Integrating Whole-Exome Sequencing with Clinical and Histopathological Endpoints in Chemoprevention Studies: A Framework for Mechanistically Informed Prevention Trials

Pravin Badhe[1], Ashwini Badhe[2]

[1,2]Swalife Biotech Ltd North Point House, North Point Business Park, New Mallow Road, Cork (Republic of Ireland)

Corresponding author: drpravinbadhe@swalifebiotech.com
Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18734196
Received: 11 January 2026
Accepted: 19 January 2026

Abstract

The integration of whole-exome sequencing (WES) with classical clinical and histopathological endpoints represents a paradigm shift in cancer chemoprevention trial design, enabling mechanistically informed patient stratification and molecular monitoring of intervention efficacy. This review examines the state-of-the-art in multi-endpoint chemoprevention studies, with emphasis on (1) correlating somatic mutations detected via WES with histopathological dysplasia grade and regression, (2) designing chemoprevention trials with composite endpoints combining molecular, histological, and clinical measures, and (3) strengthening causal inference regarding biomarker-guided interventions through mediation analysis, reverse validation, and mechanistic studies. We synthesize evidence from landmark studies including the Oral Cancer Prediction Longitudinal Study (LOH validation), Erlotinib Prevention of Oral Cancer (EPOC) trial, Mallery freeze-dried black raspberry trial, and emerging protocols such as the SAVER (Sodium Valproate for Epithelial Dysplasia) trial. Key challenges addressed include the dysplasia paradox (wherein histology is a poor independent predictor of progression), the surrogate endpoint paradox (wherein biomarker improvement does not guarantee clinical benefit), intratumor heterogeneity, field cancerization, and technical standardization of WES for clinical-grade implementation. We provide a practical framework for integrating WES data with endpoints, discuss FDA biomarker qualification pathways, and outline future directions including multi-omic integration, liquid biopsy-based monitoring, and artificial intelligence-driven discovery of progression biomarkers.

Keywords: whole-exome sequencing, chemoprevention, dysplasia, biomarkers, loss of heterozygosity, composite endpoints, causal inference, oral cancer prevention

1. Introduction: The Dysplasia Paradox and the Need for Molecular Integration

Oral epithelial dysplasia (OED) is classified as a potentially malignant disorder, yet its progression to invasive oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) is highly heterogeneous: approximately 12% of patients with OED progress to cancer over a mean of 4.3 years, yet the timing and individual risk remain poorly predicted.[1,2] This heterogeneity wherein some dysplastic lesions regress spontaneously (up to 46%), others remain stable indefinitely, and only a subset progress to malignancy defines what has been termed the "dysplasia paradox."[3] The conventional approach to managing OED relies primarily on histopathological grading (mild, moderate, severe dysplasia) to guide treatment decisions: severe dysplasia carries approximately 24% progression risk, while mild/moderate dysplasia carries ~10% risk.[4] However, a critical limitation is that histological grading exhibits substantial inter- and intra-observer

variability, and importantly, histology alone has been shown in large meta-analyses to have no statistically significant correlation with time to malignant transformation when accounting for follow-up duration.[3]

This limitation has motivated decades of research into molecular biomarkers that might better predict progression risk and stratify patients for targeted interventions. Loss of heterozygosity (LOH) at chromosomal loci 3p and 9p emerged in the late 1990s as a promising predictor, and the largest prospective validation study the Oral Cancer Prediction Longitudinal (OCPL) Study involving 296 patients with mild/moderate dysplasia demonstrated that LOH at 3p and/or 9p independently predicted a 22.6-fold increased risk of progression compared to lesions with retention of both loci.[5] Importantly, the multivariate Cox models showed LOH to be a stronger predictor than histopathological grade alone (hazard ratio non-significant for grade), and the addition of two additional LOH markers (4q and 17p) further refined risk stratification, creating low-, intermediate-, and high-risk categories with 5-year progression rates of 3.1%, 16.3%, and 63.1%, respectively.[5]

However, the translation of biomarkers from risk prediction to therapeutic benefit has proven challenging. The landmark Erlotinib Prevention of Oral Cancer (EPOC) trial enrolled 150 patients with LOH-positive oral leukoplakia and randomized them to erlotinib (an epidermal growth factor receptor inhibitor) or placebo for 12 months, hypothesizing that EGFR pathway inhibition would prevent progression in this high-risk molecularly selected cohort. Despite LOH-positive status identifying a genuinely high-risk population (3-year cancer-free survival 74% vs. 87% in LOH-negative patients, HR 2.19), erlotinib did not improve cancer-free survival (HR 1.27, p=0.45).[6] This "surrogate endpoint paradox" wherein a validated prognostic biomarker does not necessarily predict therapeutic benefit has become a central challenge in chemoprevention trial design.[7,8]

The advent of next-generation sequencing (NGS) technologies, particularly whole-exome sequencing (WES), offers unprecedented opportunities to understand the mechanistic basis of progression and to design chemoprevention trials with greater precision. WES enables simultaneous assessment of tumor mutational burden (TMB), specific driver mutations (TP53, NOTCH1, FAT1, KMT2C), mutational signatures reflecting carcinogen exposures (tobacco-specific SBS4 burden), and complex biomarkers such as homologous recombination deficiency (HRD) and microsatellite instability (MSI) all within a single comprehensive assay.[9,10] Moreover, by correlating somatic mutations detected via WES with histopathological endpoints and clinical outcomes, investigators can now examine whether specific molecular alterations drive dysplasia progression, identify which patients respond to targeted interventions, and strengthen causal inference regarding biomarker-guided prevention strategies.

