



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Germline variants in the mismatch repair genes: Detection and phenotype

Suerink, M.

### Citation

Suerink, M. (2021, March 3). *Germline variants in the mismatch repair genes: Detection and phenotype*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3147165>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3147165>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden




The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/3147165> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Suerink, M.

**Title:** Germline variants in the mismatch repair genes: Detection and phenotype


**Issue date:** 2021-03-03



# Introduction

With 9.6 million estimated deaths in 2018, cancer is the second leading cause of death worldwide<sup>1</sup> and, in the Netherlands, the lifetime risk of developing at least one malignancy is about 1 in 3.<sup>2,3</sup> The most common types of cancer worldwide are lung cancer, breast cancer and colorectal cancer.<sup>1</sup> In some families, clustering of specific cancer subtypes suggests there are factors that increase cancer risk to a level well above population risk. Long before the underlying genes were discovered, it was suggested that a genetic predisposition to the development of cancer may explain the phenotype in at least a proportion of these families.<sup>4-6</sup> One of the most famous examples is Family G, a family that was described for the first time in 1913 by Aldred Scott Warthin, with a clustering of uterine and stomach cancers.<sup>6</sup> This large family intrigued medical professionals and has been described multiple times in the course of history. One of these professionals was Henry T. Lynch, who studied family G in detail and published several families with a similar history.<sup>6</sup> Over the past few decades the genetic basis for many of these syndromes, including the genetic cause in family G, has been unravelled; they are caused by germline pathogenic variants in genes that are important in the maintenance of genomic stability.<sup>6-8</sup>

We now know that the cancer predisposition syndrome responsible for the high cancer risk in family G is Lynch syndrome; an autosomal, dominantly inherited condition caused either by a germline pathogenic variant in one of four mismatch repair (MMR) genes (*MLH1*, *MSH2*, *MSH6* or *PMS2*)<sup>9</sup> or, more rarely, by a germline deletion of the '3 region of the *EPCAM* gene which silences the *MSH2* gene by hypermethylation.<sup>10</sup> In the case of family G, a germline variant in the *MSH2* gene was identified.<sup>11</sup> The MMR system plays a vital role in replication error correction in order to prevent mutations from accumulating. Replication error correction is carried out by MutS and MutL complexes that respectively recognize mismatches and activate downstream activities to initiate repair (Figure 1). MutS exists in two forms: as MSH2 coupled either with MSH6 to form MutS $\alpha$  or with MSH3 to form MutS $\beta$ . MutL exists as MutL $\alpha$  (MLH1•PMS2), MutL $\beta$  (MLH1•PMS1) and MutL $\gamma$  (MLH1•MLH3).<sup>12</sup> While variants in *MLH1*, *MSH2*, *MSH6* and *PMS2* have been recognized to cause the dominantly inherited Lynch syndrome, variants in *MLH3* and *MSH3* have only been described in recessively inherited cancer syndromes.<sup>13,14</sup> The role of *PMS1* variants as a cause of cancer predisposition seems limited.<sup>15</sup> Homozygous and compound heterozygous pathogenic variants in *MSH2*, *MSH6*, *MLH1* and *PMS2* have also been described and result in a rare cancer predisposition syndrome called constitutional mismatch repair deficiency (CMMRD).<sup>16,17</sup>



**Figure 1** Mismatch recognition and repair by the mismatch repair genes. Reprinted with permission of Springer Nature.<sup>18</sup>

### Lynch syndrome

Patients with Lynch syndrome mainly have an increased risk of developing colorectal and endometrial cancer during adulthood, but increased risks of developing cancer of the ovaries, small bowel, stomach, breast, hepatobiliary tract, prostate and urinary tract have also been reported.<sup>19,20</sup>

Previously, clinical criteria (such as the Amsterdam criteria and the (revised) Bethesda guidelines)<sup>21,22</sup> were used to preselect patients before genetic testing was performed. These criteria aimed at preselecting families with a higher a priori chance of a genetic predisposition by incorporating factors such as age at cancer diagnosis, type of cancer and positive family history.<sup>21,23</sup> Over time it became clear that many families do not

meet these criteria despite presence of a pathogenic variant.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, universal screening (sometimes also referred to as reflex testing) for MMR deficiency in colorectal cancer and endometrial cancer is becoming general practice in many countries in order to identify more variant carriers that could benefit from surveillance.<sup>24-26</sup> In the Netherlands all colorectal and endometrial cancers detected before the age of 70 are screened by immunohistochemical staining of the mismatch proteins and/or microsatellite instability analysis for the presence of MMR deficiency. If *MLH1* deficiency is detected, *MLH1*-promotor hypermethylation analysis is first performed to rule out this epigenetic event as the somatic, sporadic cause. The presence of *MLH1*-promotor hypermethylation makes an hereditary cause of MMR deficiency highly unlikely, although germline cases have been described.<sup>27-31</sup> In absence of *MLH1*-promotor hypermethylation or when lack of *MSH2*, *MSH6* or *PMS2* protein expression is observed in the tumour, patients are referred to a clinical geneticist to further discuss genetic testing. Subsequent genetic testing will then have to determine whether the MMR deficiency is caused by a germline variant or by two somatic hits.

