Genomic patterns associated with hypoplastic compared to hyperplastic myelodysplastic syndromes

While the bone marrow in most patients with myelodysplastic syndromes (MDS) has normal or increased cellularity (hyper-MDS), approximately 10%-15% of MDS patients will present with a hypocellular bone marrow (hypo-MDS).¹ Since the diagnosis of MDS relies mainly on the presence of dyplastic morphology of myeloid precursors and/or the presence of recurrent chromosomal abnormalities, low cellularity aspirates in

patients with hypo-MDS may compromise morphologic evaluation and karyotypic analyses, and ultimately contribute to difficulties in distinguishing hypo-MDS from other bone marrow failure syndromes. Further, approximately 50% of MDS patients, including those with hypo-MDS, have normal karyotype by metaphase cytogenetics (MC), which makes the distinction even more difficult.² We previously reported that single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) array karyotyping can improve the detection of chromosomal lesions that can distinguish hypo-MDS patients from those with aplastic anemia (AA).³ This finding suggests that clonal abnormalities can be detected in

Table 1. Mutations and pathways distribution between Hypo-MDS and Hyper-MDS.

No. % No. % No. % Splicing 72 30 69 34 3 9 0.02 SRSP 5 2 5 2 0 0 1 SRSP 5 2 5 2 0 0 3.7 U2AP/L2 21 9 19 9 2 6 0.75 DNA Methylation 61 26 66 27 5 16 0.18 TZZ 23 10 20 8 18 9 2 6 1 DMMT3A 20 8 18 9 1 3 0.41 Transcription 75 32 65 32 10 31 0.57 SCTEP/ 7 3 6 3 1 3 0.44 RUXAT 24 10 3 9 0.41 0.44 RUXAT 4 2	Mutations		ALL		Hyper-MDS		Hypo-MDS	Р
Splicing 72 30 69 34 3 9 0.02 SY391 35 15 34 17 1 3 0.03 SKS72 5 2 5 2 0 0 1 ZKSR2 11 5 11 5 0 0 0.37 ZKSR2 12 9 19 9 2 6 0.18 TETZ 23 10 20 10 3 9 1 DMMTA 20 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 DMMTA 20 8 18 9 1 3 0.57 STEPPI 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 3 1 CPAROCALL 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.45 ETV6 4 2 4 2 0 1 3 0.35		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
DATABIN 3.3 1.3 3.4 1.1 1 3 0.05 DESSE2 5 2 5 2 0 0 1.1 ZESSE2 11 5 11 5 0 0 0.37 ZESSE2 11 5 11 5 0 0 0.37 DNA Methylation 61 26 56 27 5 16 0.18 TETZ 23 10 20 10 3 9 1 DMMTAA 20 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 DMMTA 20 8 18 9 1 3 0.57 SETBPI 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 3 1 RUNAL 24 10 21 10 3 9 1 3 0.45 ETV6 4 2 4 2 0 1 3 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 <td>Splicing</td> <td>72</td> <td>30</td> <td>69 24</td> <td>34</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>0.02</td>	Splicing	72	30	69 24	34	3	9	0.02
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	SF3D1 SDSF9	50 5	15	54 5	11	1	5	0.05
Line 1 9 1 9 2 6 0.75 DNA Methylation 61 26 56 27 5 16 0.18 TTZ2 23 10 20 8 18 9 2 6 1 DNM TSA 20 8 18 9 2 6 1 1 DNM TSA 20 8 18 9 2 6 1 1 DNM TSA 20 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 IDHIZ 18 8 10 21 10 3 9 1 BCORBCORLI 19 8 18 9 0 0 1 CEPPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.35 CATA 5 2 25 5 16 0.23 CATA 2 1 1 3 0.35 3 CATA 3 1 2 1 3 0.41 CEBPA	ZRSR2	11	5	11	5	0	0	0.37
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	U2AF1/2	21	9	19	9	2	6	0.75
TET2 23 10 20 10 3 9 1 DNMT24 20 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 Transcription 75 32 65 32 10 3 9 1 Transcription 75 32 65 32 10 31 0.57 SETBPI 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 RUNX1 24 10 21 10 3 9 1 BCORRCOLL 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 ETV6 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.44 Chromatin Modification 57 24 52 25 16 0.23 AXL1 3 14 30 15 3 9 0.59 50 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 2 1	DNA Methylation	61	26	56	27	5	16	0.18
DNMT2A 20 8 18 9 2 6 1 IDH/2 18 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 IDH/2 18 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 IDH/2 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 SETBPI 7 3 6 3 1 3 0.48 BCORROCML 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 ETV6 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 NPMI 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.43 CEBPA 33 14 30 15 3 9 0.59 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 MLH 7 3	TET2	23	10	20	10	3	9	1
