRK treatment, testing for NTRK mutations is recommended.

As an additional perspective, it is important to note that TRK inhibitors have been administered so far mainly to patients with metastatic disease; however, the efficacy of larotrectinib has been assessed also on selected patients with locally advanced disease. Two children with locally advanced infantile fibrosarcoma of the knee experienced substantial tumour shrinkage, allowing more conservative surgery with curative intent [33]. These data highlight the possible benefits of neoadjuvant therapy for patients with non-metastatic cancers bearing NTRK fusions [33].

Discussion

NTRK fusions can be detected at high frequency in a handful of specific histologies, namely secretory carcinoma of the breast and of the salivary glands, congenital fibrosarcoma and cellular mesoblastic nephroma, or identified at low frequency in a plethora of malignancies, and define a unique molecular subgroup of advanced solid tumours that can be targeted by specific agents. TRK inhibition has been proven highly effective leading to durable responses that have been observed without regard to the age of the patient, tumour tissue and fusion gene partner. To advance with these promising agents, it is critical to define optimal approaches for the identification of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes. The main techniques used in NTRK fusion detection are IHC, FISH, RNA- and DNA-based NGS assays.

When using a diagnostic test to identify patient populations with low prevalence molecular alterations, efficiency and cost challenges should be considered. In this respect, pan-TRK IHC has been demonstrated to represent a time-efficient and reliable screen for the detection of NTRK fusions and a two-step approach could be considered in clinical trials as well as in clinical practice. In cases displaying any degrees of protein expression, a multigene panel would be recommended to confirm or disprove the suspected genetic alteration. Nevertheless, gene panels offer the possibility to assess a relatively high number of actionable genes in a single assay, thus providing a higher degree of detail in the genomic landscape of the neoplastic lesions under investigation that may be key to plan the best therapeutic strategy for individual patients if used front line. Among the different options of gene panels, with respect to detection of NTRK fusions targeted RNA-sequencing methods may represent the gold standard for screening, provided that the RNA quality is optimal. In addition, we should also consider that whenever tissue availability is limited, a DNA/RNA approach may be preferred if DNA and/or
RNA has already been extracted and is available due to other molecular tests already carried out on that tissue; IHC could be used to confirm the presence of the fusion.

Following the review of the literature on the available methods for the detection of NTRK gene fusions, the working group has agreed on a strategy for the implementation of a rational approach for the detection of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes in human malignancies, as depicted here. In the scenario where the presence of an NTRK fusion needs to be confirmed (this happens for patients affected by tumours in which NTRK fusion are known to be highly prevalent if not pathognomonic of the lesion) any technique could work in principle, nevertheless the best options as confirmatory techniques are FISH, RT-PCR or RNA-based targeted panels. In the scenario where the challenge is the identification of NTRK fusions in an unselected population, the possibility to use an NGS targeted panel (DNA- or RNA-based) that reliably detects NTRK fusions would be ideal. In particular, if the RNA quality is optimal targetted RNA sequencing methods may represent the gold standard for screening. If an NTRK fusion is identified, then the most exhaustive approach would include the use of IHC to confirm protein expression of the detected NTRK fusions, as the protein kinase is the pharmacological target. Alternatively, a ‘two-step approach’ could be considered, which includes IHC first and confirmation of any positivity detected with IHC by NGS (a service that could be externalised). *This population would be likely represented by ‘any malignancy at an advanced stage, in particular if it has been proven wild type for other known genetic alterations tested in routine practice, and especially if diagnosed in young patients’.

**Figure 2.** Summary of the ESMO Translational Research and Precision Medicine Working Group recommendations. Following the review of the literature on the available methods for the detection of NTRK gene fusions, the working group has agreed on a strategy for the implementation of a rational approach for the detection of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes in human malignancies, as depicted here. In the scenario where the presence of an NTRK fusion needs to be confirmed (this happens for patients affected by tumours in which NTRK fusion are known to be highly prevalent if not pathognomonic of the lesion) any technique could work in principle, nevertheless the best options as confirmatory techniques are FISH, RT-PCR or RNA-based targeted panels. In the scenario where the challenge is the identification of NTRK fusions in an unselected population, the possibility to use an NGS targeted panel (DNA- or RNA-based) that reliably detects NTRK fusions would be ideal. In particular, if the RNA quality is optimal targetted RNA sequencing methods may represent the gold standard for screening. If an NTRK fusion is identified, then the most exhaustive approach would include the use of IHC to confirm protein expression of the detected NTRK fusions, as the protein kinase is the pharmacological target. Alternatively, a ‘two-step approach’ could be considered, which includes IHC first and confirmation of any positivity detected with IHC by NGS (a service that could be externalised). *This population would be likely represented by ‘any malignancy at an advanced stage, in particular if it has been proven wild type for other known genetic alterations tested in routine practice, and especially if diagnosed in young patients’.

RNA has already been extracted and is available due to other molecular tests already carried out on that tissue; IHC could be used to confirm the presence of the fusion.

Following the review of the literature on the available methods for the detection of NTRK gene fusions, the ESMO TR and PM WG recommendations for the implementation of a rational approach for the detection of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes in human malignancies are summarised in Figure 2 and include:

1. In case NTRK fusions need to be assayed in a specific histological tumour type, where NTRK genes are known to be highly recurrently rearranged with specific partners (histology-based/confirmation-approach), any method is applicable as long as validated in a CLIA laboratory. In this scenario, FISH with specific probes or nested RT-PCR represent the most cost-effective assays. Another increasingly used method is targeted RNAseq.

2. In case NTRK fusions need to be screened in an unselected population (histology-agnostic screening approach):

   a. Scenario A—no availability of a targeted sequencing assay (multigene panel): perform IHC (if no smooth muscle or neuronal differentiation is present) and send to external sequencing any detected positivity (two-step approach).

   b. Scenario B—availability of a targeted sequencing assay (multigene panel): depending on the workload and cost-efficacy analyses carried out at each Institution, perform either front-line sequencing assay or adopt a two-step approach (IHC followed by targeted sequencing). If front-line sequencing is feasible, RNA sequencing methods represent the gold standard for screening, provided that the RNA quality is optimal. Nevertheless, we should acknowledge that the most exhaustive approach would be to: (i) use targeted DNA sequencing assay (multigene panel) upfront in all patients; (ii) for mitogenic driver-negative patients, perform targeted RNAseq (multigene panel); (iii) use IHC to confirm protein expression of NTRK fusions, as we should keep in mind that the protein kinase is the pharmacological target.

A final consideration should be dedicated to the definition of the population that should be tested. At present, systematic analyses of large cohorts of metastatic cancer patients for the presence of NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes across cancer types have yet to be carried out. Therefore, phenotypic features of cancers harbouring...
NTRK1/2/3 fusion genes have yet to be fully characterised. Some guidelines, and in particular those by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network on non-small-cell lung cancer, have already included a recommendation for NTRK gene fusion testing in patients with metastatic disease [70].

Based on these premises we believe that, outside those tumour types where NTRK fusions are expected at high frequency, a more conservative approach for the time being should be applied not to miss patients harbouring these targetable genetic alterations. Therefore, we would argue that the population to be tested should be represented by ‘any malignancy at an advanced stage, in particular if it has been proven wild type for other known genetic alterations tested in routine practice, and especially if diagnosed in young patients’.
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