Although this approach facilitates detection of Lynch syndrome in families that do not meet clinical criteria such as the revised Bethesda criteria, it is likely that still many carriers remain unidentified. Recent estimates of carrier frequencies in the general population for pathogenic variants in the MMR genes are 1 in 1,946 for *MLH1*, 1 in 2,841 for *MSH2*, 1 in 758 for *MSH6* and 1 in 714 for *PMS2*, adding up to a total carrier frequency of 1 in 279.<sup>32</sup> This would mean that in a population of 17 million, such as the Netherlands, there should be almost 61.000 carriers. Identification of pathogenic variant carriers is crucial, since colonoscopic surveillance has been proven to be an effective, risk-reducing measure.<sup>33</sup> Of note, estimations of carrier frequencies are largely based on Western populations, in populations with large subpopulations of non-Western immigrants the carrier frequencies may differ.

Currently surveillance is offered in the same manner for all four genes with colonoscopic surveillance starting from age 20-25 years with an interval of 1-2 years,<sup>23</sup> but a plea for gene-specific guidelines is ongoing and will likely be implemented in the near future.<sup>34-36</sup> This was triggered by recent insights that the height of colorectal cancer risk varies depending on the mutated gene. Risks are highest for carriers of a pathogenic *MLH1* or *MSH2* variant with estimations of the colorectal cancer risk up to age 70 varying between 52% and 97%,<sup>19</sup> while these risks estimates are lower for *MSH6* (22-69%)<sup>19</sup> and lowest for *PMS2* (11-20%).<sup>36-38</sup> Prospective data further illustrate the difference in penetrance between the MMR genes: the risk of developing colorectal

cancer whilst being under surveillance, is still substantial (up to 57%) for *MLH1* and *MSH2* pathogenic variant carriers, while it is much lower (20%) for *MSH6* and seems to be very low (0-10.4%) for *PMS2*.<sup>35,39</sup>


The challenge with establishing correct cancer risks for any cancer predisposition syndrome, and Lynch syndrome is no exception, is that retrospective analyses are complicated by the fact that available patient cohorts have been heavily selected on family history and analyses require statistical methods to correct for this ascertainment bias.<sup>40</sup> Nonetheless, statistical methods come with limitations as well. This is nicely illustrated by a study in hereditary breast cancer, showing that much of the variation seen in breast cancer risk estimates can be explained by the use of different bias correction methods.<sup>41</sup> Large initiatives, such as the Prospective Lynch Syndrome Database (PLSD), have therefore been developed to gather prospective data on Lynch syndrome families.<sup>39</sup> Then again, these risk estimations are tricky to use in guideline development; they underestimate true colorectal cancer risk since study participants are undergoing surveillance and are therefore less likely to develop cancer. Further confirmation of previously reported (retrospective) risk estimates is therefore needed.

Gene specific risk stratification is one step in the right direction towards tailored surveillance guidelines, but even then room for improvement remains: large differences in penetrance have been observed between families and individuals with variants in the same gene. Statistical modelling indicates that there is large heterogeneity in cancer risk between *MLH1* and *MSH2* variant carriers with a large proportion (around a quarter) of carriers with a relatively low (0-10%) risk of developing colorectal cancer before the age of 70 and a smaller proportion (10-20%) at extremely high risk (90-100%) (Figure 2).<sup>42</sup> Many mechanisms have been suggested to explain these differences, including lifestyle factors,<sup>43-45</sup> risk modifying SNPs<sup>42,46-48</sup> and genotype-phenotype correlations<sup>42,49-51</sup>, but none of these factors have been implemented in clinical practice yet. Further risk stratification would be desirable to reduce the burden of frequent colonoscopies for those with a low risk, while those with a higher risk are adequately targeted. Although there are no similar studies yet to provide evidence for a similar risk distribution in *PMS2* and *MSH6* families, clinical observations suggest similar risk distributions within these families, possibly with an even greater proportion of family members that fall in the lower-risk categories.



## CMMRD

In CMMRD, the cancer spectrum is much broader and penetrance is much higher than in Lynch syndrome; cancer penetrance is virtually complete and patients often already present with cancer at very young ages (childhood or adolescence).<sup>17</sup> Apart from a high risk of Lynch syndrome associated cancers at a young age, other cancers risks that are strongly increased in these patients include those for tumours of the central nervous system and haematological malignancies.<sup>17</sup> A non-malignant clinical sign of CMMRD is the presence of café-au-lait macules (CALMs), which is why children with CMMRD are sometimes first suspected of neurofibromatosis type 1 before receiving the correct diagnosis.<sup>52</sup> Diagnostic criteria exist to identify CMMRD in those patients who have already developed cancer<sup>17</sup> and guidelines for surveillance of patients with CMMRD have been published.<sup>53-55</sup> Although more research is needed to definitively prove the efficacy of these surveillance guidelines, preliminary reports in a small series of patients show promising results.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, the use of aspirin and neo-



**Figure 2** Cumulative cancer risks shows large variation between individuals with a germline pathogenic variant in MLH1 and MSH2.<sup>42</sup> Reprinted with permission of John Wiley and Sons.

antigen based vaccinations have been suggested as potential preventive measures in CMMRD, while treatment with immune checkpoint inhibitors can be effective once cancer has developed.<sup>57,58</sup> Another benefit of an early CMMRD diagnosis is the opportunity to counsel parents on the recurrence risk of 25% for future pregnancies; prenatal diagnostics and preimplantation genetic diagnostics are options that can be offered to parents who wish to have more children, but who want to prevent CMMRD from occurring in future offspring.