IDH1/2 18 8 18 9 0 0 0.14 Transcription 75 32 65 32 1 3 1 RUXXI 24 10 21 10 3 9 1 BCORBCORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 EV6 4 2 4 2 0 1 1 NPM1 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.35 GATA2 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 Chromatin Modification 57 24 52 25 16 0.23 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 LZH2 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.25 SUZ12 9 4	DNMT3A	20	8	18	9	2	6	1
Transcription 75 32 65 32 10 31 0.57 SETBP/ 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 BCORBCORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 BCORBCORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.44 BCORBCORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.44 RUNX1 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 MII 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.35 GATA2 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 Chromatin Modification 57 24 52 5 16 0.23 ASKI2 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 EZH2 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 IZIZ1 3 1 </td <td>IDH1/2</td> <td>18</td> <td>8</td> <td>18</td> <td>9</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.14</td>	IDH1/2	18	8	18	9	0	0	0.14
SETBP1 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 RUNX1 24 10 21 10 3 9 1 BCORBCORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 ETV6 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 NPM1 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.43 Chromatin Modification 57 24 52 25 5 16 0.23 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.59 SUZ12 9 4 8 3 0	Transcription	75	32	65	32	10	31	0.57
RUNXI 24 10 21 10 3 9 1 BCOR/BCORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 ETV6 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 NPMI 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 3 1 1 3 0.35 GATA2 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 Chromatin Modification 57 24 52 25 5 16 0.23 SUZI2 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 3 0.49 SUZI2 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 3 0 0 1 SUZI2 9 4 8 4 1 3 0.25 5 SUZI2 9 4 8 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 SUZI2 2	SETBP1	7	3	6	3	1	3	1
BCORRECORLI 19 8 18 9 1 3 0.48 ETV6 4 2 0 0 1 NPMI 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.35 CATA2 4 2 3 1 3 0.43 Cromatin Modification 57 24 52 25 5 16 0.23 AXXL 33 14 30 15 3 9 0.59 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 SUZ12 9 4 8 3 0 0 0 MLL 7 3 7 3 0 0 0 0 MCM6A 2 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 Obesion 34	RUNX1	24	10	21	10	3	9	1
LV0 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 DPMI 14 6 11 5 3 9 0.41 CEBPA 3 1 2 1 1 3 0.35 GATA2 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 Chromatin Modification 57 24 52 25 16 0.23 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 EZH2 6 3 6 3 0 0 1 SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 EZH2 6 3 6 3 0 0 0 1 MLL 7 3 1 0 1 3 0.25 FU73 3 1 3 1 0 1 3 0.25 IAR 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 IAR 2 1 1	BCOR/BCORL1	19	8	18	9	1	3	0.48
Intrin1401133390.41GATA231130.350.41GATA24231130.44Chromatin Modification572452255160.23ASKL133143015390.59SUZ129484131EZH26363001MLL7373000.60KDM6A2110130.25Receptor/Kinases6352130.58JAK22110130.25FLT33101001Cohesion34143216260.16STAG226112412260.29SMG34242001RAD214242001RAD2142130.591CBL7363131NF16352390.08DX414221260.09DX544231130.44 <td< td=""><td>EIVO NDM1</td><td>4</td><td>Z</td><td>4</td><td>Z</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>I 0.41</td></td<>	EIVO NDM1	4	Z	4	Z	0	0	I 0.41
CLD/AJJLLIIJJ0.03CATA24231130.44Chromatin Modification572452255160.23ASXLI33143015390.59SUZ129484131EZH26363001MLL7373000.60KDM6A2110130.25Receptor/Kinases6352130.25JAK22110130.25FLT33131001Chrosion34143216260.16STAG226112412260.16SMC10000011AD214242001RAD214242001RAD21422130.43CBL7363131NFI6352130.43CBL7313101NFI6352390.08 <t< td=""><td>INFINI CFRPA</td><td>14 2</td><td>0</td><td>11</td><td>5 1</td><td>5 1</td><td>3</td><td>0.41</td></t<>	INFINI CFRPA	14 2	0	11	5 1	5 1	3	0.41
Chromatin Modification572452255160.23ASXLI33143015390.59 $SUZI2$ 9484131 $SUZI2$ 9484131 $SUZI2$ 9484131 $SUZI2$ 9484131 $SUZI2$ 9484131 $SUZI2$ 6363001 MLL 7373000.60 MLL 7352130.25Receptor/Kinases6352130.25 $JAC2$ 2110130.25 $FLT3$ 3131001 ARZ 2110001 $Christian34143216260.28SMG34242001RAD2I4242001RASVARAS8363260.29CBL73631310NFI6352130.59PTNIJ131000<$	GATA2	4	2	3	1	1	3	0.44
