ABSTRACT

**Aim:** v-Raf murine sarcoma viral oncogene homolog B (*BRAF*) gene mutations are broadly divided as *BRAF* V600E and *BRAF* non-V600E. These groups exhibit differences in the clinical, histological, molecular and therapeutic mechanisms.

**Case Presentation and Discussion:** The case described is of a middle aged female with an aggressive rectal adenocarcinoma diagnosed on biopsy and immunohistochemistry. A rare *BRAF* non-V600E mutation at codon 601, K601E was detected. This mutation has been described in very few cases of colonic adenocarcinoma. The tumor showed extensive local and peritoneal disease with lung metastasis at presentation and progression on the primary line of chemotherapy. The aggressive predisposition of the tumor was contrary to reports suggesting non-V600E tumors to connote a better prognosis.

**Conclusion:** Active reporting of non-V600E *BRAF* variants in colorectal adenocarcinoma is essential in order to create a robust database which will help in assessing a biological behavior of these tumors and explore the role of targeted therapy.
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1. INTRODUCTION

v-Raf murine sarcoma viral oncogene homolog B (BRAF) gene mutation is an early event in colorectal carcinogenesis [1]. These mutations encode three protein classes; first are RAS independent monomers resulting from substitution Valine (V) to Glutamate (E) at codon 600 (BRAF V600E) accounting for more than 90% of BRAF mutations [2]. Class two and three mutations on codons 601 and 597 and codons 594 and 596 respectively are grouped as non-V600E [2]. Reporting these rare variants is essential as adequate and conclusive data regarding the biological behavior of these tumours is not available. Here, a rectal adenocarcinoma with a rare BRAF K601E mutation is discussed, which is the first instance of presence of the mutation at this location.

2. CASE PRESENTATION

A fifty-two year old postmenopausal woman presented with on and off complaints of white vaginal discharge for 4 months, with recent spotting. Per speculum examination showed a mass involving the entire cervix and vaginal wall which was also felt per rectally as an exophytic growth involving the rectal mucosa.

She had serum carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA) levels of 2251 ng/mL (range 0-3 ng/mL) and cancer antigen 125 (CA-125) levels of 441.2 U/mL (range 0-35 U/mL). A computed tomography scan (CT scan) showed a 5.6x4.5x3.1 cm thickening in the middle and lower third of the rectum, lower cervix and vagina with extensive pelvic spread, peritoneal disease, enlarged abdominal and inguinal lymph nodes and multiple pulmonary nodules.

Biopsy taken from the cervix revealed an adenocarcinoma with papillary and micropapillary pattern and extracellular mucin. However, the immunoprofile was that of a lower gastrointestinal tract primary with Cytokeratin 20 (CK20) (DAKO, Denmark) and Homeobox protein CDX2 (CDX2) (DAKO, Denmark) positivity and negativity for p16INK4a (Roche, USA). (Fig. 1) Retained mismatch repair proteins (MMR) (Cell Marque, USA) were noted on immunohistochemistry.

Fig. 1. Microscopic findings: A. Adenocarcinoma in papillary pattern (Hematoxylin and Eosin (H and E), x100), B. Adenocarcinoma along with extracellular mucin pools (H and E, 100x), C. Membranous positivity for CK20 (diaminobenzidine (DAB), 200x), D. Nuclear positivity for CDX2 (DAB,200x), E-H. IHC for mismatch repair proteins showing retained nuclear staining-MLH1 (E), PMS2 (F), MSH2 (G) and MSH6 (H) (DAB, 200x)
In view of planning chemotherapy, RAS and BRAF molecular analysis was undertaken on the biopsy specimen. DNA extracted from formalin fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tumour section was subjected to Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) using specific primers for RAS and BRAF. (Table 1 includes details of the primers and PCR conditions used). PCR was followed by cycle sequencing, performed in Veriti thermal cycler (ABI, Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). The cycle sequenced products were purified and were capillary electrophoresed on ABI Genetic Analyzer 3500 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). The electropherograms were analysed on Chromas lite sequence analysis software (BRAF-Gene ID 673, KRAS-Gene ID3845, NRAS- Gene ID 4893, HRAS-Gene ID 3265).

Sequencing results depicted nucleotide substitution at 1801 (c.1801A>G) on codon 601 (K601E). (Fig. 2) Exons 2, 3 and 4 of KRAS and NRAS genes and of exon 2 and 3 of HRAS gene showed a wild type sequence. The patient completed three cycles of Capecitabine and Oxaliplatin based chemotherapy regimen. Due to disease progression on imaging the regimen was changed to Capecitabine with Irinotecan. Currently, the patient is on regular follow-up.

