The 40-gene expression profile (40-GEP) test identifies cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma (cSCC) patients at high risk of metastasis within lower-staged tumors to better guide treatment decisions

Ally-Khan Somani¹, Sherrif Ibrahim², Alison Fitzgerald³, Jennifer Siegel³, Anesh Prasai³, Matthew Goldberg⁴, Aaron S. Farberg⁵, Javier Cañueto⁶, Sarah Arron⁷ ¹1Indiana University School of Medicine, IN; ²Rochester Dermatologic Surgery, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ³Castle Biosciences, TX; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY; ⁴Icahn School of Medicine at

Background

- Available tumor staging systems for cSCC include the American Joint Committee on Cancer, 8th Edition (AJCC8) and Brigham and Women's Hospital (BWH) staging. Each system utilizes different risk factors to determine the T-stage^{3,4} and have limited and variable accuracy for determining metastasis risk.^{4,5}
- The 40-GEP test is validated to independently stratify for regional and/or distant metastasis for cSCC patients with one or more risk factors into three risk categories: Class 1 (low), Class 2A (higher) and Class 2B (highest).^{5,6}

Table 1. Variability in risk factor assessment for cSCC impacts staging and therefore treatment decisions

Clinicopathologic risk factor	40-GEP testing criteria	Factors used for NCCN (v1.2023)	
Tumor size ≥2 cm	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Invasion beyond subcutaneous fat or >6mm [‡]	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Perineural invasion [#]	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Poorly differentiated	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Recurrent [†]		\checkmark	
Immunosuppression	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Site of prior RT or chronic inflammation	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Located on head, neck, anogenital, hands, and feet, any size	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Borders poorly defined	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Rapidly growing tumor	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Neurological symptoms	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Lymphatic or vascular involvement	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Desmoplastic SCC	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Specific high-risk subtypes##	\checkmark	\checkmark	

recurrence; ##Acantholytic, adenosquamous, or metaplastic subtypes (40-GEP- others will be considered on a case-by-case basis)

Methods

In an IRB-approved, retrospective, multi-center study, primary tumor tissue and associated clinical data from patients with cSCC and one or more clinicopathologic risk factors (n=897) were collected. Within this overall cohort, lower BWH and AJCC8 T-staged samples were evaluated by Kaplan-Meier survival analysis to determine metastasis-free survival according to 40-GEP risk class.

Results





Clinical Issue and Objective

Lower-stage tumors are those that lack risk factors that are considered at higher risk for disease progression but can be characterized by other highrisk factors that are clinically concerning (Table 1). Improved risk assessment in these lower staged subsets is important because up to onethird of all metastatic events have been reported for patients originally staged as T1.^{1,2} The current study investigated whether the 40-GEP test could independently identify lower-staged patients at increased risk of metastasis.



for statistical significance but shows a similar trend to the other subsets.

significant 3-year metastasis-free survival between all classes. AJCC8 T2 cohort was underpowered

Table 2. Demographics and clinical characteristics of the overall cohort (n=897) based on lower T-staged cohorts

Risk Factor

Metastatic events **40-GEP** Distribution Class 1 Class 2A Class 2B **Patient Characteristics** Age, y, median (range) Male sex, n (%) Immunosuppression, n (%) **Tumor Characteristics** Head and Neck, n (%) Tumor diameter*, cm, mean ± S Tumor thickness**, mm, mean Poorly differentiated, n (%) Perineural invasion[§], n (%) Lymphovascular invasion, n (%) Invasion beyond subcutaneous Surgery Type Mohs

SD=standard deviation; *=(n=820); **=(n=204); $\S=$ presence of perineural invasion

treatment decisions.

References

1. Eggermont, JEADV 2023 2. Farberg, Derm Ther 2022 3. Amin, Cancer J Clin. 2017 4. Karia, JCO 2014 5. Wysong, JAAD 2021 6. Ibrahim, Future Onc 2021

Disclosures

This study was sponsored by Castle Biosciences, Inc. (CBI), which provided funding to the contributing centers for tissue and clinical data retrieval. AKS is a speaker for CBI. JS, AP, AF and MG are employees and options holders of CBI. ASF is a consultant for CBI. SA is a paid consultant for CBI.

	Combined	BWH		AJCC8	
	(n=897)	T1 (n=444)	T2a (n=335)	T1 (n=496)	T2 (n=216)
	118 (13.15%)	29 (6.53%)	45 (13.43%)	44 (8.9%)	18 (8.3%)
	510 (56.9%) 350 (39.0%) 37 (4.1%)	291 (65.5%) 141 (31.8%) 12 (2.7%)	175 (52.2%) 149 (44.5%) 11 (3.3%)	312 (62.9%) 168 (33.9%) 16 (3.2%)	119 (55.1%) 89 (41.2%) 8 (3.7%)
	72 (26-95) 653 (72.8%) 230 (25.6%)	71 (26-95) 322 (72.5%) 146 (32.9%)	73 (44-95) 244 (72.8%) 63 (18.81%)	70 (26-95) 364 (73.4%) 164 (33.1%)	76 (44-95) 154 (71.3%) 30 (13.9%)
D : SD	577 (64.3%) 1.91 (±1.63) 5.26 (±6.63) 130 (14.5%) 46 (5.1%)	293 (66.0%) 0.99 (±0.45) 1.90 (±1.66) 0 (0%) 8 (1.8%)	192 (57.3%) 2.45 (±1.39) 7.37 (±6.81) 58 (17.3%) 13 (3.9%)	336 (67.7%) 1.01 (± 0.45) 1.78 (± 1.39) 56 (11.3%) 11 (2.2%)	105 (48.6%) 2.48 (± 0.50) 3.23 (± 2.06) 25 (11.6%) 7 (3.2%)
fat, n (%)	14 (1.6%) 81 (9.03%)	3 (0.68%) 0 (0%)	1 (0.3%) 34 (10.15%)	2 (0.4%) 0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%) 0 (0.0%)
	601 (67.0%)	312 (70.3%)	236 (70.5%)	352 (71.0%)	166 (76.9%)

Conclusions

Within a cohort of cSCC patients considered lower risk by current staging alone, the 40-GEP identified those who experienced a substantial increase in metastatic risk.

These results represent a clinically significant improvement in risk assessment for cSCC patients with observed rates of metastasis over 10% and 20% which are clinically actionable for nodal staging or post-operative adjuvant radiation.

Combining clinicopathologic risk assessment with individual biologic risk, as provided by the 40-GEP test, improves the accuracy of risk assessment used clinically as the basis of