Molecular profiling in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: why so many types of subtypes?
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Summary

The term diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) includes a heterogeneous collection of biologically distinct tumours. This heterogeneity currently presents a barrier to the successful deployment of novel, biologically targeted therapies. Molecular profiling studies have recently proposed new molecular classification systems. These have the potential to resolve the biological heterogeneity of DLBCL into manageable subgroups of tumours that rely on shared oncogenic programmes. In many cases these biological programmes straddle the boundaries of our existing systems for classifying B-cell lymphomas. Here we review the findings from these major molecular profiling studies with a specific focus on those that propose new genetic subgroups of DLBCL. We highlight the areas of consensus and discordance between these studies and discuss the implications for current clinical practice and for clinical trials. Finally, we address the outstanding challenges and solutions to the introduction of genomic subtyping and precision medicine in DLBCL.
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Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) is an aggressive non-Hodgkin lymphoma and the commonest lymphoid malignancy.1 First-line therapy with immunochemotherapy regimens such as cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, prednisone + rituximab (R-CHOP) now cures up to 60% of patients. However, those failing first-line therapy present a significant clinical challenge and a majority of these patients still die from their disease. To address this need, the molecular pathogenesis of DLBCL has been the focus of intense study. The extent of new biological and genetic understanding that has been amassed in recent years is remarkable. It has highlighted multiple targetable oncogenic pathways and launched the development of a plethora of promising novel therapeutic agents. However, this excitement has been tempered by more sobering statistics; since R-CHOP was introduced in 2002,2 numerous phase-three trials have examined modifications or additions to R-CHOP as first-line therapy for DLBCL. Many have examined the use of promising novel therapeutic agents.3–8 However, none of these trials has met its primary end-point and first-line therapy for DLBCL has remained unchanged for almost two decades.2 Although the promise of molecularly targeted therapy in DLBCL may be more elusive than we had hoped, one can also view this as an opportunity to re-assess the design of clinical trials to increase our chances of future improvements to clinical management.

The greatest barrier to the successful introduction of targeted therapy in DLBCL is the diversity of genetic features and phenotypes within this clinical entity. It continues to become clear that DLBCL is not a single disease but a collection of diseases, each with defining molecular and biological features. The full repertoire of distinguishable entities that comprise this spectrum are beginning to be described but remains far from fully resolved. Since each entity may rely on distinct oncogenic pathways it is reasonable to assume that novel therapies designed to inhibit specific oncogenic pathways may have activity only in certain subgroups and therefore may show little detectable activity if used in a blanket approach. Recent molecular profiling studies provide us with a handle to rationalise this biological heterogeneity into more homogeneous subgroups of DLBCL. It is premature to consider that knowledge of these subtypes can direct the optimal treatment for an individual patient. However, it provides a framework on which to design and interpret the results of future clinical trials.

Existing strategies for molecular profiling of DLBCL

The first insight into the molecular heterogeneity of DLBCL arose from the application of gene expression profiling using microarray technology.9 This showed that DLBCL could be divided into two groups with distinct gene expression...
patterns; one resembling normal germinal-centre B cells and another sharing features with blood B cells activated in vitro. These transcriptional subtypes became known as germinal-centre (GCB) and activated B cell (ABC) respectively. A statistical approach was later developed to rank DLBCLs based on their expression of these genes and assign them probabilistically into one of these two groups, leaving a small number of cases unclassified (UC). Although it had not been established that these classes originated from distinct cell types, this classification system became known as cell of origin (COO). A number of implementations of COO classifiers have since been developed that could be applied to microarray, RNA-Seq or more focused gene expression measurements including NanoString or HTG EdgeSeq technology. The requirement for sophisticated transcriptional profiling technology initially limited the utility of COO profiling to research applications. Attempts to reproduce the COO transcriptional classification in a standard diagnostic setting by scoring surrogate protein markers with immunohistochemistry met with variable success, but at best were able to offer a binary classification of GCB or non-GCB that imperfectly recapitulated the transcriptional classification.

Initial excitement for this stratification related to the observation that patients with ABC DLBCL had, on average, a worse prognosis than GCB DLBCLs. However, perhaps the most significant consequence of the COO classification was to provide a framework on which to build our understanding of DLBCL biology. Indeed, the experimental comparison of ABC and GCB biopsies and cell lines has allowed us to dissect critical oncogenic pathways unique to each subtype. In contrast, its contribution to routine clinical practice has been more limited and COO was not incorporated into the revised WHO classification of DLBCL until 2016. Although there are numerous therapies targeting genetic features that are strongly associated with only one COO, there is currently no compelling evidence to suggest that ABC and GCB patients receive benefit from different treatments up-front or in the relapse setting.