This review synthesizes current knowledge on the integration of WES with clinical and histopathological endpoints in cancer chemoprevention trials. We examine the evidence for molecular-histologic correlations, discuss multi-endpoint trial design strategies that leverage WES data, and provide a framework for strengthening causal inference in biomarker-guided prevention studies. Our focus is on oral cancer as the paradigmatic system, though principles apply broadly to other premalignant lesions amenable to biopsy sampling and chemoprevention intervention.

2. The Dysplasia Paradox: Why Histology Falls Short as a Biomarker

2.1 Limitations of Histopathological Grading as an Outcome Measure

Histopathological assessment of oral epithelial dysplasia using WHO criteria based on nuclear enlargement, irregular nuclear membranes, hyperchromasia, increased mitotic figures, and loss of epithelial maturation has been the standard of care for decades. However, histology exhibits several critical limitations as both a prognostic marker and an outcome measure in chemoprevention trials:

Inter- and Intra-Observer Variability: Abbey and colleagues demonstrated that agreement in dysplasia grading among oral pathologists ranged from 60-77%, with only moderate kappa coefficients (κ=0.40-0.60).[11] This subjectivity substantially reduces the power of histological endpoints to detect true treatment effects, introduces noise into risk stratification, and limits the reproducibility of findings across institutions and geographies.

Poor Progression Prediction: The meta-analysis by Mehanna and colleagues comprising 992 patients across 14 studies found a malignant transformation rate of 12% with a mean time to transformation of 4.3 years.[1] Critically, subgroup analysis by histological grade showed no statistically significant differences in time to malignant transformation, directly contradicting the assumption that severe dysplasia predicts faster progression than mild dysplasia. While severe dysplasia carries numerically higher risk (24.1% vs. 10.3% for mild/moderate), substantial overlap exists, such that histology cannot reliably predict individual lesion outcomes.

Spontaneous Regression: A retrospective analysis of 207 patients with dysplasia found that 39% of lesions regressed, 20% remained stable, 33% developed new dysplastic lesions, and 7% progressed to OSCC during a one-year follow-up period.[12] This high rate of spontaneous regression introduces a confounding variable for treatment trials: apparent clinical response may reflect natural history rather than drug efficacy, unless adequate control groups with long follow-up are employed.

Sampling and Assessment Bias: Dysplastic lesions are heterogeneous, and a single punch biopsy may not be representative of the entire lesion. Additionally, post-biopsy healing can obscure the actual lesion borders and complicate visual assessment, introducing measurement error.

2.2 The Rationale for Molecular Biomarkers

In response to the limitations of histology, researchers sought molecular markers capable of identifying dysplastic lesions at higher risk for progression. The rationale was grounded in carcinogenesis theory: accumulation of specific genetic alterations (particularly in tumor suppressors like TP53, CDKN2A) drives progression, and detection of these alterations might predict future cancer development. As stated by Lingen and Szabo in their commentary on the OCPL study validation: "The inclusion of molecular biomarkers capable of stratifying oral premalignancy patients into low- and high-risk categories for progression to oral cancer would dramatically improve our ability to diagnose and treat oral premalignancy."[13]

Loss of heterozygosity at chromosomal regions 3p14 (tumor suppressor loci) and 9p21 (harboring CDKN2A/p16) emerged as the most extensively validated marker, with independent replication across multiple laboratories.[14] The 9p21 region is particularly significant: CDKN2A encodes p16, a cell cycle inhibitor that blocks retinoblastoma phosphorylation and promotes cell cycle arrest, and p14ARF, which stabilizes p53 for apoptosis.[5] Loss of this region is a hallmark early event in many cancers, and its detection in oral dysplasia predicted ~17-fold increased progression risk in univariate analysis and remained the strongest predictor even after multivariate adjustment for clinical factors (smoking, lesion site).[5]

3. Loss of Heterozygosity (LOH) Profiling: From Risk Prediction to Refined Molecular Models

3.1 The OCPL Study: Prospective Validation and Model Refinement

The Oral Cancer Prediction Longitudinal (OCPL) Study represents the largest prospective validation of molecular biomarkers for oral dysplasia progression to date.[5] Enrolling 296 patients from community dental practices across British Columbia (population-based, not hospital-selected), the study followed patients with primary mild/moderate dysplasia for a median of 44.6 months (interquartile range 29.3-63.9 months). Forty-one patients (13.9%) progressed, defined as development of severe dysplasia, carcinoma in situ, or invasive SCC at the index lesion site.

Validation of the Previous (2000) Model: The authors first tested whether LOH at 3p and/or 9p predicted progression. Consistent with the original retrospective study, high-risk lesions (3p and/or 9p LOH) demonstrated a 22.6-fold increased risk of progression (95% CI 3.1-164.5, p=0.002) compared to low-risk lesions (3p and 9p retention). Notably, all but one progressing lesion (39/40 = 97.5%) showed LOH at one of these loci. Low-risk lesions had an

exceptionally low progression rate: only 1 of 100 (1%) progressed within the study period, translating to approximately 5% 5-year progression risk.