ASXLI 33 14 30 15 3 9 0.59 SUZI2 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 BZH2 6 3 6 3 0 0 1 MLL 7 3 7 3 0 0 0.60 KDM6A 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 Receptor/Kinases 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.25 FLT3 3 1 0 1 0 1 3 0.25 FLT3 3 1 0 1 0 0 1 1 Cohesion 34 14 32 16 2 6 0.16 STAG2 26 11 24 12 2 6 0.28 SMC1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 SMC2 26 11 24 12 2 6 0.29 SMC1 0	Chromatin Modification	57	24	52	25	5	16	0.23
SUZ12 9 4 8 4 1 3 1 EZH2 6 3 6 3 0 0 1 MLL 7 3 7 3 0 0 0.60 MLL 7 3 7 3 0 0 0.60 KDM6A 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 Receptor/Kinases 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.25 FU3 3 1 3 1 0 1 3 0.25 FU3 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 0 1 Cohesion 34 14 32 16 2 6 0.28 SMG3 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 SMG2 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 1 8 0.43 0.43 RAD21 4 2 0 0 1 1 3	ASXL1	33	14	30	15	3	9	0.59
EZH2 6 3 6 3 0 0 1 MLL 7 3 7 3 0 0 0.60 KDM6A 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 Receptor/Kinases 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.25 JAK2 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 FLT3 3 1 3 1 0 1 3 0.25 FLT3 3 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1	SUZ12	9	4	8	4	1	3	1
MLL 7 3 7 3 0 0 0.60 KDM6A 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 Receptor/Kinases 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.58 JAK2 2 1 1 0 1 3 0.25 FLT3 3 1 3 1 0 1 3 0.25 FLT3 3 1 3 1 0 1 0 0 1 Cohesion 34 14 32 16 2 6 0.16 STAG2 26 11 24 12 2 6 0.28 SMC3 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAD21 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAD21 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAS Pathway 24 10 20 10 4 13 0.43 13 0.59 </td <td>EZH2</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td>	EZH2	6	3	6	3	0	0	1
KDMbA2110130.25Receptor/Kinases6352130.58JAK22110130.25FUI33131001SIMC1010001Cohesion34143216260.16STAG226112412260.28SMC34242001RAD214242001RAS Pathway241020104130.43KR4SVRAS8363131OK47363131NF16352130.59PTPN113131001RNA Helicase8352390.08DDX414221260.09DDX544231130.44DHX290000001CBC156147130.70	MLL	7	3	7	3	0	0	0.60
Receptor/Kinases6352130.58JAK22110130.25FLT33131001KIT1010001Cohesion34143216260.16STAG226112412260.28SMC34242001SIMC10000001RAS Pathway241020104130.43KRAS/NRAS83632130.59CBL73631001NFI6352130.59PTPN113131001RNA Helicase8352390.08DDX344231130.44DHX290000001Fig3156147130.70	KDM6A	2	1	I	0	1	3	0.25
JAK2110130.25FLT33100130.25FLT3310001KIT1010001Cohesion34143216260.16STAC226112412260.28SMC34242001RAD214242001RAS Pathway241020104130.43KRAS/NRAS8363260.29CBL7363131NFI6352130.59PTPN113131001DDX414231130.44DX544231130.44DX544231130.44DX544231130.44DX544231130.44DX544231130.44DX544231130.44DX544231130.44DX5442 <th< td=""><td>Receptor/Kinases</td><td>6</td><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>0.58</td></th<>	Receptor/Kinases	6	3	5	2	1	3	0.58
<i>KIT</i> 3131001 <i>KIT</i> 1010001Cohesion34143216260.16 <i>STAG2</i> 26112412260.28 <i>SMC3</i> 4242001 <i>SIMC1</i> 0000001 <i>RAD21</i> 4242001 <i>RAD21</i> 4242001 <i>RAS</i> Pathway241020104130.43 <i>RASNRAS</i> 8363131 <i>OBL</i> 7363131 <i>NF1</i> 6352130.59 <i>PTPN11</i> 3131001RNA Helicase8352390.08 <i>DDX41</i> 4231130.44 <i>DHX29</i> 000001FUNOr Suppressor35153216390.26 <i>TPS3</i> 156147130.70	JAKZ ELT2	2	1	1	0	I	3	0.25
II I Cohesion 34 14 32 16 2 6 0.16 $STAG2$ 26 11 24 12 2 6 0.28 $SMC3$ 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 $SIMC1$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 $RAD21$ 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAS Pathway 24 10 20 10 4 13 0.43 $KRAS/NRAS$ 8 3 6 3 1 3 1 CBL 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 NFI 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 $PTPN11$ 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 $DDX41$ 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 $DHX29$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Funor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 $TPS3$ 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	r li ə Kit	$\begin{pmatrix} G \end{pmatrix}$ 1	1	อ 1	1	0	0	1
Conteston 34 14 32 10 2 6 0.10 STAG2 26 11 24 12 2 6 0.28 SMC3 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 SIMC1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 RAD21 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAS Pathway 24 10 20 10 4 13 0.43 KRAS/NRAS 8 3 6 3 2 6 0.29 CBL 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 NFI 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 PTPN11 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 DDX41 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Tumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	Cohosion	94	1/	20	16	0	0 C	0.16