An alternative strategy to subclassify DLBCL is based upon the detection of rearrangement of MYC, BCL2 and/or BCL6 by fluorescent in-situ hybridisation (FISH), a technique routinely available in diagnostic laboratories. These double/triple translocated cases are now assigned to a new diagnostic entity that is currently considered distinct from DLBCL in the 2016 revised WHO classification. This is termed high-grade B-cell lymphoma with MYC and BCL2 and/or BCL6 rearrangements, or HGBL-DH/TH (also commonly referred to as double-hit or triple-hit lymphoma), which can also include tumours that do not have DLBCL morphology. However, it remains far from clear that the detection of MYC and BCL2/BCL6 rearrangements identifies a biologically homogeneous lymphoma subtype. The impetus for this classification was driven in part by the perceived impact on prognosis; initial retrospective series suggested a dismal survival amongst lymphomas with rearrangement of both MYC and BCL2. However, this may partially reflect the initial preferential testing of high-risk cases as subsequent prospective clinical trials have confirmed a definite but more modest negative prognostic impact. The negative prognostic impact of double-hit lymphoma (DHL) may be restricted to those cases with translocation between MYC and the immunoglobulin loci rather than other rearrangement partners, a distinction that may not be discernible in all routinely used FISH assays but can be revealed by dual-fusion probe assays. This situation is further confounded by the existence of pseudo-double-hit lymphoma, specifically those with t(3;8)(q27;24), which are indistinguishable from separate BCL2 and MYC translocations by break-apart FISH. Many centres have adopted intensified immunochemotherapy approaches for double-hit patients based on retrospective studies. However, this approach has never been tested in a prospective, randomised setting. This widespread adoption now acts as a barrier to a randomised trial and is a situation we should endeavour to avoid repeating as emerging genetic subtypes become incorporated into clinical practice.

More recently, two groups used complementary gene expression approaches to identify MYC-driven subtypes of DLBCLs. One of the signatures was derived from the subset of DHL with MYC and BCL2 translocations. These cases were almost all GCB by COO profiling and termed the ‘double-hit signature’ (DHITsig). The other study used a Burkitt lymphoma signature to identify ‘Molecular High-Grade’ (MHG) lymphomas. Both of these signatures identify MYC-driven DLBCL cases that overlap only partially with HGBL-DH/TH. For example, approximately half of tumours classified as DHITsig lack one of the expected oncogene rearrangements by FISH (e.g., BCL2 or MYC). More thorough genetic characterisation of such cases revealed frequent cryptic rearrangements of the MYC or BCL2 loci. These two related transcriptional subgroups have clinical relevance because DHITsig/MHG tend to represent a subgroup of GCB DLBCLs with an inferior survival relative when treated with R-CHOP. Whether intensified or other therapy would benefit this group of patients remains to be determined. Figure 1 provides a high-level overview of the variety of assays in use for research and clinical application for lymphoma diagnosis and subclassification.

**Genomic profiling of DLBCL**

Initial unbiased genome and exome-wide sequencing studies reaffirmed the biological distinctions between ABC and GCB DLBCLs as well as revealing the genetic similarities between GCB DLBCL and follicular lymphoma. Many recurrently mutated genes were specific to B-cell lymphoma, suggesting biology distinct from that of epithelial malignancies. Investigation of the more frequent mutations revealed lymphoma-specific oncogenic mechanisms such as the mutation of chromatin modifiers in GCB DLBCL and the B-cell receptor (BCR) pathway in ABC DLBCL. As larger numbers of
patients were sequenced the genomic complexity of DLBCL became increasingly apparent. In contrast to other hematological malignancies, DLBCL shows a greater number of mutations per patient and a larger number of recurrently mutated genes, with a long tail of genes mutated in only a small number of cases. Overall, the field has now converged onto approximately 150 protein-coding driver genes that are recurrently mutated or functional targets of somatic copy number alterations in DLBCL. Whilst the majority of these genes are mutated in only a minority of patients it became clear that these mutations were not randomly distributed. For example, cases with mutant MYD88 were more likely to carry a mutation of CD79B. In contrast, cases with BCL2 translocation are enriched for CREBBP and EZH2 mutations. This suggested that mutations might cluster into functional groups that could represent biological subtypes of DLBCL.