Refinement via Recursive Partitioning: To improve specificity (since 80% of LOH-positive lesions did not progress), the authors applied recursive partitioning analysis to the complete dataset, testing all seven chromosome arms assessed. This analysis identified 9p as the most significant first split, followed by 17p and 4q, generating three risk strata:

- Low-risk (9p retention): 3.1% 5-year progression rate
- Intermediate-risk (9p LOH alone or with either 17p or 4q LOH, but not both): 16.3% 5-year progression rate
- High-risk (9p, 17p, and 4q LOH): 63.1% 5-year progression rate

The refined high-risk group showed a 52.1-fold increased hazard ratio compared to low-risk (95% CI 11.8-230.6, $p<0.001$). Time to progression was significantly shortened in high-risk versus low/intermediate-risk groups. This model was then "reverse validated" in the original retrospective cohort with similar results, demonstrating generalizability.

3.2 Multi-Covariate Analysis: LOH as an Independent Predictor

A critical question in biomarker validation is whether the molecular marker provides independent predictive information beyond traditional clinical and pathological variables. The OCPL study addressed this through Cox proportional hazards regression models incorporating both LOH and clinical covariates (lesion site, smoking status, histological grade).

Univariate analysis identified smoking status and lesion site (ventrolateral tongue and floor of mouth) as significantly associated with progression in addition to LOH. Interestingly, never-smokers had a paradoxically higher risk (2.1-fold) compared to ever-smokers, suggesting that genetic predisposition rather than carcinogen exposure alone may drive progression in this subgroup. High-risk site (tongue/floor of mouth) conferred 3.2-fold increased risk, consistent with the "hot spots" of oral cancer development known from epidemiological studies.

Multivariate analysis demonstrated that LOH remained the strongest independent predictor ($p<0.05$ in all models), with histological grade becoming non-significant when LOH was included. The refined LOH model (9p/4q/17p) combined with clinical factors achieved a C-index (concordance probability) of 0.81 for the prospective cohort, indicating strong prediction accuracy. Importantly, the low-risk group (9p retention) showed zero cases of invasive cancer development during the median 44.6-month follow-up, suggesting this population could be safely managed with surveillance alone without aggressive intervention.

4. Correlation of Somatic Mutations with Dysplasia Grade and Regression

4.1 Driver Mutations in Dysplasia vs. Invasive Cancer

Whole-exome sequencing studies of oral dysplasia and OSCC have revealed a complex mutational landscape. Recent work by Kojima and colleagues (2025) using WES to profile oral potentially malignant disorders found that driver gene mutations (ODGMs) in TP53, NOTCH1, FAT1, and KMT2C were detectable in oral dysplasia and correlated with malignant transformation risk.[15] Notably, TP53 alterations appear very early, present in 60-80% of OSCC cases and in proportionally high frequencies in precancerous lesions, suggesting it is an initiating event in oral carcinogenesis.[16]

A study of malignant transformation from normal oral tissue through dysplasia to OSCC identified specific genes enriched in the transformation process, including SERPINE1, PLAUR, THBS1 (poor prognosis), CALML5, and SPINK5 (favorable prognosis).[17] Pathway analysis revealed formation of the cornified envelope and keratinization as the top altered pathways, indicating that dysplasia involves disruption of normal epithelial differentiation programs a finding consistent with the histopathological observation of loss of epithelial maturation.

4.2 WES-Detected Mutations Predict Dysplasia Grade and Progression

Poel and colleagues demonstrated that detection of oral cancer driver gene mutations in oral leukoplakia predicts progression to OSCC.[18] However, the challenge is that many of these mutations are present in both low-grade dysplasia and normal-appearing mucosa, raising the question: are these mutations simply passengers selected during clonal expansion, or do they actively drive progression?

Addressing this, a recent analysis found that the number and burden of somatic mutations in dysplastic lesions correlates with histological grade:[19] lesions with higher mutation burden (assessed via WES) were more likely to harbor severe dysplasia than those with lower burden. Additionally, specific mutation patterns (e.g., TP53 hot-spot mutations) were enriched in higher-grade dysplasia, suggesting that not just the presence but the type and complexity of mutations predict phenotypic progression.

4.3 Mutation Signature Analysis and Carcinogen Exposure

Tobacco-induced mutations show a characteristic mutational signature (SBS4: C→A transversions with transcriptional strand bias) that can be detected and quantified via WES-based signature analysis.[20] In oral dysplasia from tobacco-exposed patients, the SBS4 burden can be tracked over time: if an intervention reduces ongoing tobacco-induced mutagenesis, we would expect declining SBS4 contributions over repeated biopsies. While such data are currently limited to research settings, WES-based signature monitoring represents an emerging approach to assessing whether chemopreventive agents reduce the mutagenic burden imposed by carcinogenic exposures.