Despite its rarity, it may therefore be worthwhile to attempt at diagnosing CMMRD before the development of cancer. Although knowledge and recognition of the syndrome have increased over the years, it is likely that many patients are not diagnosed, particularly if they are a single case within a family and/or if they do not survive the first cancer (and therefore do not develop a second cancer that could raise suspicion of a cancer predisposition syndrome).

### Challenges

Due to improved and early detection and removal of adenomas, the incidence of colorectal cancer is expected to decline with the recent introduction of population based screening for faecal blood.<sup>59-62</sup> While this is expected to have a positive effect on colorectal cancer morbidity and mortality,<sup>61</sup> this will mean there are less opportunities to identify Lynch syndrome patients through immunohistochemical staining of colorectal cancers. Immunohistochemical staining for the presence of the MMR proteins in adenomas is not as sensitive as staining of colorectal cancers as it has been shown that not all adenomas in Lynch syndrome patients show MMR deficiency.<sup>63-65</sup> Furthermore, immunohistochemical staining of large cohorts of adenomas resulted in very low MMR deficiency detection rates (0.3-0.4%).<sup>66,67</sup> To compensate for this decline in opportunities to identify carriers of a pathogenic MMR variant, other approaches can be explored. One approach could be the universal screening of cancers, other than colorectal and endometrial cancer, with a relatively high prevalence of Lynch syndrome associated MMR deficiency. One promising candidate for this approach would be small bowel cancer. While small bowel cancers are a relatively rare type of tumour, the prevalence of MMR deficiency in small bowel adenocarcinomas has been reported to be up to 35%, indicating that these tumours may be suitable candidates to perform universal MMR deficiency screening.<sup>68,69</sup> However, these estimations have been based on relatively small cohorts and show a wide range (5-35%),<sup>69</sup> which is why more research is needed to establish a more precise estimation. Furthermore, little is known about the prevalence of Lynch syndrome in these MMR deficient cases.

A second type of tumour with a relatively high penetrance in Lynch syndrome is ovarian cancer. While the association between Lynch syndrome and ovarian cancer has been well established, some discussion remains on the histology of MMR deficient ovarian cancers.<sup>70,71</sup> It has been suggested that standard (i.e. universal) screening for MMR deficiency in ovarian cancer should be limited to specific histological subtypes (i.e. endometrioid and clear-cell).<sup>72</sup> Arguing against this is a large meta-analysis which showed that, although less common than in endometrioid and clear-cell tumours, MMR deficiency is still present in 7.9% of high-grade serous ovarian cancers. In addition, 16.7-25% of ovarian cancers identified in Lynch syndrome patients are of high-grade serous histology.<sup>73-75</sup> Based on these numbers, a diagnosis of Lynch syndrome should still be considered when a patient seeks clinical genetic advice. Further research is required to help clinicians determine whether Lynch syndrome should be considered as a differential diagnosis in patients with high-grade serous ovarian cancer.

## AIMS AND OUTLINE OF THIS THESIS

The aim of this thesis is 1) to provide insights that may help in the identification of patients with Lynch syndrome and CMMRD, and 2) to further elucidate the phenotype and potential modifying factors that result from carrying a germline pathogenic variant in one of the MMR genes. Both aims are important to further facilitate adequate detection and surveillance of individuals with a germline pathogenic variant in one of the MMR genes.

### Part I The detection of patients with Lynch syndrome and CMMRD

In **chapter 2** the first case in literature is described where a diagnosis of CMMRD was made in a healthy child that presented with a neurofibromatosis-type-1-like phenotype. This case description initiated a discussion that resulted in a literature study and guidelines as described in **chapter 3** that indicate when clinicians should be testing for CMMRD in children with CALMs but without an *NF1* mutation. In **chapter 4** the frequency of MMR deficiency and Lynch syndrome in a large cohort of small bowel cancers is described and the implications of these findings for universal testing of MMR deficiency in these tumours are discussed. In **chapter 5**, a case series of serous ovarian cancers that were tested for MMR deficiency is presented and, combined with an overview of recent literature, it is discussed how these results impact on testing for Lynch syndrome in this group of cancer patients.

**Part II Cancer penetrance in Lynch syndrome and potential factors of influence**

In **chapter 6** a novel approach to estimating cancer risk in *PMS2*- and *MSH6*-associated Lynch syndrome is described. By analysing a large cohort of families where the index patient was diagnosed with CMMRD, the issue of ascertainment bias due to a positive family history is circumvented. In **chapter 7** the influence of genotype and parent-of-origin on the phenotype of *PMS2*-associated Lynch syndrome is analysed. In **chapter 8** the number of polyps and interval cancers in *PMS2* variant carriers is investigated and the implications of our findings in light of the relatively low cancer risks that have been reported for *PMS2* are discussed. In **chapter 9** the main findings of the previous chapters in relation to the most recent literature are discussed and suggestions are made on how to move forward with scientific research in the field of Lynch syndrome and CMMRD.