SMC2 20 11 24 12 2 0 0 0 $SMC3$ 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 $SIMC1$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 $RAD21$ 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAS Pathway 24 10 20 10 4 13 0.43 $KRAS/NRAS$ 8 3 6 3 2 6 0.29 CBL 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 NFI 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 $PTPN11$ 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 $DDX41$ 4 2 2 1 1 3 0.44 $DHX29$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Tumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 $TPS3$ 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	STAC?		14	54 94	10	2	6	0.10
Difference I	SMC3	4	2	4	2	0	0	1
RAD21 4 2 4 2 0 0 1 RAS Pathway 24 10 20 10 4 13 0.43 <i>KRAS/NRAS</i> 8 3 6 3 2 6 0.29 <i>CBL</i> 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 <i>NF1</i> 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 <i>PTPN11</i> 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 <i>DDX41</i> 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 <i>DX54</i> 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 <i>DHX29</i> 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 FUB 5 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 <i>TPS3</i> 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	SIMC1	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	1
RAS Pathway 24 10 20 10 4 13 0.43 <i>KRAS/NRAS</i> 8 3 6 3 2 6 0.29 <i>CBL</i> 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 <i>NFI</i> 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 <i>PTPN11</i> 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 <i>DDX41</i> 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 <i>DDX54</i> 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 <i>DHX29</i> 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Fumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 <i>TP53</i> 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	RAD21	4	2	4	2	0	0	1
KRAS/NRAS 8 3 6 3 2 6 0.29 CBL 7 3 6 3 1 3 1 NF1 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 PTPN11 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 DDX41 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 DDX54 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 Fumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	RAS Pathway	24	10	20	10	4	13	0.43
CBL7363131 NFI 6352130.59 $PTPN11$ 3131001RNA Helicase8352390.08 $DDX41$ 4221260.09 $DDX54$ 4231130.44 $DHX29$ 0000001rumor Suppressor35153216390.26 $TP53$ 156147130.70	KRAS/NRAŠ	8	3	6	3	2	6	0.29
NFI 6 3 5 2 1 3 0.59 PTPN11 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 DDX41 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 DDX54 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 1 rumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	CBL	7	3	6	3	1	3	1
PTPN11 3 1 3 1 0 0 1 RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 DDX41 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 DDX54 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 rumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	NF1	6	3	5	2	1	3	0.59
RNA Helicase 8 3 5 2 3 9 0.08 DDX41 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 DDX54 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Fumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	PTPNII	3	I	3	I	0	0	I
DDX41 4 2 2 1 2 6 0.09 DDX54 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Tumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	RNA Helicase	8	3	5	2	3	9	0.08
DDX54 4 2 3 1 1 3 0.44 DHX29 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Tumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 TP53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	DDX41	4	2	2	1	2	6	0.09
DIX25 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Fumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 7P53 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70	DDX34 העייים	4	2	3	1	1	3 0	0.44
Tumor Suppressor 35 15 32 16 3 9 0.26 $TP53$ 15 6 14 7 1 3 0.70		0	15	0	10	0	0	1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	TUTTOR Suppressor	35 15	15 6	52 14	10 7	స 1	9 2	0.20 0.70
APC = 7 - 3 - 5 - 2 - 2 - 6 - 0.94	APC	15 7	U 3	14 5	2	2	ა ჩ	0.70
WTI 5 2 5 2 0 0 1	WT1	5	2	5	2	0	0	1
<i>PFH6</i> 8 3 8 4 0 0 0.60	PFH6	8	3	8	4	0	0	0.60