To pursue this concept, Staudt and colleagues at the National Cancer Institute (NCI) performed transcriptional profiling, whole-exome sequencing, targeted mutation sequencing and array-based copy number analysis on 574 cases of DLBCL. They identified the most enriched combinations of genetic alterations in each transcriptional subtype of DLBCL and found patterns of genetic features that extended beyond the two main COO subgroups. They devised a set of subdivisions or genetic subgroups named after the most common distinguishing features of each group. One of these was characterised by MYD88 and CD79B mutations (MCD) and strongly associated with ABC DLBCL. Another was enriched for EZH2 mutation and BCL2 translocation (EZB) and was prototypical of GCB DLBCL. Stemming from an observation that BCL6 structural alterations and NOTCH2 mutations were enriched among cases unclassifiable by COO, a third group (BN2) was proposed. They also noticed a small number of ABC patients with mutations in NOTCH1 that were mutually exclusive with other ABC or NOTCH2 mutations and were considered a separate group (N1). Just over half of patients remained UC suggesting further subtypes remained to be described. A summary of the genetics of the NCI cohort and their relationship to COO is shown in Fig 2.

Concurrent with this work, Shipp and colleagues at Harvard applied a data-driven clustering strategy to mutational and copy number data derived from whole-exome and targeted sequencing of 304 DLBCLs. In contrast to the NCI study, the Harvard group relied on an unsupervised consensus clustering method. This resolved patients into five clusters that mathematically shared the most similar repertoires of genetic alterations. These clusters were termed C1–C5. Despite the distinct statistical approach, considerable overlap with the NCI findings were apparent; the C1 cluster, enriched for BCL6 fusion and NOTCH2 mutation corresponded clearly to the BN2 group. The C3 cluster, enriched for translocation of BCL2 and mutation of CREBBP and EZH2 clearly corresponded to the EZB group. The C5 cluster, enriched for MYD88 and CD79B mutations aligned to the MCD group. However, two new clusters emerged. C2 was dominated by mutation of TP53 and widespread copy number alteration. C4 was enriched for somatic hypermutation of SGK1 and genes encoding histone linker proteins. A tiny fraction of patients (4%) with no detectable mutations were categorised as C0.

A follow-up paper from the NCI then examined further cases not classified in their original publication. They noted that these were enriched for tumours with high levels of aneuploidy and mutation of TP53. A second enrichment was seen for cases with mutation of SGK1 and TET2. These genetic features were used to seed the clustering of two new subtypes termed A53 (aneuploidy, TP53) and ST2 (SGK1, TET2). These corresponded closely to the Harvard C2 and C4 clusters. Thus, each of the five Harvard clusters could...
now be mapped to one of the NCI genetic subgroups. However, there remained substantial discrepancies in how cases are assigned to each of the corresponding subgroups and a notable difference between studies was that over 40% of cases remained UC or genetically composite in the NCI study. The genetic classification system developed by the NCI became known as LymphGen and was released as a publicly available tool that can be applied to classify an individual case. A comparison of the genetics and classification strategies of the NCI (LymphGen) and Harvard studies is presented in Fig 3. Finally, a study from the UK Haematological Malignancy Research Network (HMRN) applied targeted sequencing of 293 genes to DNA extracted from archived formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) biopsies from 928 cases of DLBCL. Sequencing data were subjected to unsupervised clustering using a Bernoulli mixture modelling strategy.
Clustering was based predominantly on mutation data, with copy number alterations considered only for a small number of genes. Translocation and gene fusion data were not available for all cases and were therefore excluded from the clustering. Therefore, this study differed from the NCI and Harvard studies in several respects: the sequencing strategy used, the types of the genetic data seen by the clustering algorithms, and the statistical approach employed to identify clusters. Despite this, genetic subtypes emerged that could be mapped almost precisely to NCI and Harvard categories. These were named according to the most enriched genetic feature. The group termed MYD88 recapitulated the MCD/C5 clusters. The BCL2 group corresponded to EZB/C3. A NOTCH2 group mapped to the BN2/C1 clusters. Finally, an SGK1 group reproduced the ST2/C4 clusters. Perhaps owing to the greater number of cases in the HMRN study, the SGK1 group was split into SOCS1/SGK1 and TET2/SGK1. Overall, 27% of cases remained UC. Neither a NOTCH1 mutant group or an A53/C2 equivalent group were identified. In fact, the frequency of N1 cases (1-7% of all DLBCL in the NCI study) was too low to be resolvable as a distinct category in unsupervised clustering, whereas limited copy number data precluded identification of an A53/C2 group in the HMRN study. However, rather than being classified elsewhere, both TP53 and NOTCH1 mutant patients were principally enriched amongst the UC cases suggesting their absence should not be considered as evidence against the validity of these groups. A further modification of the HMRN classification used the presence of MYC hotspot and NOTCH1 PEST domain mutations to identify a NOTCH1 and BCL2-MYC subgroups.41 This modified HMRN classifier showed high concordance when cases were reclassified using the NCI LymphGen classifier (Fig 4).