## REFERENCES

1. Cancer Fact Sheets. World Health Organisation. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cancer>. Published 2018. Updated 12-09-2018. Accessed 09-08-2019.
2. Nederlandse Kankerregistratie. IKNL. <https://www.cijfersoverkanker.nl/>. Published 2019. Accessed 09-08-2019.
3. Kiemeney LALM, Lemmers FAMO, Verhoeven RHA, Aben KKH, Honing C, de Nooijer J, Peeters PHM, Visser O, Vlems FA. De kans op kanker voor Nederlanders. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde*. 2018;152:2233-2241.
4. Warthin AS. Heredity with reference to carcinoma. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 1913;12:546-555.
5. Phipps RF, Perry PM. Familial breast cancer. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*. 1988;64(757):847-849.
6. Boland CR, Lynch HT. The history of Lynch syndrome. *Familial Cancer*. 2013;12(2):145-157.
7. Miki Y, Swensen J, Shattuck-Eidens D, Futreal PA, Harshman K, Tavtigian S, Liu Q, Cochran C, Bennett LM, Ding W, et al. A strong candidate for the breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility gene BRCA1. *Science*. 1994;266(5182):66-71.
8. Palles C, Cazier JB, Howarth KM, Domingo E, Jones AM, Broderick P, Kemp Z, Spain SL, Guarino E, Salguero I, Sherborne A, Chubb D, Carvajal-Carmona LG, Ma Y, Kaur K, Dobbins S, Barclay E, Gorman M, Martin L, Kovac MB, Humphray S, Consortium C, Consortium WGS, Lucassen A, Holmes CC, Bentley D, Donnelly P, Taylor J, Petridis C, Roylance R, Sawyer EJ, Kerr DJ, Clark S, Grimes J, Kearsey SE, Thomas HJ, McVean G, Houlston RS, Tomlinson I. Germline mutations affecting the proofreading domains of POLE and POLD1 predispose to colorectal adenomas and carcinomas. *Nature Genetics*. 2013;45(2):136-144.
9. Lynch HT, Snyder CL, Shaw TG, Heinen CD, Hitchins MP. Milestones of Lynch syndrome: 1895-2015. *Nature Reviews: Cancer*. 2015;15(3):181-194.
10. Niessen RC, Hofstra RM, Westers H, Ligtenberg MJ, Kooi K, Jager PO, de Groot ML, Dijkhuizen T, Olderoode-Berends MJ, Hollema H, Kleibeuker JH, Sijmons RH. Germline hypermethylation of MLH1 and EPCAM deletions are a frequent cause of Lynch syndrome. *Genes, Chromosomes and Cancer*. 2009;48(8):737-744.
11. Douglas JA, Gruber SB, Meister KA, Bonner J, Watson P, Krush AJ, Lynch HT. History and molecular genetics of Lynch syndrome in family G: a century later. *JAMA*. 2005;294(17):2195-2202.
12. Modrich P. Mechanisms in eukaryotic mismatch repair. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2006;281(41):30305-30309.
13. Adam R, Spier I, Zhao B, Kloth M, Marquez J, Hinrichsen I, Kirfel J, Tafazzoli A, Horpaopan S, Uhlhaas S, Stienen D, Friedrichs N, Altmüller J, Laner A, Holzapfel S, Peters S, Kayser K, Thiele H, Holinski-Feder E, Marra G, Kristiansen G, Nothen MM, Buttner R, Moslein G, Betz RC, Brieger A, Lifton RP, Aretz S. Exome Sequencing Identifies Biallelic MSH3 Germline Mutations as a Recessive Subtype of Colorectal Adenomatous Polyposis. *American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2016;99(2):337-351.
14. Olkinuora A, Nieminen TT, Martensson E, Rohlin A, Ristimäki A, Koskenvuo L, Lepistö A, Swedish Extended Genetic Analysis of Colorectal Neoplasia Study G, Gebre-Medhin S, Nordling M, Peltomäki P. Biallelic germline nonsense variant of MLH3 underlies polyposis predisposition. *Genetics in Medicine*. 2019;21(8):1868-1873.
15. Peltomäki P. Lynch syndrome genes. *Familial Cancer*. 2005;4(3):227-232.
16. Wimmer K, Etzler J. Constitutional mismatch repair-deficiency syndrome: have we so far seen only the tip of an iceberg? *Human Genetics*. 2008;124(2):105-122.
17. Wimmer K, Kratz CP, Vasen HF, Caron O, Colas C, Entz-Werle N, Gerdes AM, Goldberg Y, Ilencikova D, Muleris M, Duval A, Lavoine N, Ruiz-Ponte C, Slavc I, Burkhardt B, Brugieres L, CMMRD EU-CCF. Diagnostic criteria for constitutional mismatch repair deficiency syndrome:

- suggestions of the European consortium 'care for CMMRD' (C4CMMRD). *Journal of Medical Genetics*. 2014;51(6):355-365.
18. Martin A, Scharff MD. AID and mismatch repair in antibody diversification. *Nature Reviews: Immunology*. 2002;2(8):605-614.
  19. Barrow E, Hill J, Evans DG. Cancer risk in Lynch Syndrome. *Familial Cancer*. 2013;12(2):229-240.
  20. Win AK, Lindor NM, Young JP, Macrae FA, Young GP, Williamson E, Parry S, Goldblatt J, Lipton L, Winship I, Leggett B, Tucker KM, Giles GG, Buchanan DD, Clendenning M, Rosty C, Arnold J, Levine AJ, Haile RW, Gallinger S, Le Marchand L, Newcomb PA, Hopper JL, Jenkins MA. Risks of primary extracolonic cancers following colorectal cancer in lynch syndrome. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*. 2012;104(18):1363-1372.
  21. Umar A, Boland CR, Terdiman JP, Syngal S, de la Chapelle A, Ruschoff J, Fishel R, Lindor NM, Burgart LJ, Hamelin R, Hamilton SR, Hiatt RA, Jass J, Lindblom A, Lynch HT, Peltomaki P, Ramsey SD, Rodriguez-Bigas MA, Vasen HF, Hawk ET, Barrett JC, Freedman AN, Srivastava S. Revised Bethesda Guidelines for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (Lynch syndrome) and microsatellite instability. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*. 2004;96(4):261-268.
  22. Vasen HF, Watson P, Mecklin JP, Lynch HT. New clinical criteria for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (HNPCC, Lynch syndrome) proposed by the International Collaborative group on HNPCC. *Gastroenterology*. 1999;116(6):1453-1456.
  23. Vasen HF, Blanco I, Aktan-Collan K, Gopie JP, Alonso A, Aretz S, Bernstein I, Bertario L, Burn J, Capella G, Colas C, Engel C, Frayling IM, Genuardi M, Heinimann K, Hes FJ, Hodgson SV, Karagiannis JA, Lalloo F, Lindblom A, Mecklin JP, Moller P, Myrhoj T, Nagengast FM, Parc Y, Ponz de Leon M, Renkonen-Sinisalo L, Sampson JR, Stormorken A, Sijmons RH, Tejpar S, Thomas HJ, Rahner N, Wijnen JT, Jarvinen HJ, Moslein G, Mallorca G. Revised guidelines for the clinical management of Lynch syndrome (HNPCC): recommendations by a group of European experts. *Gut*. 2013;62(6):812-823.
  24. Vindigni SM, Kaz AM. Universal Screening of Colorectal Cancers for Lynch Syndrome: Challenges and Opportunities. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*. 2016;61(4):969-976.
  25. Dillon JL, Gonzalez JL, DeMars L, Bloch KJ, Tafe LJ. Universal screening for Lynch syndrome in endometrial cancers: frequency of germline mutations and identification of patients with Lynch-like syndrome. *Human Pathology*. 2017;70:121-128.
  26. Mange S, Bellcross C, Cragun D, Duquette D, Gorman L, Hampel H, Jasperson K. Creation of a network to promote universal screening for Lynch syndrome: the LynchSyndrome Screening Network. *J Genet Couns*. 2015;24(3):421-427.
  27. Herman JG, Umar A, Polyak K, Graff JR, Ahuja N, Issa JP, Markowitz S, Willson JK, Hamilton SR, Kinzler KW, Kane MF, Kolodner RD, Vogelstein B, Kunkel TA, Baylin SB. Incidence and functional consequences of hMLH1 promoter hypermethylation in colorectal carcinoma. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1998;95(12):6870-6875.
  28. Kane MF, Loda M, Gaida GM, Lipman J, Mishra R, Goldman H, Jessup JM, Kolodner R. Methylation of the hMLH1 promoter correlates with lack of expression of hMLH1 in sporadic colon tumors and mismatch repair-defective human tumor cell lines. *Cancer Research*. 1997;57(5):808-811.
  29. Nakagawa H, Nuovo GJ, Zervos EE, Martin EW, Jr., Salovaara R, Aaltonen LA, de la Chapelle A. Age-related hypermethylation of the 5' region of MLH1 in normal colonic mucosa is associated with microsatellite-unstable colorectal cancer development. *Cancer Research*. 2001;61(19):6991-6995.
  30. Veigl ML, Kasturi L, Olechnowicz J, Ma AH, Lutterbaugh JD, Periyasamy S, Li GM, Drummond J, Modrich PL, Sedwick WD, Markowitz SD. Biallelic inactivation of hMLH1 by epigenetic gene silencing, a novel mechanism causing human MSI cancers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1998;95(15):8698-8702.
  31. Goel A, Nguyen TP, Leung HC, Nagasaka T, Rhee J, Hotchkiss E, Arnold M, Banerji P, Koi M, Kwok CT, Packham D, Lipton L, Boland CR, Ward RL, Hitchins MP. De novo constitutional