Figure 1. Frequency of gene mutations involved in common functional pathways. Genes included in common functional pathways: Splicing: SF3B1, SRSF2, ZRSR2, U2AF1/2. DNA methylation: TET2, DNMT3A, IDH1/2. Transcription: SETBP1, RUNX1, BCOR/BCORL1, ETV6, NPM1, CEBPA, GATA2. Chromatin Modification: ASXL1, SUZ12, EZH2, MLL, KDM6A. Receptor/Kinases: JAK2, FLT3, KIT. Cohesion: STAG2, SMC3, SIMC1, RAD21. RAS Pathway: KRAS/NRAS, CBL, NF1, PTPN11. RNA Helicase: DDX41, DDX54, DHX29. Tumor Suppressor: TP53, APC, WT1, PFH6.

hypo-MDS and AA by using higher sensitivity methods other than MC.

Recently, next generation sequencing (NGS) technologies of the human genome identified several genes that are frequently affected by somatic mutations and play an important role in both the prognosis and the pathogenesis of MDS.⁴⁻⁶ Some of these mutations have a significant impact on disease phenotype, the progression of MDS to acute myeloid leukemia (AML), and on overall survival (OS).⁴⁻⁶ Somatic mutations in genes such as ASXL1, TET2, and DNMT3A are present in healthy individuals, and their incidence increases with age.⁷ More importantly, the presence of these mutations predisposes these individuals to develop hematologic malignancies.⁷ Furthermore, somatic mutations in genes such as ASXL1, TET2, DNMT3A and BCOR, were found in 19% of patients with AA, and their presence was associated with an increased risk of transformation to MDS and AML.8 These findings suggest that somatic mutations in certain genes have the potential to contribute to both disease initiation and progression.