It is encouraging that studies with different sequencing and computational approaches independently converge on a remarkably similar system for the genetic classification of DLBCL. The degree of consensus provides strong evidence for the validity of genetically defined, biological subtypes of DLBCL. Gene expression profiling offers further support that the genetic classification provides a means to rationalise the genetic heterogeneity of DLBCL into subgroups that share a common biological pathogenesis and may therefore respond similarly to specific therapies. We anticipate that robust publicly available methods to assign DLBCLs to these subgroups will emerge as their definition continues to be refined. This, therefore, begins to address one of the biggest barriers to the introduction of targeted therapies or precision medicine to the treatment of DLBCL.

Superimposing the biology of genetic subtypes onto other known lymphoma entities

Examining the mutational repertoires of individual subtypes provides clues to the biology and reveals unexpected overlap with other categories of lymphoma distinct from DLBCL (Figs 5 and 6, Table I). MCD tumours have the strongest ABC expression signature and are characterised by mutations that activate BCR and toll-like receptor pathways, both of which converge onto increased nuclear factor kappa B (NFkB) activity.42–44 Other frequent genetic alterations include amplification of the BCL2 locus, deletion of the cell cycle negative regulator CDKN2A, and mutations that converge upon immune evasion.49 Almost all cases show the transcriptional profile of ABC DLBCL including increased signatures of NFkB and MYC activity.37,40 The genetic features of MCD overlap strongly with those reported in the extranodal lymphomas, including primary central nervous system lymphoma (PCNSL), primary breast lymphoma and primary testicular lymphoma (PTL).45–47 Indeed, cases of PCNSL and PTL included in the above clustering studies almost all clustered into the MCD subtype (Fig 5B). Recent single-cell analysis of normal lymph nodes suggests a substantial proportion of MCD lymphoma may arise from a distinct pre-memory B-cell stage of post-germinal-centre B-cell development (Fig 6).48 This finding resonates with the frequent mutation of TBL1X1R1 in MCD DLBCL, since TBL1X1R1 mutations in mouse models promote memory B-cell expansion and extranodal lymphoma.49 Overall, this suggests MCD DLBCL is a distinct form of DLBCL that, from a biological perspective, overlaps more strongly with PCNSL and PTL than it does with other forms of DLBCL not otherwise specified (NOS). The recurrent mutation of BCR and immune pathway genes within this subtype leads to hypotheses about potential therapeutic vulnerabilities that may be tested in future clinical trials of BCR or immune checkpoint inhibition.

At the other end of the biological spectrum, EZB tumours are strongly enriched for GCB DLBCLs. They are characterised by translocation of BCL2 into the immunoglobulin locus, and mutation of histone modifiers such as KMT2D, EZH2, CREBBP and EP300. Mouse models have shown how mutations of these genes lead to a block of differentiation and sustained expression of the germinal-centre transcriptional programme, which co-operate with BCL2 to drive lymphomagenesis.50–52 The mutation profile of EZB matches closely to that seen in follicular lymphoma (FL).29,33,59,60 The HMRN study showed that DLBCLs that had transformed from FL were strongly enriched in this cluster (Fig 5B).40 The shared genetic features of transformed FL and EZB DLBCL is consistent with the notion that so-called de novo cases of EZB DLBCL and FL may both arise from a common origin (Fig 6).40 Indeed, the HMRN study revealed that 27% of cases assigned to this subtype had evidence of previously
undiagnosed FL discovered on lymph node or trephine biopsy concurrent with the diagnosis of DLBCL.\textsuperscript{40} This leads us to speculate that a substantial proportion of \textit{de novo} DLBCLs of the EZB class may arise via transformation from an occult FL.

The EZB subtype also appears to be the primary genetic background of DHL. The HMRN study showed how HGBL-DH/TH cases (identified by FISH) were found predominantly within this subtype, as were the transcriptionally identified MHG cases.\textsuperscript{40} Similarly, the NCI study used the closely related DHITsig transcriptional signature to reveal enrichment of DHITsig\textsuperscript{+} cases within the EZB subtype.\textsuperscript{39} This suggests the existence of a subgroup of aggressive, MYC-driven lymphomas within the EZB cluster that represents a distinct disease entity that may arise from germinal-centre dark-zone centroblasts (Fig 6). It also suggests that \textit{MYC} or \textit{BCL2} single- or doubly rearranged cases from other genetic subtypes may not necessarily have the same clinical or biological implications. In the NCI LymphGen classification system, EZB is further subdivided into EZB-MYC\textsuperscript{+} and EZB-MYC\textsuperscript{−} to differentiate cases with and without either \textit{MYC} rearrangement or the DHITsig gene expression signature. Similarly, in a modification to the original HMRN classification (modified HMRN), the presence of \textit{MYC} hotspot mutations, which are known to correlate strongly with rearrangement status,\textsuperscript{41} were used to define MYC-driven cases within the BCL2 subgroup.\textsuperscript{41} Notably, tissue collection in most of the above studies occurred prior to the WHO revision to lymphoid classification which introduced the category of high-grade B-cell lymphoma with \textit{MYC} and \textit{BCL2} and/or \textit{BCL6} rearrangements. These new genetic findings challenge the utility of this WHO disease category as a meaningful, homogeneous biological entity and motivate the revision of this definition.