Table 1. Primer sequences with specific PCR conditions required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene of interest</th>
<th>Primer sequence</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAF</td>
<td>GGTGATTTTTGGTCTAGCTACAG</td>
<td>56°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS Exon 2</td>
<td>AGGCCCTGCTGAAAAATGACTGAA</td>
<td>60°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS Exon 3</td>
<td>AAAGAATGGTCTCGACCCAG</td>
<td>60°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS Exon 4</td>
<td>TGGCAAAATACACAAAGAACG</td>
<td>58°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRAS Exon 2</td>
<td>GACCTCGAAAGATGTACCTAG</td>
<td>62°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRAS Exon 3</td>
<td>ACGGTTCTTCTGCTGTTGTA</td>
<td>60°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRAS Exon 4</td>
<td>GGCAGAGACCGCTGAGGAG</td>
<td>62°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAS Exon 2</td>
<td>TCGTGTCTACTCCTGGTCCTTTGT</td>
<td>58°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAS Exon 3</td>
<td>ACAGGTTCTTCTGCTGTTGTA</td>
<td>62°C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: BRAF, v-Raf murine sarcoma viral oncogene homolog B; KRAS, Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog; NRAS, Neuroblastoma sarcoma viral oncogene homolog; HRAS, HRas proto-oncogene

Fig. 2. Electropherogram obtained from sanger sequencing of BRAF gene. Heterozygous point mutations seen at nucleotide position 1801 showing Guanine in place of Adenine (c.1801A>G)
3. DISCUSSION

We describe a patient with a locally advanced rectal adenocarcinoma. Immunohistochemistry showed positivity for CDX2 along with CK20; both being extremely sensitive markers of colorectal differentiation [3]. The presence of the rare BRAF K601E mutation further added to the uniqueness of the tumor.

Cremolini et al in their study of BRAF mutations in colorectal adenocarcinomas showed that BRAF non-V600E mutant tumours, amounted to 1.8% [4]. These tumours were more common in females, affected the left colon and rectum, were well differentiated on histology with mucinous subtype being very infrequent and did not show peritoneal involvement [2,4]. Mucin pools and peritoneal involvement was seen in the present case which is a disparity to the above findings. The BRAF variant found in the present case, BRAF K601E mutation belongs to class two and has been described in malignant melanoma, lung carcinoma and thyroid carcinoma with an incidence of less than 5% amongst all BRAF mutant cases [5,6]. Osumi et al investigated 824 colorectal cancers and found BRAF non-V600E mutations in 14 (1.7%) cases of which, K601E mutation was seen in 1 (0.12%) case, details of which were not mentioned [7]. Moisset et al reported BRAF K601E mutation in a caecal adenocarcinoma in a young patient with aggressive clinical course, even showing peritoneal involvement as seen in the case presented [8]. Due to sheer uncommonness of the mutation and the different clinical pictures exhibited, it is difficult to predict the clinical presentation and progression of these tumors.

A number of researchers have analysed survival in non-V600E BRAF mutant cases with scant data about the K601E variant. The Biomarker Research for anti-EGFR Monoclonal Antibodies by Comprehensive Cancer Genomics (BREAC) Study showed a significantly reduced overall and progression free survival for both BRAF V600E and non-V600E mutant patients as compared to BRAF wild type ones [9]. Jones et al showed that BRAF V600E had the worst overall survival (11.4 months) followed by BRAF wild type (43 months) and lastly non-V600E mutant tumours (60.3 months) and non-V600E mutations independently correlated with improved overall survival [1,10]. A study of thyroid neoplasms also showed that specifically BRAF K601E mutant tumours had a better outcome than BRAF V600E tumours [6]. The patient with mutant BRAF K601E caecal adenocarcinoma did not respond to an adjuvant chemotherapy regimen comprising Oxaliplatin, Irinotecan and Bevacizumab and died 8 months after surgery [8]. The patient being discussed is at seven months post diagnosis, on the second line of chemotherapy. Though majority of the studies show non-V600E BRAF mutations as having a better prognosis than the V600E counterparts, the patient described by Moisset et al and the present case showed rapid disease progression which is a distinct finding.

Regarding the therapeutic importance of BRAF K601E, there are reports suggestive of response to MEK inhibitors Trametinib and Binimetinib in melanoma patients [5]. Such clinical trials have not been documented in colorectal carcinoma cases and need evaluation in a larger cohort.

4. CONCLUSION

The case described, of a K601E (BRAF non V600E) mutant adenocarcinoma further emphasizes the need for reporting of such rare variants and following up with treatment response as definite regimens are the need of the hour in this era of personalized medicine.
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