Using NGS technologies, we hypothesized that identification of somatic mutations and their combinations may help to define the clonal architecture that can lead to the development of hypo-MDS, and that these somatic mutations can possibly be used to aid in establishing the diagnosis.

Bone marrow and peripheral blood samples were collected from 237 patients diagnosed with MDS (according to the 2008 WHO criteria)⁹ at our institution between January 2000 and December 2013. Informed consent for sample collection was obtained according to protocols approved by the institutional review boards of Cleveland Clinic and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Hypo-MDS was defined using a standard definition of bone marrow cellularity </= 25%, regardless of age. When indicated based on clinical suspicion, immunohistochemical staining for CD34 was performed to rule out/in collections of immature cells. Pathomorphologic evaluation of the marrow was performed by a hematopathologist not associated with the study, in a blinded fashion, as the study was conceived after the bone marrow review. All bone marrow biopsies that are included in our analysis were deemed to be adequate for evaluation of cellularity by our experienced

hematopathologists. Cytogenetic analysis was performed on fresh aspirates according to the standard metaphase karyotyping protocol and analyzed according to ISCN guidelines.¹⁰ NGS of 62 significantly affected genes, selected based on the frequency observed in a separate cohort of MDS patients analyzed by whole exome sequencing (WES), were analyzed. The selected observations were validated by targeted deep sequencing using MiSeq (Illumina, San Diego, CA). Our sequence library deep sequencing was for generated bv TruSeqCustomAmplicon (Illumina). Mutations were considered individually and grouped into several functional pathways which were hypothesized to characterize MDS pathogenesis. Variant allele frequencies (VAFs) adjusted by zygosity were used to define clonal architecture of driver versus subclonal mutations. Differences among variables were evaluated by Fisher's exact test and the Mann-Whitney U test (i.e. Wilcoxon rank-sum test) for categorical and continuous output variables, respectively. Time-to-event analyses were plotted using the Kaplan-Meier method, and curves were compared with the twotailed log rank test. A two sided P value <0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

Of the 237 MDS patients included in the analysis, 32 (14%) had hypo-MDS. Compared to hyper-MDS, hypo-MDS patients presented with lower white blood cell counts (median 2.4 vs. $3.7 \times 10^{\circ}/L$, P=0.002), and lower absolute neutrophil counts (median, $1.07 vs. 1.67 \times 10^{\circ}/L$, P=0.01) (*Online Supplementary Table S2*). Cytogenetic analyses showed no significant differences between groups in: normal karyotype 38% in hyper-MDS vs. 42% in hypo-MDS, P=0.85), +8 (6% vs. 9%, P=0.43), -7/-7q (5% vs. 6%, P=0.67), complex ≥ 3 (17% vs. 9%, P=0.43). With a median follow up of 33.6 months (range, 0.4-128.5), the median OS for hyper-MDS was similar to hypo-MDS (23.4 vs. 29.4 months, P=0.9) (*Online Supplementary Figure S1*).

Overall, 76% of patients had at least one of the 62 screened mutations, the most common being SF3B1 (15%), ASXL1 (14%), STAG2 (11%), TET2 (10%), RUNX1 (10%), U2AF1/2 (9%), and DNMT3A (8%), (Table1). Mutations in SF3B1 (3% vs. 17%, P=0.02), and IDH1/2 (0% vs. 9%, P=0.06) were more likely to be observed in hyper-MDS (Table 1). The mutations and their positions in hypo-MDS are included in Online



Figure 2. Distribution of mutations of significantly mutated genes in hypo-MDS vs. hyper-MDS.

Supplementary Table S3. When mutations were grouped into functional pathways known to play an important role in MDS pathophysiology, mutations in splicing machinery genes were more common in hyper-MDS compared to hypo-MDS (34% vs. 9%, P=0.03), (Table 1, Figure 1). Patients with hypo-MDS also had a lower average number of somatic mutations (mean, 1 vs. 2, P=0.03) and consonant with this finding, fewer had 2 or more mutations (28% vs. 49%, P=0.02) compared to hyper-MDS (Figure 2).