The BN2 subgroup does not have unifying gene expression features and represents a mix of ABC, GCB and UC cases. BN2 is enriched for \textit{BCL6} fusion and mutation of \textit{NOTCH2} and other \textit{NOTCH} pathway genes. Interestingly, transcriptional signatures of \textit{NOTCH} activation were not identified in these tumours,\textsuperscript{37-40} suggesting that the activating \textit{NOTCH2} mutations may exert their effect at a specific stage of lymphoma development. Other mutations enriched in the BN2 cluster appear to activate NFKB; these include loss of \textit{TNFAIP3}, gain of \textit{BCL10} and 3′-untranslated region (3′UTR) mutation (leading to enhanced expression) of \textit{NFKBIZ}.\textsuperscript{62} Many of these genetic alterations, especially \textit{NOTCH2} mutation, are reminiscent of marginal-zone lymphoma (MZL).\textsuperscript{63,64} It is tempting to speculate that these lymphomas arise from transformation of an underlying MZL (Fig 6). However, evidence of pre-existing MZL was not identified in the clustering studies.\textsuperscript{38,40} Nevertheless, it is clear that a shared biological programme and likely a shared cellular origin may link these two diseases.

The ST2 subtype also shares genetic similarity to indolent lymphoma — in this case nodular lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma (NLPHL)\textsuperscript{65} but direct evidence of transformation from the latter remains to be identified. Mutations in this subtype (including SOCS1, \textit{DUSP2}, \textit{STAT3} and \textit{BRAF}) may lead to activation of JAK/STAT and ERK signalling pathways, a suggestion supported by gene expression signatures.\textsuperscript{40} \textit{SGK1} mutations may lead to hyperstable protein isoforms that act in parallel to AKT in the PI3K pathway.\textsuperscript{66} In the HMRN study the SGK1 subtype was subdivided into SOCS1/SGK1 and TET2/SGK1. The former shares genetic overlap with primary mediastinal B-cell lymphoma, including \textit{SOCS1}, \textit{ITPKB}, \textit{NFKBIE} and \textit{CIITA}.\textsuperscript{67,68} The SOCS1/SGK1 subtype was enriched for cases of PMBCL (Fig 5B); however, the remaining cases did not show preferential mediastinal involvement. This suggests that PMBCL, a tumour defined in part by its restricted anatomical involvement, may share considerable biological overlap with this subtype of nodal DLBCL NOS. This supports previous descriptions of nonmediastinal DLBCLs with gene expression features and genetics reminiscent of PMBCL and we speculate that these contribute, in part, to the SOCS1/SGK1 subgroup.\textsuperscript{69,70}

The N1 subtype is dominated by mutations that remove the degradation domain, and thereby activate the oncogene \textit{NOTCH1}. These mutations are rare in DLBCL overall (1.7% and 2.4% in the NCI and HMRN studies respectively) but are common in chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (CLL) and in Richter’s syndrome.\textsuperscript{71,72} N1 cases reported in the clustering studies do not appear to represent overt transformation of CLL but seem to share common oncogenic programmes with these diseases.

Finally, the A53 subtype is defined by widespread copy number variation. Mutation or deletion of \textit{TP53} is enriched