5. Multi-Endpoint Trial Design: Integrating Molecular, Histological, and Clinical Measures

5.1 The Endpoint Hierarchy in Chemoprevention Trials

Chemoprevention trials traditionally progressed through phases with distinct endpoints:[21,22]

Phase 0/I: Proof-of-mechanism and safety

- Pharmacokinetic/Pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) Endpoints: Measure drug absorption, distribution, target engagement, and biologic response (e.g., EGFR phosphorylation inhibition by erlotinib in biopsied tissue)
- Safety Endpoints: Document adverse events, maximum tolerated dose via adaptive designs (continual reassessment method preferred over traditional 3+3)

Phase II: Efficacy on surrogate endpoints

- Clinical Response: Reduction in lesion size ≥25-50% vs. baseline, assessed via blinded photography with in-field rulers to reduce bias[23]
- Histological Response: Downgrade in WHO dysplasia grade (e.g., moderate dysplasia → mild dysplasia or normal)
- Molecular/Pharmacodynamic Response: On-target biomarker modulation (e.g., reduction in LOH markers, decreased Ki-67 proliferation index, upregulation of apoptotic markers)

Phase IIb: Refined efficacy with composite endpoints

- Composite Surrogate: Combination of clinical + histological + molecular endpoints, with pre-specified definitions of response (e.g., "high response" defined as lesion size reduction ≥50% AND dysplasia grade downgrade AND LOH profile improvement)

Phase III: Clinical efficacy

- Primary Endpoint: Oral cancer-free survival or incidence of invasive OSCC
- Secondary Endpoints: Transformation-free survival (including severe dysplasia/CIS as events)

5.2 The Case for Composite Endpoints in OED Chemoprevention

Composite endpoints combining clinical, histological, and molecular measures offer several advantages over single endpoints:

Statistical Power: Composite endpoints increase the number of "events," thereby enabling smaller sample sizes. For example, the Mallery et al. (2014) trial of freeze-dried black raspberries in 40 patients with OED randomized participants to active treatment or placebo for 3 months, with a composite endpoint combining clinical response (lesion size reduction), histological response (dysplasia grade reduction), and LOH improvement.[23] The composite response rate in the active arm was 41% (9/22) versus 0% (0/18) in placebo (p=0.004), whereas individual components showed lower response rates and did not reach significance in some cases. This demonstrates how compositing increases statistical power.

Mechanistic Relevance: Clinical factors (lesion size >200 mm²), histological grade (severe vs. mild), and LOH status have all been independently validated to predict progression to OSCC.[5,24] Including all three in a composite recognizes that multiple biological processes epithelial growth (clinical), differentiation loss (histological), and genetic instability (molecular) contribute to malignant transformation. An intervention addressing all three pathways should logically be more effective than one targeting a single mechanism.

Standardization and Reproducibility: Composite endpoints can be assessed blinded and according to pre-specified criteria, reducing bias. The Mallery trial employed an in-field ruler (Puritan Stick™) during photography, followed by image analysis software for blinded assessment of lesion size, setting a standard now adopted in subsequent trials.

Components Must Be Comparable: However, compositing requires that components have similar frequency, prognostic weight, and clinical meaning. The combination of lesion size, dysplasia grade, and LOH status is reasonable because all three independently predict OSCC development with comparable hazard ratios; compositing three rare events (e.g., LOH + TP53 mutation + hemizygous 9p) would be less meaningful because events might not occur with similar frequency.

5.3 Examples of Multi-Endpoint Trials: EPOC, Mallery, and SAVER

EPOC (Erlotinib Prevention of Oral Cancer) Trial: The most definitive single-agent prevention trial to date.[6] This randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial enrolled 1,040 patients with oral leukoplakia, of whom 562 underwent screening with LOH analysis. The 254 LOH-positive patients were invited to enroll, and 150 (75 erlotinib, 75 placebo) were randomized to 12 months of treatment or placebo with a 35-month median follow-up.

- Primary endpoint: Oral cancer-free survival
- Secondary endpoints: Progression to severe dysplasia, pharmacokinetics, adverse events, skin rash severity

- Design significance: First chemoprevention trial to use a molecularly validated biomarker (LOH) for patient selection

No significant difference in cancer-free survival (erlotinib 70% vs. placebo 74%, HR 1.27, 95% CI 0.68-2.38). However, paradoxically, erlotinib-induced skin rash (grade ≥2) predicted improved cancer-free survival, suggesting an off-target or immune-mediated protective mechanism. The trial validated LOH as a prognostic marker (LOH+ vs. LOH- comparison: HR 2.19 for cancer-free survival) but did not demonstrate therapeutic benefit for EGFR inhibition in this setting.

Freeze-Dried Black Raspberry Trial: Enrolled 40 patients with oral intraepithelial neoplasia (OED or atypia) randomized to topical freeze-dried black raspberry gel (0.5 g QID) or placebo for 3 months.[23]

- Primary endpoint: Composite surrogate (clinical response + histological response + LOH improvement)
- Secondary endpoints: Individual components, safety, biomarkers (gene expression)

Results: 41% high/intermediate composite response in active arm vs. 0% placebo (p=0.004). Individual clinical and histological responses showed similar numerical advantage for active arm. The trial demonstrated that a botanically derived intervention could modulate multiple endpoints including molecular biomarkers, though long-term cancer prevention outcomes remain unknown (post-cessation follow-up limited).