Clonal evolution has been previously described at relapse in primary AML and in MDS transforming to AML.^{11,12} VAF have been used to estimate the proportion of tumor cells that carry a given mutation and can identify driver clones (mutations are present in all cells) or subclones (mutations are present in a fraction of cells). When analyses were limited to samples with one or more mutations, 42 (13%) showed multiple driver mutations, and no distinctions between founder and subclones could be identified. However, among other samples the average size of the driver clone was higher in hyper-MDS compared to hypo-MDS (45% vs. 34%, P<0.001). Furthermore, mutations in SF3B1, ZRSR2, U2AF1, SRSF2, TET2, ASXL1, and BCOR were predominantly observed as driver clones in patients with hyper-MDS compared to hypo-MDS (Figure 3). None of the mutations were exclusively observed as a driver clone in hypo-MDS (Figure 3).

In this study, we investigated the genomic pattern of acquired somatic mutations in patients with hypo- and hyper-MDS. Although patients with hypo-MDS had similar clinical and survival characteristics, except lower WBC and ANC, acquired somatic mutation patterns were different in these two groups. Patients with hypo-MDS acquired fewer somatic mutations and had smaller driver clones compared to hyper-MDS. Somatic mutations in

splicing machinery were observed predominantly in patients with hyper-MDS, and as driver clones were found exclusively in patients with hyper-MDS. Several other mutations, such as TET2, ASXL1, and BCOR, etc..(Figure 1), were also found to be driver clones in patients with hyper-MDS compared to hypo-MDS. One possible explanation for these findings is that the immune system in patients with hypo-MDS may suppress the driver clone, inhibiting its growth and genetic evolution, thus limiting the acquisition of downstream somatic lesions. On the other hand, some driver clones, such as SF3B1, SRSF2, TET2, ASXL1, and BCOR may overcome this inhibitory effect. Supporting this theory, experimental and clinical evidence suggests that immune-mediated damage to hematopoietic precursors plays an important role in a subset of patients with MDS - particularly hypo-MDS.^{13,14} Additionally, some patients with MDS - especially hypo-MDS - respond to treatment with immunosuppressive therapy such as cyclosposine +/-ATG, and alemtuzumab, suggesting that immunemediated mechanisms play an important role in the pathophysiology of hypo-MDS.^{14,15} Two patients in our hypo-MDS cohort received treatment with ATG +/cyclosporine: one with a DNMT3A mutation and an initial bone marrow cellularity of <5% progressed to AML with a bone marrow cellularity of 90% after 6 months of treatment with ATG/cyclosporine; another with an APC mutation and an initial bone marrow cellularity of <25% progressed after 10 months of treatment with ATG/cyclosporine, with a 50% cellularity marrow with increased blasts. These limited examples suggest that disrupting the immune system in patients with hypo-MDS may result in a growth advantage of the driver clone, leading to progression to hypercellular marrows. Another piece of evidence of the interaction between acquired somatic mutations and the immune system has been





recently explored in patients with AA. Kulasekararaj *et al.* showed that 19% of patients with AA acquire somatic mutations in genes such as *ASXL1, TET2, DNMT3A*, and *BCOR*, and that the presence of these genes was associated with longer disease duration and an increased risk of transformation to MDS/AML.⁸ Similar mutations were found as driver clones in our patient cohort with hyper-MDS, suggesting that these mutations have a progressive advantage that may overcome the inhibitory effect from the immune system that is also seen in patients with AA. Since the diagnosis of AA is often difficult to distinguish morphologically from hypo-MDS, the use of somatic mutations patterns to aid with the diagnosis should be explored further in future studies.

In conclusion, hypo-MDS is a morphological entity, rather than a truly separate diagnosis from classic hyper-MDS. Although clinical characteristics and outcome are similar for hypo-and hyper-MDS, genomic differences in the driver clones exist between the two groups. Additional analyses comparing genomic changes in hypo-MDS to other bone marrow failure syndromes such as AA are needed to further understand the underlying genetic changes in these diseases.