---

**Fig 3.** Comparison of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and Harvard clusters. (A) The frequency of mutations in key genes associated with diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) genetic subgroups are compared between the NCI and Harvard cohorts for the four largest subgroups. Whilst strong agreement is seen for some genes, such as those defining the BN2/C1 group, there is more variable consensus across other subtypes, exemplified by genes such as \textit{TET2}, \textit{BCL2} and \textit{SOCS1}. (B) This oncoprint shows the genetic features of each class across three DLBCL cohorts including the Harvard,\textsuperscript{49} NCI\textsuperscript{17} and a cohort of patients from British Columbia.\textsuperscript{74} LymphGen was applied to the genetic data from all three cohorts and the classifications are shown with and without composite labels — LymphGen and LymphGenSimple respectively. (C) The alluvial plot shows the relative proportion of cases from the Harvard cohort assigned to each class when reclassified by LymphGen. This reclassification was done in two ways; with or without the A53 option enabled in the LymphGen classifier. Vertical ribbons represent individual cases and can be followed from top to bottom. Notably, when the A53 class is available, a large number of cases switch classification from one of the core classes to A53. The plot demonstrates relatively high consensus between the two classification systems when considering the core classes, but weaker consensus over patients classified into the A53 and C2 clusters.
but not exclusive to this subtype. Beyond TP53, very few other coding mutations were enriched within this subtype and tumours with prototypical mutations characteristic of the other groups are commonly assigned A53 or composite classes including A53. Other than sharing aneuploidy resulting from the loss of TP53, it is unclear whether a unifying biology exists within this group. When Harvard cases are reclassified using the LymphGen classifier it becomes clear that the A53 and C2 classes show much less overlap than do the other equivalent classes. The observation that many of the cases classified as A53 are reclassified to one of the other classes indicates that this classification may mask biology that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LymphGen Cluster name</th>
<th>Mutated genes</th>
<th>LymphGen Wright et al.</th>
<th>Harvard Chapuy et al.</th>
<th>UK-HMRN Lacy et al.</th>
<th>COO</th>
<th>Related lymphomas</th>
<th>Oncogenic pathways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCD</td>
<td>MYD88 (L265P)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Almost all ABC</td>
<td>Extranodal lymphomas including PCNSL, primary testicular and primary breast lymphomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD79B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B cell receptor signaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIM1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NFKB activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETV6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cell cycle dysregulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDKN2A mut/del</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MYC activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCL2 amp</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>immune escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBLIXR1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lymphoplasmacytic lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRDM1 mut/del</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZB</td>
<td>BCL2 translocation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost all GCB. Includes most cases with MHG or DHTsig+ gene expression signature</td>
<td>Closely related to follicular lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCL2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformed FL and cases of DLBCL with a concurrent diagnosis of FL almost all fall into this cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EZH2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TNFRSF14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREBBP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KMT2D</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEF2B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRF8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN2</td>
<td>BCL6 fusion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most unclassified but includes ABC and some GCB cases</td>
<td>Genetic similarity to marginal-zone lymphoma, although no evidence of direct transformation from MZL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTCH2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NFKB activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TNFAIP3 mut/del</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTCH2 activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCL10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberrant B cell development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD70</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immune evasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMEM30A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPEN</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UBE2A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>SGK1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost all GCB</td>
<td>Similar mutations to nodular lymphocyte presominent Hodgkin lymphoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TET2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JAK/STAT activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRAF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI3K activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZFP36L1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ERK activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCS1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD38</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFKBIE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIKBIA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST1H1E</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAT3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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would otherwise be revealed from other genetic features (Fig 3). This suggests that the genetic identity A53/C2 is the least robust of the genetic groups (Fig 3B).

The genetic heterogeneity within the diagnosis of DLBCL NOS suggests it represents an assortment of diseases. However, comparison with other lymphoma types suggests that the biology may straddle the boundaries between DLBCL NOS and other lymphoma types defined by the current World Health Organization classification system. Ultimately, a biology-focused classification of aggressive B-cell lymphoma may redefine many of these boundaries.

**Implications for prognosis**

The molecular classification systems discussed above are based principally upon grouping tumours with shared biology. However, a separate question is whether genetic classifications provide us with prognostic information that could be useful in guiding patient management. It is clear that clinical factors remain a dominant factor determining prognosis. It is also clear that clinical factors are not independently distributed across the genetic subtypes. Thus, care must be taken when inferring the independent prognostic impact of each subtype.

Whilst genetic subgroups may show differential responses to targeted therapy in the future, all current information relates to conventional immunochemotherapy. Each of the studies discussed above examined the impact of genetic subtypes on patient outcome. It is important to acknowledge differences in the patient cohorts and the types of treatment used. The Harvard study reported clinical outcomes on 259 patients treated with R-CHOP-like therapy and derived from a combination of archived biopsy collections and the RICOVER-60 trial of elderly DLBCL. The NCI study reported clinical outcomes on 240 patients, enriched for ABC DLBCL, treated with R-CHOP-like therapy and derived from a combination of archived biopsy collections and the CALGB 50303 clinical trial. The HMRN study reported clinical data on 690 patients from the HMRN registry, which prospectively tracks outcomes of every new haematological malignancy diagnosis made at a regional diagnostic referral centre. The latter may escape the inevitable recruitment and selection biases implicit in clinical trial or pathological archives. Finally, distinct from the previous studies, the HMRN study also reported outcome for the 579 DLBCL patients treated with full-dose R-CHOP. Comparison to patients treated with R-CHOP-like regimens in the same study reveals the importance of this subtle distinction. A summary of five-year overall survival (OS) outcomes by subtype across studies is shown in Fig 7.
study, SOCS1/SGK1 was the subtype associated with the highest OS (five-year OS 80%) in R-CHOP-treated patients and the lowest hazard ratio, when adjusted for International Prognostic Index (IPI). Therefore, clear consensus exists around the favourable outcome in this genetic subtype. Conversely, consensus also exists around the poor outcome of patients with the N1 subtype; five-year OS was 27% in the NCI study and 40% using a modified HMRN classification. Similarly poor survival was seen for EZB–MYC patients identified by expression profiling in the NCI study (five-year OS 48%) or BCL2-MYC cases in the HMRN study (five-year OS 40%).