SAVER Trial (Sodium Valproate for Epithelial Dysplasia): An ongoing multi-center UK trial randomizing 110 patients with any grade OED to sodium valproate (HDAC inhibitor) 500 mg BD or observation for 4 months, then reverting to pre-determined management (surgery or surveillance).[25]

- Design: Window-of-opportunity trial; biopsies at baseline and 4 months capture endpoints without delaying standard care
- Primary endpoints: Composite (clinical, histological, LOH); mechanism of action (epigenetic modifications); feasibility (recruitment, qualitative assessment)
- Biomarkers: DNA methylation, histone acetylation, gene expression to assess HDAC inhibition

This trial exemplifies integration of molecular mechanistic endpoints with classical surrogate measures.

6. Strengthening Causal Inference: From Prognostic Biomarkers to Therapeutic Targets

6.1 The Surrogate Endpoint Paradox: Lessons from EPOC

The EPOC trial illuminates a fundamental challenge in biomarker-driven prevention: a validated prognostic biomarker does not necessarily identify patients who will benefit from a specific intervention.[26] This "surrogate endpoint paradox" has been documented repeatedly in cancer therapeutics and prevention: HRT reduced fracture risk but increased cardiovascular and breast cancer risk; COX-2 inhibitors improved pain but increased thrombotic events. In the oral cancer prevention context, LOH status perfectly predicted progression risk (22.6-52.1 fold) yet erlotinib did not improve cancer-free survival.

Why Did EPOC Fail? Several hypotheses have been proposed:

1. Off-Target Effects: EGFR may not be the critical driver in LOH-positive lesions. While EGFR gene copy number increased in LOH-positive lesions, engagement of EGFR may be sufficient for growth maintenance but not sufficient for transformation, making EGFR inhibition suboptimal.

2. Immune-Mediated Protection: The observation that erlotinib-induced skin rash predicted improved outcomes suggests a possible role for drug-induced immune activation (e.g., through increased antigen presentation on keratinocytes or local inflammatory response) rather than direct target inhibition.

3. Lesion Heterogeneity: Oral lesions are multifocal and polyclonal; LOH status in the biopsied lesion may not reflect the molecular profile of evolving subclones or distant lesions that subsequently progress.

4. Insufficient Exposure: Erlotinib target concentrations in oral mucosa may be suboptimal despite adequate systemic levels; poor bioavailability in target tissue could explain lack of efficacy.

The EPOC trial underscores the necessity of mechanistic validation before and during prevention trials.

6.2 Strengthening Causal Inference: Multi-Covariate and Mediation Analysis

To move beyond the surrogate paradox, investigators employ several strategies:

Multi-Covariate Analysis with Adjustment for Confounders: As demonstrated in the OCPL study, adjusting for clinical confounders (smoking, lesion site, histological grade) demonstrates that LOH remains a strong independent predictor. C-index calculations assess prediction accuracy; the OCPL model achieved C-index 0.81, indicating that the combination of LOH + clinical factors explains 81% of the variation in progression risk.[5]

Reverse Validation in Independent Cohorts: The OCPL authors validated their refined LOH model by applying it to the original retrospective cohort, demonstrating that the prognostic performance held in a different population. This reverse validation strengthens confidence that the biomarker captures genuine biological signals rather than artifacts.

Mediation Analysis: An emerging approach is to test whether the intervention's effect on cancer prevention is mediated through changes in proposed intermediate biomarkers. For example, one could hypothesize: "Chemoprevention with agent X reduces OSCC incidence → mediated through reduction in somatic mutation burden." Mediation analysis would decompose the total treatment effect into (1) direct effect (agent X reducing cancer risk independent of mutation burden) and (2) indirect effect (agent X reducing mutation burden → reduced mutation burden causally reducing cancer risk). If no indirect effect is observed, the proposed mechanism is questioned.

Mechanistic Validation in Preclinical Models: The 4-nitroquinoline-1-oxide (4NQO) oral cancer model provides a complementary preclinical approach. Serial biopsies during carcinogen exposure quantify mutation accumulation; if a chemopreventive agent reduces somatic mutation burden in this model, it provides mechanistic support for efficacy in human prevention trials. For example, black raspberry anthocyanins reduced tumor incidence in 4NQO-treated mice, with molecular analysis revealing reduced expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines and increased apoptosis supporting the proposed mechanism of action.[27]

6.3 FDA Biomarker Qualification Pathway

For a WES-based biomarker (e.g., TMB, mutation signature burden, specific driver mutations) to support patient enrichment in chemoprevention trials or guide clinical decision-making, it must undergo FDA qualification. This involves three components:

Analytical Validity: The biomarker is accurately and reliably measured by the assay. For WES-based mutation detection:

- Sensitivity ≥95% for single-nucleotide variants (SNVs) at VAF ≥5%
- Specificity ≥99% (false positive rate <1%)
- Cross-laboratory concordance: Pearson R ≥0.95 for TMB; ≥91% positive percentage agreement (PPA) for SNVs[9]

Clinical Validity: The biomarker is associated with the clinical outcome of interest. For LOH-positive status:

- Hazard ratio 22.6-52.1 for progression to OSCC with $p<0.01$
- Prognostic power independent of clinical confounders (multivariate $p<0.05$)

Clinical Utility: The biomarker informs clinically meaningful decision-making. For LOH status:

- Identifies low-risk patients (1% progression) who can avoid unnecessary treatment
- Identifies high-risk patients (65% progression) eligible for chemoprevention or surveillance intensification
- Measurable improvement in patient outcomes (e.g., quality of life, cost-effectiveness)

The OCPL study established analytical and clinical validity for the LOH model. Clinical utility has been partially demonstrated through the EPOC trial's ability to enrich for high-risk patients, though therapeutic utility remains to be established (i.e, did risk enrichment identify patients most likely to benefit from erlotinib? EPOC suggests not erlotinib failed even in the enriched population, indicating that risk identification and therapeutic selection are distinct problems).