Aziz Nazha,¹ David Seastone,¹ Tom Radivoyevitch,² Bartlomiej Przychodzen,² Hetty E. Carraway,¹ Bhumika J. Patel,² Jennifer Carew,² Hideki Makishima,² Mikkael A. Sekeres,¹ and Jaroslaw P. Maciejewski²

⁴Leukemia Program, Department of Hematology and Oncology; ²Translational Hematology and Oncology Research Department, Cleveland Clinic, Taussig Cancer Institute, Cleveland, OH, USA

Funding: Supported in part by NIH grants from R01 655365071402, U54 655365070704, K24 655365071503.

Correspondence: maciejj@ccf.org doi:10.3324/haematol.2015.130112

Key words: MDS, hypoplastic, mutations.

Information on authorship, contributions, and financial & other disclosures was provided by the authors and is available with the online version of this article at www.haematologica.org.

References

- Sloand EM. Hypocellular myelodysplasia. Hematol Oncol Clin North Am. 2009;23(2):347-360.
- Huang TC, Ko BS, Tang JL, et al. Comparison of hypoplastic myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS) with normo-/hypercellular MDS by International Prognostic Scoring System, cytogenetic and genetic studies. Leukemia. 2008;22(3):544-550.
- Afable MG 2nd, Wlodarski M, Makishima H, et al. SNP array-based karyotyping: differences and similarities between aplastic anemia and hypocellular myelodysplastic syndromes. Blood. 2011; 117(25):6876-6884.
- Haferlach T, Nagata Y, Grossmann V, et al. Landscape of genetic lesions in 944 patients with myelodysplastic syndromes. Leukemia. 2014;28(2):241-247.
- Bejar R, Stevenson K, Abdel-Wahab O, et al. Clinical effect of point mutations in myelodysplastic syndromes. N Engl J Med. 2011; 364(26):2496-2506.
- Papaemmanuil E, Gerstung M, Malcovati L, et al. Clinical and biological implications of driver mutations in myelodysplastic syndromes. Blood. 2013;122(22):3616-3627; quiz 3699.
- Jaiswal S, Fontanillas P, Flannick J, et al. Age-related clonal hematopoiesis associated with adverse outcomes. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(26):2488-2498.
- 8. Kulasekararaj AG, Jiang J, Smith AE, et al. Somatic mutations identify a subgroup of aplastic anemia patients who progress to myelodysplastic syndrome. Blood. 2014;124(17):2698-2704.
- Vardiman JW, Thiele J, Arber DA, et al. The 2008 revision of the World Health Organization (WHO) classification of myeloid neoplasms and acute leukemia: rationale and important changes. Blood. 2009;114(5):937-951.
- International Standing Committee on Human Cytogenetic Nomenclature., Shaffer LG, Tommerup N. ISCN 2005 : an international system for human cytogenetic nomenclature (2005) : recommendations of the International Standing Committee on Human Cytogenetic Nomenclature. Basel ; Farmington, CT: Karger, 2005.
- Walter MJ, Shen D, Ding L, et al. Clonal architecture of secondary acute myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(12):1090-1098.
- Ding L, Ley TJ, Larson DE, et al. Clonal evolution in relapsed acute myeloid leukaemia revealed by whole-genome sequencing. Nature. 2012;481(7382):506-510.
- Calado RT. Immunologic aspects of hypoplastic myelodysplastic syndrome. Semin Oncol. 2011;38(5):667-672.
- Śloand EM, Barrett AJ. Immunosuppression for myelodysplastic syndrome: how bench to bedside to bench research led to success. Hematol Oncol Clin North Am. 2010;24(2):331-341.
- Yazji S, Giles FJ, Tsimberidou AM, et al. Antithymocyte globulin (ATG)-based therapy in patients with myelodysplastic syndromes. Leukemia. 2003;17(11):2101-2106.