The potential prognostic impact of the other groups is not as clear. EZB patients had an intermediate outcome (five-year OS 70%) in the NCI study, a good outcome in the HMRN study (five-year OS 82%) but one of the poorest survivals (five-year OS 60%) in the Harvard study (Fig 7). The MCD subtype had an extremely poor survival in the NCI study (five-year OS 40%). However, in the Harvard study the MCD equivalent (C5) showed outcomes identical to the EZB/C3 subgroup (five-year OS 60%). Interestingly, the HMRN study showed a poor outcome amongst curatively treated (R-CHOP-like) patients, but this effect was greatly reduced when the analysis was restricted to cases treated with full-dose R-CHOP (Fig 7). Thus, the negative outcome in this subtype may in part reflect an overrepresentation of older or comorbid patients who are unable to tolerate full-dose treatment and are therefore generally excluded from clinical studies. The BN2 subgroup shows an intermediate outcome in the NCI study (five-year OS 67%), an excellent outcome in the Harvard study (five-year OS 80%), but a poor outcome in the HMRN study (five-year OS 55%). The A53 group showed an intermediate prognosis in both the NCI and Harvard studies (five-year OS 65%).

In summary, whilst the effect of some groups is clear (ST2, N1, EZB–MYC), the true prognostic impact of the other groups remains to be determined in prospective trials. However, the real value of a genetic classification system does not lie in its ability to predict response to R-CHOP. Rather it will be to identify homogeneous groups of tumours with shared biology that may respond similarly to specific targeted therapies.

Challenges of implementing molecular subtyping

Implementing a genomic classifier in clinical practice will be associated with a number of challenges. Important
considerations include the type of sequencing required and choice of classifier to be used (Fig 1). The NCI and Harvard studies used whole-exome sequencing to identify mutation and copy number alteration in a combination of fresh frozen and FFPE biopsies. The HMRN study used a targeted sequencing panel applied to FFPE biopsies, an approach that might be more suited to a diagnostic laboratory. Indeed, for all classifiers the vast majority of information comes from the genetic status of about 100–150 genes. However, the absence of genome-wide copy number precludes identification of the A53 group. Targeted copy number assays or shallow whole-genome sequencing may ultimately become cost-efficient ways to identify the A53 group. However, for now, for individual research groups, the added value of identifying the A53 group (6–6% of patients) will need to be weighed against the significant increase in sequencing required for A53 identification.

The choice of classifier is also important. Initial studies relied upon clustering of large numbers of patients. Translating this to a single patient is now possible using the NCI...
LymphGen classifier or the code linked to the HMRN study. Importantly the LymphGen classifier is designed to work with 'imperfect data' meaning it can be used for both targeted or whole-exome sequencing. A further classifier from the Harvard group has been described in abstract that relies on just 22 genetic features but is not publicly available. A recent publication applied the LymphGen classifier to cases classified in the HMRN study and showed high concordance with the original HMRN assignment. Indeed, the greatest source of variability was the number of cases classified at all rather than the movement between subtypes (Fig 5B). LymphGen assigned a unique classification to 53% of cases, whereas HMRN classified 73% of cases. In contrast, the Harvard classifier, according to their original clustering paper, assigns a classification to 96% of cases. These numbers are clearly very different and raise the important question of how to judge which provides the most correct answer. Whilst the general description of individual molecular subgroups is an area of agreement, precisely where to place the boundaries around them is not. In the absence of a gold standard reference this may prove challenging to resolve. The answer will ultimately come from the ability of a classifier to identify patient groups that respond to targeted therapies. Until consensus is reached it would seem prudent for clinical trials to return gene expression data within a three-week window of genes with widely different mutation frequencies include SOCS1, TET2 and BCL2 (Fig 3A). This most likely reflects different variant filtering strategies. Thus, different variant calling strategies may provide different outputs even when the same classifier is used. This may become a more significant problem as classifiers attempt to focus onto a smaller number of classifier genes, where the opportunity to spread the risk of classifying individual genes is reduced.