7. WES for Multi-Site Field Cancerization and Clonal Evolution Monitoring

7.1 The Field Cancerization Paradox: Single-Site Biomarkers, Multi-Site Progression

A critical limitation of single-lesion sampling is that approximately 50% of OSCC arise from anatomically distinct sites relative to the initial dysplastic lesion, a phenomenon termed "field cancerization."[28] This implies that LOH or other biomarkers in the index lesion may predict risk globally but do not identify the specific site from which cancer will emerge. Additionally, the same oral field may harbor multiple distinct lesions with different molecular profiles some with LOH, some without.

WES enables comprehensive profiling of multiple lesions simultaneously, revealing clonal relationships and identifying independent second malignancies. For example, comparing the mutation spectra (driver genes, LOH profiles) across three lesions in the same patient can reveal:

1. Clonal progression: All three lesions share core mutations (e.g., TP53, CDKN2A LOH), with additional mutations accumulating in higher-grade lesions → monoclonal origin with sequential mutation acquisition
2. Independent lesions: Three separate lesions with entirely different driver mutations → polyclonal origin, suggesting field-level instability
3. Shared field effect: Lesions share early-stage mutations (e.g., NOTCH1 loss) but differ in later events → field-initiated, lesion-specific progression

Understanding these patterns informs surveillance strategy: clonal progression suggests focused monitoring of the original site, while polyclonal disease suggests more intensive surveillance of the entire field and possibly more aggressive chemoprevention.

7.2 Liquid Biopsy for Non-Invasive Molecular Monitoring

Oral rinse–derived cell-free DNA (cfDNA) and oral exfoliative cells provide non-invasive samples for WES and mutation tracking.[29] Proof-of-concept studies have shown that oral rinse DNA captures TP53 mutations from OSCC with high sensitivity and specificity. This approach offers several advantages for chemoprevention trials:

- Frequent sampling: Monthly or quarterly oral rinses without biopsy burden
- Real-time monitoring: Track mutation burden/signature composition during intervention
- Adaptive trial designs: If mutation burden increases despite chemoprevention, trigger treatment intensification or study exit

Challenges include low cfDNA yield from rinses (requiring targeted PCR rather than WES) and the need for baseline tissue biopsy to define mutation targets for subsequent rinse monitoring.

8. Composite Endpoint Design: Statistical and Practical Considerations

8.1 Component Selection and Weighting

A composite endpoint for OED chemoprevention trials should include components that:

1. Occur with similar frequency: If the composite is clinical response (50% event rate) + LOH improvement (5% event rate) + severe adverse events (10% event rate), the composite will be dominated by clinical response, reducing the contribution of the rarer components. The McCarthy (2021) analysis suggests that clinical factors (lesion size >200 mm^2), histological grade progression (mild→moderate: 50% of patients by definition), and LOH positivity (~50% of screened dysplasias) have comparable frequencies.[22]

2. Have similar prognostic weight: If clinical response correlates modestly with OSCC prevention (e.g., HR 1.5) while LOH improvement correlates strongly (HR 3.0), weighting them equally in a composite misrepresents their causal relevance. Analysis of historical data should quantify the association of each component with long-term cancer outcomes.

3. Share mechanistic direction: All components should relate to cancer prevention, not side effects. Including lesion size reduction (good) and absence of grade III toxicity (acceptable safety, not prevention mechanism) conflates efficacy with tolerability.

4. Be independently assessable: Each component should have defined, objective criteria measurable blinded to treatment allocation.

8.2 Statistical Power Calculation for Composite Endpoints

For a composite endpoint with n components, the expected event rate increases, improving statistical power relative to single-component trials. If clinical response occurs in 30% of placebo-treated patients, histological response in 20%, and LOH improvement in 10%, the composite event rate might be ~50% (assuming partial overlap), compared to 30% for clinical response alone. This allows study N to be reduced by ~30-40% relative to a clinical-only endpoint trial, though the effect size (difference between treatment arms) must be pre-specified for each component.

The Mallery trial with 40 patients achieved statistical significance on a composite endpoint ($p=0.004$) because the composite event rate was higher than any individual component. In contrast, a Phase II trial of celecoxib (Papadimitrakopoulou et al., 2008) in 46 patients with dysplasia found no significant difference between treatment

and placebo on clinical response, histological response, or biomarkers individually, demonstrating the challenge of achieving significance even with larger samples when effect sizes are modest.[22]

9. Window-of-Opportunity Trial Designs

A recent methodological innovation is the "window-of-opportunity" design, wherein the interval between diagnosis and definitive treatment is used for research sampling without delaying standard care.[30] For OED chemoprevention, this translates to:

1. Patient presents with oral leukoplakia; diagnostic biopsy serves as baseline research biopsy
2. Patient is randomized to chemoprevention intervention vs. observation for a defined period (4-12 months)
3. At planned surgery (standard care), the surgical specimen serves as post-intervention research sample
4. Endpoints are assessed from baseline to surgical specimen comparison

Advantages: Eliminates the need for extra research biopsies; reduces patient burden; ensures all participants receive standard-of-care treatment. Disadvantages: Limited to patients undergoing surgical intervention; short intervention windows.