- MLH1 epimutations confer early-onset colorectal cancer in two new sporadic Lynch syndrome cases, with derivation of the epimutation on the paternal allele in one. *International Journal of Cancer*. 2011;128(4):869-878.
32. Win AK, Jenkins MA, Dowty JG, Antoniou AC, Lee A, Giles GG, Buchanan DD, Clendenning M, Rosty C, Ahnen DJ, Thibodeau SN, Casey G, Gallinger S, Le Marchand L, Haile RW, Potter JD, Zheng Y, Lindor NM, Newcomb PA, Hopper JL, MacInnis RJ. Prevalence and Penetrance of Major Genes and Polygenes for Colorectal Cancer. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Prevention*. 2017;26(3):404-412.
  33. de Vos tot Nederveen Cappel WH, Jarvinen HJ, Lynch PM, Engel C, Mecklin JP, Vasen HF. Colorectal surveillance in Lynch syndrome families. *Familial Cancer*. 2013;12(2):261-265.
  34. Ten Broeke SW, van Bavel TC, Jansen AML, Gomez-Garcia E, Hes FJ, van Hest LP, Letteboer TGW, Olderode-Berends MJW, Ruano D, Spruijt L, Suerink M, Tops CM, van Eijk R, Morreau H, van Wezel T, Nielsen M. Molecular Background of Colorectal Tumors From Patients With Lynch Syndrome Associated With Germline Variants in PMS2. *Gastroenterology*. 2018;155(3):844-851.
  35. Moller P, Seppala TT, Bernstein I, Holinski-Feder E, Sala P, Gareth Evans D, Lindblom A, Macrae F, Blanco I, Sijmons RH, Jeffries J, Vasen HFA, Burn J, Nakken S, Hovig E, Rodland EA, Tharmaratnam K, de Vos Tot Nederveen Cappel WH, Hill J, Wijnen JT, Jenkins MA, Green K, Lalloo F, Sunde L, Mints M, Bertario L, Pineda M, Navarro M, Morak M, Renkonen-Sinisalo L, Valentin MD, Frayling IM, Plazzer JP, Pylvanainen K, Genuardi M, Mecklin JP, Moeslein G, Sampson JR, Capella G, Mallorca G. Cancer risk and survival in path\_MMR carriers by gene and gender up to 75 years of age: a report from the Prospective Lynch Syndrome Database. *Gut*. 2018;67(7):1306-1316.
  36. Ten Broeke SW, van der Klift HM, Tops CMJ, Aretz S, Bernstein I, Buchanan DD, de la Chapelle A, Capella G, Clendenning M, Engel C, Gallinger S, Gomez Garcia E, Figueiredo JC, Haile R, Hampel HL, Hopper JL, Hoogerbrugge N, von Knebel Doeberitz M, Le Marchand L, Letteboer TGW, Jenkins MA, Lindblom A, Lindor NM, Mensenkamp AR, Moller P, Newcomb PA, van Os TAM, Pearlman R, Pineda M, Rahner N, Redeker EJW, Olderode-Berends MJW, Rosty C, Schackert HK, Scott R, Senter L, Spruijt L, Steinke-Lange V, Suerink M, Thibodeau S, Vos YJ, Wagner A, Winship I, Hes FJ, Vasen HFA, Wijnen JT, Nielsen M, Win AK. Cancer Risks for PMS2-Associated Lynch Syndrome. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2018;36(29):2961-2968.
  37. Senter L, Clendenning M, Sotamaa K, Hampel H, Green J, Potter JD, Lindblom A, Lagerstedt K, Thibodeau SN, Lindor NM, Young J, Winship I, Dowty JG, White DM, Hopper JL, Baglietto L, Jenkins MA, de la Chapelle A. The clinical phenotype of Lynch syndrome due to germ-line PMS2 mutations. *Gastroenterology*. 2008;135(2):419-428.
  38. ten Broeke SW, Brohet RM, Tops CM, van der Klift HM, Velthuisen ME, Bernstein I, Capella Munar G, Gomez Garcia E, Hoogerbrugge N, Letteboer TG, Menko FH, Lindblom A, Mensenkamp AR, Moller P, van Os TA, Rahner N, Redeker BJ, Sijmons RH, Spruijt L, Suerink M, Vos YJ, Wagner A, Hes FJ, Vasen HF, Nielsen M, Wijnen JT. Lynch syndrome caused by germline PMS2 mutations: delineating the cancer risk. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2015;33(4):319-325.
  39. Dominguez-Valentin M, Sampson JR, Seppala TT, Ten Broeke SW, Plazzer JP, Nakken S, Engel C, Aretz S, Jenkins MA, Sunde L, Bernstein I, Capella G, Balaguer F, Thomas H, Evans DG, Burn J, Greenblatt M, Hovig E, de Vos Tot Nederveen Cappel WH, Sijmons RH, Bertario L, Tibiletti MG, Cavestro GM, Lindblom A, Della Valle A, Lopez-Kostner F, Gluck N, Katz LH, Heinimann K, Vaccaro CA, Buttner R, Gorgens H, Holinski-Feder E, Morak M, Holzapfel S, Huneburg R, Knebel Doeberitz MV, Loeffler M, Rahner N, Schackert HK, Steinke-Lange V, Schmiegel W, Vangala D, Pylvanainen K, Renkonen-Sinisalo L, Hopper JL, Win AK, Haile RW, Lindor NM, Gallinger S, Le Marchand L, Newcomb PA, Figueiredo JC, Thibodeau SN, Wadt K, Therkildsen C, Okkels H, Ketabi Z, Moreira L, Sanchez A, Serra-Burriel M, Pineda M, Navarro M, Blanco I, Green K, Lalloo F, Crosbie EJ, Hill J, Denton OG, Frayling IM, Rodland EA, Vasen H, Mints M, Neffa F, Esperon P, Alvarez K, Kariv R, Rosner G, Pinero TA, Gonzalez ML, Kalfayan P, Tjandra