It remains likely that a significant number of cases will not fit into the current genetic subtypes and that further subtypes remain to be discovered. Given the number of cases of DLBCL that have been subjected to exome sequencing it seems less likely that new driver mutations will be discovered in protein-coding genes. However, the next wave of whole-genome sequencing may reveal previously undiscovered alterations in non-coding and regulatory regions. A recent example is the frequent mutation of the 3’UTR of NFKBIZ, leading to elevated protein expression in ABC DLBCL. Further such discoveries may reveal new subgroups within the UC cases or may refine the current classification in a manner similar to how gene expression profiling has identified a MYC-driven subgroup of EZB. Advances in technology for proteomic quantification, assessment of host immune status or the involvement of viral pathogens in driving lymphogenesis may all contribute new understanding to the challenge of defining molecular subtypes of DLBCL in coming years.

Finally, there are logistical considerations associated with the need for sufficient quantity and quality of biopsy tissue, and the ability to return sequencing data in a clinically meaningful timeframe. The recent UK REMoDL-B study overcame similar challenges for microarray assays and returned gene expression data within a three-week window for nationally recruited patients analysed at a central diagnostic laboratory. We believe a similar approach could be applied to genetic profiling. Furthermore, advances in circulating tumour DNA technology may ultimately allow DLBCL genotyping to be performed on a plasma sample.

Why now is the time to invest in genomic profiling for DLBCL

It is important to be clear about the potential value of any form of molecular profiling. Broadly there are three reasons for the potential value of any form of molecular profiling. Broadly there are three reasons...
to do this: (i) to inform on prognosis; (ii) to allow selection of optimal therapy; and (iii) to provide a biology-based framework on which to design and interpret clinical trials. We have discussed how genomic profiling provides some, although limited, prognostic information on R-CHOP-treated DLBCL. Our current understanding of the underlying biology already allows hypotheses to be generated about which subgroups may respond to specific therapy. However, at present these remain hypotheses and it would be premature to suggest that genomics subtypes can currently be used to select therapy. Instead, the true value of genomics subtyping lies in the provision of a biology-based framework on which to design and interpret DLBCL trials. As discussed at the start of the review, the most significant barrier to the introduction of new and targeted therapies to first-line DLBCL is the considerable biological heterogeneity within the umbrella of DLBCL. The molecular subtypes discussed above allow the grouping of cases that share similar biology, depend on similar oncogenic pathways and therefore may respond in a similar way to targeted therapies. Stratifying patients into molecular subtypes will allow us to detect responses to therapy that may only be seen in a small but defined molecular subgroup. This may require that we rethink our clinical trial strategy. We envisage that future trials may follow an adaptive design where novel agents are initially screened across all DLBCL types but subsequently focused onto molecular subgroups where a potential response signal is observed. Our current biological understanding may allow us to narrow the therapeutic focus already; however there will always be surprises. An example of this is the REMoDL-B trial, which randomised first-line DLBCL patients to R-CHOP plus or minus proteasome inhibition with bortezomib based on the hypothesis that proteasome inhibition might benefit ABC DLBCL patients.\(^5\) Whist improved outcome was not seen overall, or in the hypothesised subtype, a trend towards improved progression-free survival (PFS) was unexpectedly seen in the MHG subgroup identified by transcriptional profiling\(^27\). This result should now be tested in a formal prospective trial in MHG patients.

As genomic profiling becomes standard in DLBCL we should heed the lessons learned from our experiences with COO and FISH profiling. This includes the need for a harmonised approach, and to resist the temptation for oversimplified assays that provide a poor proxy for the true classification. It also highlights the importance of prospective studies to determine the true prognostic impact, and for randomised studies to avoid the premature adoption of fashionable but unproven subtype-directed therapies.

We consider it is essential to now include molecular profiling in all prospective drug trials in DLBCL. Whether this should include comprehensive exome and RNA sequencing or a more focused sequencing strategy is a debate that will continue. But without some form of genomic testing to resolve individual molecular subtypes it is unlikely we will ever deploy novel therapies in DLBCL to their greatest advantage. As our understanding of the genomics and biology of DLBCL progresses we can expect that classification systems will continue to evolve. The broadest possible molecular profiling may therefore future-proof trials against evolution in genetic subtyping. However, we should not let this delay starting. Indeed, one important aspect of introducing molecular profiling now will be to overcome the logistical and infrastructure barriers to returning genomic data in a clinically meaningful timeframe. To stand a chance of being effective, biologically-targeted therapies need to be deployed in a biologically targeted manner. Molecular subtyping of DLBCL is the next step in this precision medicine journey.
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