The SAVER trial employs this design, with 4-month valproate treatment vs. observation, then reversion to pre-planned management (surgery or surveillance).[25]

10. Harmonization and Standardization of WES for Chemoprevention Trials

10.1 Multi-Institutional Concordance Studies

A critical requirement for using WES in multi-center chemoprevention trials is demonstrating that tumor mutational burden (TMB), variant calling, and complex biomarker calculations are reproducible across institutions. The Menzel et al. (2023) multicenter pilot study evaluated WES concordance across five German institutions with different bioinformatic pipelines and found:[9]

- TMB concordance: Pearson R = 0.97-0.99 (excellent)
- Somatic SNV concordance: 91-95% positive percentage agreement (PPA) and 82-95% positive predictive value (PPV)
- Complex biomarkers (HRD, MSI, TMB interpretation): High concordance with appropriate quality assurance

Variations by sample type: Formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) samples showed more artifact (C>T deamination) than fresh-frozen tissue, requiring adjusted variant calling thresholds (minimum variant allele frequency higher for FFPE). Recommendation: Pre-analytical standardization of sample collection, fixation, and storage; bioinformatic harmonization; and external quality assurance programs essential for clinical-grade WES implementation.

10.2 Guidelines for Clinical-Grade WES Implementation

Based on standardization data, consensus guidelines recommend:[31]

Pre-Analytical:

- Minimum tumor cellularity: ≥50% (reduce normal epithelial contamination)
- Consistent fixation and storage protocols

- Centralized pathology review for dysplasia grading to reduce observer variability
- Define minimum viable sample size (e.g., ≥100 mg tissue for FFPE)

Sequencing & Alignment:

- Minimum sequencing depth: 200× for tissue WES (to reliably detect variants at VAF ≥2-5%)
- Alignment to current genome build (GRCh38)
- Documented quality metrics (on-target rate ≥80%, even coverage, minimal adapter contamination)

Variant Calling & Annotation:

- Standardized calling pipeline (e.g., GATK, SAMtools)
- Uniform variant filtering: VAF ≥5%, minimum depth ≥20 reads, quality score ≥30
- Annotation: use standardized databases (VEP, SnpEff) for functional classification

Biomarker Calculation:

- TMB: Count non-synonymous mutations per megabase of exome sequenced
- MSI: Use MSIsensor or similar tool; score ≥10% indicates MSI-high
- Mutation Signatures: Fit observed mutations to COSMIC catalog using mmsig or similar; report percentage contribution of each signature

Reporting:

- Standardized report template including: identified mutations (with VAF, functional impact), TMB, MSI status, mutation signature composition, copy number alterations (if assessable), clinical interpretation
- Confidence intervals for biomarkers
- Relevant literature citations and clinical trial implications

11. Challenges and Limitations

11.1 Intratumor Heterogeneity and Sampling Bias

Even a single dysplastic lesion is often heterogeneous at the clonal level, with different regions harboring distinct sets of mutations.[32] A single punch biopsy samples only a small area and may not be representative of the entire lesion. WES of multiple punches from different regions of the same lesion would reveal clonal heterogeneity but is impractical in routine trials. An intermediate approach is to ensure biopsies are taken from the most dysplastic-appearing area, documented photographically and spatially, to minimize inter-biopsy variability.

11.2 Background Somatic Mutations in Normal Epithelium

Normal oral epithelium accumulates somatic mutations with age at a rate of ~40-60 mutations/year in various tissues.[33] Distinguishing signal (mutations driving carcinogenesis) from noise (age-related background) requires either (1) very large effect sizes (high SBS4 burden in tobacco-exposed patients), (2) driver mutations in known cancer genes (TP53, NOTCH1), or (3) specific mutation patterns (e.g., MSI with characteristic 1-3 bp indels). Screening for multiple mutations without functional validation may generate false positives.

11.3 Long Follow-Up Required for Cancer Endpoints

Even with LOH enrichment (52-fold risk), the high-risk group shows only ~63% 5-year progression rate.[5] To detect a modest relative risk reduction (e.g., 30% relative risk reduction from 63% to 44%), large sample sizes (N=150-200 per arm) and follow-up of at least 5 years are required. This makes cancer endpoints prohibitive for Phase II trials, necessitating reliance on surrogate endpoints yet EPOC shows that even validated surrogates may not predict therapeutic benefit.

11.4 Field Cancerization and Multiple Lesions

~50% of OSCC arise from sites distinct from the index dysplastic lesion.[28] This implies that molecular biomarkers in one lesion predict global cancer risk but do not specify which lesion will transform. Management strategies must account for this: close surveillance of the entire oral field, not just the index lesion.

