## In Reply: TP53 Alteration Status and Tumor Mutational Burden Score: Prevalence and Prognosis in Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma

Kimberly M. Burcher,<sup>1,</sup> Harper L. Wilson,<sup>2</sup> Elena Gavrila,<sup>3</sup> Arianne Abreu,<sup>4</sup>

Ralph B. D'Agostino Jr.<sup>5</sup> Wei Zhang,<sup>6</sup> Mercedes Porosnicu<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center, Winston-Salem, NC, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Anesthesiology & Perioperative Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine, Charleston, SC, USA <sup>3</sup>Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, Salem, VA, USA

<sup>4</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, LewisGale Medical Center, Salem, VA, USA

<sup>5</sup>Biostatistics and Data Science, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC, USA

<sup>6</sup>Cancer Biology, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC, USA

<sup>7</sup>Medical Oncology and Hematology, Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center, Winston-Salem, NC, USA

Immunotherapy continues to revolutionize oncology, yet progress is hindered by the lack of biomarkers that reliably predict response. This deficiency is especially limiting in head and neck squamous cell cancer (HNSCC), where immunotherapy benefits 20% of patients or less. Biomarkers, including tumor mutational burden (TMB), PD-L1 expression, and *TP53* mutations, have been implicated as predictors of response and survival in immunotherapy, but review reveals mixed results.<sup>1-5</sup>

In our previous manuscript, we discussed the prevalence and implications of various gene alterations in HNSCC, and showed that not only was TP53 the most prevalent (present in 73.3% of patients' tDNA and/or ctDNA samples), but it also predicted poor survival.<sup>6</sup> Jiang et al.<sup>7</sup> referenced these results and analyzed the prevalence and prognostic implications of TP53 alterations in a cohort of 1661 patients treated with immunotherapy (128 with HNSCC). They reported that 45.3% of HNSCC patients had alterations in TP53 (likely lessened by limitation of analysis to tDNA alone, although not clarified in the letter) and that such alterations were associated with decreased survival. The study further correlated TP53 alterations with high TMB, concluding that these results indicate the prognostic value of TP53 alterations for immunotherapy in HNSCC. To address these findings, we analyzed TMB in our 75-patients study. Methods were similar to the original paper.<sup>6</sup> Tumor mutational burden was categorized into low (0-5 mutations/megabase) and high (6+ mutations/megabase) groups.

Seventy-two patients had available TMB; 47% (n = 34) had high scores and 53% (n = 38) had low scores. Patients with high TMB had improved survival when measured from time of sample collection (P = .0379) and diagnosis (P = .0176) in univariate (Figure 1A, B) and multivariate analysis (P = .01). High TMB score as a continuous variable also predicted improved survival (P = .014). No significant association between altered *TP53* and TMB was identified. As a continuous variable, TMB score and *TP53* alterations (present vs absent) were not significantly correlated in tDNA (average 7.54 vs 7.42; P = .95), ctDNA (average 7.78 vs 7.21; P = .75), or tDNA and/or ctDNA (average 7.48 vs 7.61; P = .95; Figure 1C-E). Similarly, TMB score as a categorical variable (high vs low) did not correlate with *TP53* alterations in any DNA samples (P = .60; P = .65; and P = .78, respectively).

Only a small percentage of our study patients were treated with immunotherapy; therefore, analyses regarding immunotherapy response were not pursued. In the series by Jiang et al., all patients received immunotherapy, allowing correlative interpretation of the *TP53* status as potential treatment biomarker. The presence of *TP53* alterations was associated with decreased survival, and *TP53* alterations were associated with high TMB. These simultaneous findings make *TP53* alterations harder to interpret as prognosticator for immunotherapy. Nonetheless, there is literature to suggest the relationships between *TP53* status, TMB, survival, and immunotherapy response may be complicated by additional variables such as *TP53* protein functional status<sup>8</sup> and the known association of *TP53* mutations with chromosomal aberations.<sup>9</sup>

The authors would like to thank Jiang et al for their interest and join the recommendation for further investigations into the role of *TP53* alteration status and TMB as predictors of response to immunotherapy and survival in HNSCC.

## Funding

Biostatistical and bioinformatics services were supported by the Comprehensive Cancer Center of Wake Forest University National Cancer Institute Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA012197. Mercedes Porosnicu's effort was partly supported by NIH/NCI U01 CA215848.

Received: 31 July 2021; Accepted: 29 September 2021.

<sup>©</sup> The Author(s) 2022. Published by Oxford University Press.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



**Figure 1.** Kaplan-Meier analysis of survival regarding TMB (categorical) and distribution of TMB (continuous) across TP53 status. (**A**) Survival from time of sample collection in patients with TMB scores 0 to 5 vs 6 or above; (**B**) survival from time of diagnosis in patients with TMB scores 0 to 5 vs. 6 or above; (**C**) box plot charting TMB values (continuous) vs TP53 status in tDNA samples; (**D**) box plot charting TMB values (continuous) vs TP53 status tDNA and/or ctDNA samples. Blue solid lines indicate survival curves for patients TMB 0 to 5; Red dashed lines indicate survival curves for patients with TMB 6 or above. In box plots, average TMB for each category are marked with an "X" The median score is marked with a horizontal line within the box. Quartiles and outliers are depicted according to custom.

## **Conflict of Interest**

The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

## References

- Dong Z-Y, Zhong W-Z, Zhang X-C, et al. Potential predictive value of *TP53* and *KRAS* mutation status for response to PD-1 blockade immunotherapy in lung adenocarcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2017;23(12):3012-3024. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432. CCR-16-2554.
- Zhao L, Qu X, Wu Z, et al. TP53 somatic mutations are associated with poor survival in non-small cell lung cancer patients who undergo immunotherapy. *Aging (Albany NY)*. 2020;12(14):14556-14568. https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.103502.
- Kamal Y, Cheng C, Frost HR, Amos CI. Predictors of disease aggressiveness influence outcome from immunotherapy treatment in renal clear cell carcinoma. *Oncoimmunology*. 2019;8(1):e1500106. https://doi.org/10.1080/2162402X.2018.1500106
- 4. Xu F, Lin H, He P, et al. A TP53-associated gene signature for prediction of prognosis and therapeutic responses in lung squamous

cell carcinoma. Oncoimmunology. 2020;9(1):1731943. https://doi. org/10.1080/2162402X.2020.1731943.

- Gavrielatou N, Doumas S, Economopoulou P, Foukas PG, Psyrri A. Biomarkers for immunotherapy response in head and neck cancer. *Cancer Treat Rev.* 2020;84:101977. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ctrv.2020.101977.
- Wilson H, D'Agostino R, Meegalla N, et al. "The Prognostic and Therapeutic Value of the Mutational Profile of Blood and Tumor Tissue in Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma." *The oncologist* 2021;26:e279-e289.
- Jiang C, Zhou X, Han J, Yue Z, Li B. The prognostic value of TP53 alteration in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma receiving immunotherapy. Oncologist. 2022;27:e604-e605.
- Burtness B, Deneka A, Baca Y, et al. Correlation of tumor mutational burden (TMB) with CDKN2A and TP53 mutation in HPV-negative head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC). *J Clin Oncol.* 2020;38(Suppl 15):6552.
- Scully C, Field JK, Tanzawa H. Genetic aberrations in oral or head and neck squamous cell carcinoma 2: chromosomal aberrations. *Oral Oncol.* 2000;36(4):311-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1368-8375(00)00021-x.