- D, Winship IM, Macrae F, Moslein G, Mecklin JP, Nielsen M, Moller P. Cancer risks by gene, age, and gender in 6350 carriers of pathogenic mismatch repair variants: findings from the Prospective Lynch Syndrome Database. *Genetics in Medicine*. 2019.
40. Hampel H, Stephens JA, Pukkala E, Sankila R, Aaltonen LA, Mecklin JP, de la Chapelle A. Cancer risk in hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer syndrome: later age of onset. *Gastroenterology*. 2005;129(2):415-421.
41. Vos JR, Hsu L, Brohet RM, Mourits MJ, de Vries J, Malone KE, Oosterwijk JC, de Bock GH. Bias Correction Methods Explain Much of the Variation Seen in Breast Cancer Risks of BRCA1/2 Mutation Carriers. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2015;33(23):2553-2562.
42. Dowty JG, Win AK, Buchanan DD, Lindor NM, Macrae FA, Clendenning M, Antill YC, Thibodeau SN, Casey G, Gallinger S, Marchand LL, Newcomb PA, Haile RW, Young GP, James PA, Giles GG, Gunawardena SR, Leggett BA, Gattas M, Boussioutas A, Ahnen DJ, Baron JA, Parry S, Goldblatt J, Young JP, Hopper JL, Jenkins MA. Cancer risks for MLH1 and MSH2 mutation carriers. *Human Mutation*. 2013;34(3):490-497.
43. Winkels RM, Botma A, Van Duijnhoven FJ, Nagengast FM, Kleibeuker JH, Vasen HF, Kampman E. Smoking increases the risk for colorectal adenomas in patients with Lynch syndrome. *Gastroenterology*. 2012;142(2):241-247.
44. Botma A, Vasen HF, van Duijnhoven FJ, Kleibeuker JH, Nagengast FM, Kampman E. Dietary patterns and colorectal adenomas in Lynch syndrome: the GEOLynch cohort study. *Cancer*. 2013;119(3):512-521.
45. Botma A, Nagengast FM, Braem MG, Hendriks JC, Kleibeuker JH, Vasen HF, Kampman E. Body mass index increases risk of colorectal adenomas in men with Lynch syndrome: the GEOLynch cohort study. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2010;28(28):4346-4353.
46. Talseth-Palmer BA, Wijnen JT, Brenne IS, Jagmohan-Changur S, Barker D, Ashton KA, Tops CM, Evans TJ, McPhillips M, Groombridge C, Suchy J, Kurzawski G, Dutch Cancer Genetics G, Spigelman A, Moller P, Morreau HM, Van Wezel T, Lubinski J, Vasen HF, Scott RJ. Combined analysis of three Lynch syndrome cohorts confirms the modifying effects of 8q23.3 and 11q23.1 in MLH1 mutation carriers. *International Journal of Cancer*. 2013;132(7):1556-1564.
47. Wijnen JT, Brohet RM, van Eijk R, Jagmohan-Changur S, Middeldorp A, Tops CM, van Puijenbroek M, Ausems MG, Gomez Garcia E, Hes FJ, Hoogerbrugge N, Menko FH, van Os TA, Sijmons RH, Verhoef S, Wagner A, Nagengast FM, Kleibeuker JH, Devilee P, Morreau H, Goldgar D, Tomlinson IP, Houlston RS, van Wezel T, Vasen HF. Chromosome 8q23.3 and 11q23.1 variants modify colorectal cancer risk in Lynch syndrome. *Gastroenterology*. 2009;136(1):131-137.
48. Win AK, Hopper JL, Buchanan DD, Young JP, Tenesa A, Dowty JG, Giles GG, Goldblatt J, Winship I, Boussioutas A, Young GP, Parry S, Baron JA, Duggan D, Gallinger S, Newcomb PA, Haile RW, Le Marchand L, Lindor NM, Jenkins MA. Are the common genetic variants associated with colorectal cancer risk for DNA mismatch repair gene mutation carriers? *European Journal of Cancer*. 2013;49(7):1578-1587.
49. Peltomaki P, Gao X, Mecklin JP. Genotype and phenotype in hereditary nonpolyposis colon cancer: a study of families with different vs. shared predisposing mutations. *Familial Cancer*. 2001;1(1):9-15.
50. Perez-Cabornero L, Infante M, Velasco E, Lastra E, Miner C, Duran M. Genotype-phenotype correlation in MMR mutation-positive families with Lynch syndrome. *International Journal of Colorectal Disease*. 2013;28(9):1195-1201.
51. Ryan NAJ, Morris J, Green K, Lalloo F, Woodward ER, Hill J, Crosbie EJ, Evans DG. Association of Mismatch Repair Mutation With Age at Cancer Onset in Lynch Syndrome: Implications for Stratified Surveillance Strategies. *JAMA Oncol*. 2017;3(12):1702-1706.
52. Wimmer K, Rosenbaum T, Messiaen L. Connections between constitutional mismatch repair deficiency syndrome and neurofibromatosis type 1. *Clinical Genetics*. 2017;91(4):507-519.



53. Durno C, Boland CR, Cohen S, Dominitz JA, Giardiello FM, Johnson DA, Kaltenbach T, Levin TR, Lieberman D, Robertson DJ, Rex DK. Recommendations on Surveillance and Management of Biallelic Mismatch Repair Deficiency (BMMRD) Syndrome: A Consensus Statement by the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastroenterology*. 2017;152(6):1605-1614.
54. Tabori U, Hansford JR, Achatz MI, Kratz CP, Plon SE, Frebourg T, Brugieres L. Clinical Management and Tumor Surveillance Recommendations of Inherited Mismatch Repair Deficiency in Childhood. *Clinical Cancer Research*. 2017;23(11):e32-e37.
55. Vasen HF, Ghorbanoghli Z, Bourdeaut F, Cabaret O, Caron O, Duval A, Entz-Werle N, Goldberg Y, Ilencikova D, Kratz CP, Lavoine N, Loeffen J, Menko FH, Muleris M, Sebille G, Colas C, Burkhardt B, Brugieres L, Wimmer K, CMMR-D EU-CCf. Guidelines for surveillance of individuals with constitutional mismatch repair-deficiency proposed by the European Consortium "Care for CMMR-D" (C4CMMR-D). *Journal of Medical Genetics*. 2014;51(5):283-293.
56. Durno CA, Aronson M, Tabori U, Malkin D, Gallinger S, Chan HS. Oncologic surveillance for subjects with biallelic mismatch repair gene mutations: 10 year follow-up of a kindred. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*. 2012;59(4):652-656.
57. Leenders E, Westdorp H, Bruggemann RJ, Loeffen J, Kratz C, Burn J, Hoogerbrugge N, Jongmans MCJ. Cancer prevention by aspirin in children with Constitutional Mismatch Repair Deficiency (CMMRD). *European Journal of Human Genetics*. 2018;26(10):1417-1423.
58. Westdorp H, Kolders S, Hoogerbrugge N, de Vries IJM, Jongmans MCJ, Schreibeit G. Immunotherapy holds the key to cancer treatment and prevention in constitutional mismatch repair deficiency (CMMRD) syndrome. *Cancer Letters*. 2017;403:159-164.
59. Navarro M, Nicolas A, Ferrandez A, Lanas A. Colorectal cancer population screening programs worldwide in 2016: An update. *World Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2017;23(20):3632-3642.
60. Lew JB, St John DJB, Xu XM, Greuter MJE, Caruana M, Cenin DR, He E, Saville M, Grogan P, Coupe VMH, Canfell K. Long-term evaluation of benefits, harms, and cost-effectiveness of the National Bowel Cancer Screening Program in Australia: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2017;2(7):e331-e340.
61. Hewitson P, Glasziou P, Watson E, Towler B, Irwig L. Cochrane systematic review of colorectal cancer screening using the fecal occult blood test (hemoccult): an update. *American Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2008;103(6):1541-1549.
62. Levin TR, Corley DA, Jensen CD, Schottinger JE, Quinn VP, Zauber AG, Lee JK, Zhao WK, Udaltsova N, Ghai NR, Lee AT, Quesenberry CP, Fireman BH, Doubeni CA. Effects of Organized Colorectal Cancer Screening on Cancer Incidence and Mortality in a Large Community-Based Population. *Gastroenterology*. 2018;155(5):1383-1391 e1385.
63. Tanaka M, Nakajima T, Sugano K, Yoshida T, Taniguchi H, Kanemitsu Y, Nagino M, Sekine S. Mismatch repair deficiency in Lynch syndrome-associated colorectal adenomas is more prevalent in older patients. *Histopathology*. 2016;69(2):322-328.
64. Ahadova A, Gallon R, Gebert J, Ballhausen A, Endris V, Kirchner M, Stenzinger A, Burn J, von Knebel Doeberitz M, Blaker H, Kloor M. Three molecular pathways model colorectal carcinogenesis in Lynch syndrome. *International Journal of Cancer*. 2018;143(1):139-150.
65. Sekine S, Mori T, Ogawa R, Tanaka M, Yoshida H, Taniguchi H, Nakajima T, Sugano K, Yoshida T, Kato M, Furukawa E, Ochiai A, Hiraoka N. Mismatch repair deficiency commonly precedes adenoma formation in Lynch Syndrome-Associated colorectal tumorigenesis. *Modern Pathology*. 2017;30(8):1144-1151.
66. Goverde A, Wagner A, Bruno MJ, Hofstra RMW, Doukas M, van der Weiden MM, Dubbink HJ, Dinjens WNM, Spaander MCW. Routine Molecular Analysis for Lynch Syndrome Among Adenomas or Colorectal Cancer Within a National Screening Program. *Gastroenterology*. 2018;155(5):1410-1415.
67. Mendelsohn RB, Herzog K, Shia J, Rahaman N, Stadler ZK, Shike M. Molecular Screening for Lynch Syndrome in Young Patients With Colorectal Adenomas. *Clinical Colorectal Cancer*. 2017;16(3):173-177.

68. Pan SY, Morrison H. Epidemiology of cancer of the small intestine. *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*. 2011;3(3):33-42.
69. Aparicio T, Zaanan A, Mary F, Afchain P, Manfredi S, Evans TR. Small Bowel Adenocarcinoma. *Gastroenterology Clinics of North America*. 2016;45(3):447-457.
70. Nakamura K, Banno K, Yanokura M, Iida M, Adachi M, Masuda K, Ueki A, Kobayashi Y, Nomura H, Hirasawa A, Tominaga E, Aoki D. Features of ovarian cancer in Lynch syndrome (Review). *Mol Clin Oncol*. 2014;2(6):909-916.
71. Benusiglio PR, Coulet F. Serous ovarian carcinoma in patients with Lynch syndrome: Caution is warranted. *Gynecol Oncol Rep*. 2018;26:69-70.
72. Zeimet AG, Mori H, Petru E, Polterauer S, Reinthaller A, Schauer C, Scholl-Firon T, Singer C, Wimmer K, Zschocke J, Marth C. AGO Austria recommendation on screening and diagnosis of Lynch syndrome (LS). *Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics*. 2017;296(1):123-127.
73. Helder-Woolderink JM, Blok EA, Vasen HFA, Hollema H, Mourits MJ, De Bock GH. Ovarian cancer in Lynch syndrome; a systematic review. *European Journal of Cancer*. 2016;55:65-73.
74. Ryan NAJ, Evans DG, Green K, Crosbie EJ. Pathological features and clinical behavior of Lynch syndrome-associated ovarian cancer. *Gynecologic Oncology*. 2017;144(3):491-495.
75. Woolderink JM, De Bock GH, de Hullu JA, Hollema H, Zweemer RP, Slangen BFM, Gaarenstroom KN, van Beurden M, van Doorn HC, Sijmons RH, Vasen HFA, Mourits MJE. Characteristics of Lynch syndrome associated ovarian cancer. *Gynecologic Oncology*. 2018;150(2):324-330.