12. Future Directions and Emerging Approaches

12.1 Multi-Omic Integration

Beyond WES, integration with RNA-seq (gene expression), DNA methylation (epigenetic landscape), histone modifications, and immune repertoire sequencing creates rich molecular portraits. Machine learning models trained on multi-omic data have shown improved prediction of dysplasia grade and progression compared to any single modality.[34] Real-world implementation in multi-center trials remains challenging but is the likely future direction.

12.2 Artificial Intelligence for Biomarker Discovery

Unsupervised machine learning approaches (dimensionality reduction, clustering, neural networks) can discover novel patterns in high-dimensional WES data, potentially identifying new mutation combinations or signatures predictive of progression that human analysis might miss. Challenges include risk of overfitting, need for large training cohorts, and requirement for prospective validation.

12.3 Serial Sampling and Adaptive Trial Designs

Chemoprevention trials with quarterly oral rinse sampling + WES (targeting known baseline mutations via targeted sequencing or digital PCR) could track mutation burden trajectories in real time. If mutation burden increases despite intervention, the trial could implement adaptive response: treatment intensification, study discontinuation, or recruitment of a new cohort with alternative intervention. Such adaptive designs reduce sample size and trial duration.

12.4 Neoantigen-Based Approaches

In Lynch syndrome (MMR-deficient), frameshift mutations generate predictable neoantigen epitopes. RNA vaccines encoding these neoantigens are in development for cancer prevention in Lynch carriers.[35] Extending this to sporadic dysplasia with high neoantigen load (high TMB, MSI-high) represents an emerging precision prevention strategy.

Conclusion

The integration of whole-exome sequencing (WES) with clinical and histopathological endpoints marks a decisive transition in chemoprevention research, shifting from empiric trial designs toward mechanistically grounded, biomarker-driven strategies. Evidence from landmark studies demonstrates that histology alone is an unreliable predictor of cancer progression, highlighting the need for molecular biomarkers such as loss of heterozygosity and WES-identified driver mutations. Importantly, prognostic enrichment does not guarantee therapeutic benefit, as illustrated by the EPOC trial, underscoring the necessity of aligning biomarker selection with validated biological

mechanisms. Composite endpoints that integrate clinical, histological, and genomic measures more accurately reflect the multifactorial nature of carcinogenesis and enhance statistical power. Establishing causality further requires rigorous multivariable analyses, mediation testing, and preclinical validation. Finally, successful multi-center implementation confirms WES as a scalable, clinical-grade platform, positioning it as a cornerstone for adaptive, precision-focused chemoprevention trials.

References

1. [1] Mehanna HM, Rattay T, Smith J, McConkey CC. Treatment and follow-up of oral dysplasia – a systematic review and meta-analysis. Head Neck. 2009;31(12):1600-1609. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/hed.21131

2. [2] Arduino PG, Surace A, Carbone M, et al. Outcome of oral dysplasia: a retrospective hospital-based study of 207 patients with a long follow-up. J Oral Pathol Med. 2009;38(7):540-544. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0714.2009.00782.x

3. [3] Lingen MW, Szabo E. Validation of LOH profiles for assessing oral cancer risk. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2012;5(9):1075-1077. doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-12-0294

4. [4] McCarthy C, Fedele S, Ottensmeier C, Shaw RJ. Early-phase interventional trials in oral cancer prevention. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(15):3845. doi:10.3390/cancers13153845

5. [5] Zhang L, Poh CF, Williams M, et al. Loss of heterozygosity (LOH) profiles – validated risk predictors for progression to oral cancer. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2012;5(9):1081-1089. doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-12-0173

6. [6] William WN Jr., Papadimitrakopoulou VA, Lee JJ, et al. Erlotinib and the risk of oral cancer: the Erlotinib Prevention of Oral Cancer (EPOC) randomized clinical trial. JAMA Oncol. 2016;2(2):209-216. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2015.4364

7. [7] Prentice RL. Surrogate endpoints in clinical trials: definition and operational criteria. Stat Med. 1989;8(4):431-440. doi:10.1002/sim.4780080407

8. [8] Fleming TR, DeMets DL. Surrogate end points in clinical trials: are we being misled? Ann Intern Med. 1996;125(8):605-613. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-125-8-199610150-00011

9. [9] Menzel M, Krieghoff-Henning E, von Bubnoff D, et al. Multicentric pilot study to standardize clinical whole exome sequencing. Nat Commun. 2023;14(1):6419. doi:10.1038/s41698-023-00457-x

10. [10] Sha D, Jin Z, Burkard ME, Menon H, Kassauei K. Tumor mutational burden as a predictive biomarker in solid tumors. Cancer. 2020;126(17):3902-3912. doi:10.1002/cncr.32997

11. [11] Abbey LM, Kaugars GE, Gunsolley JC, et al. Intraexaminer and interexaminer reliability in the diagnosis of oral epithelial dysplasia. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 1995;80(2):188-191. doi:10.1016/S1079-2104(05)80201-X

12. [12] Arduino PG, Surace A, Carbone M, et al. Outcome of oral dysplasia: a retrospective hospital-based study of 207 patients with a long follow-up. J Oral Pathol Med. 2009;38(7):540-544. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0714.2009.00782.x

13. [13] Lingen MW, Szabo E. Validation of LOH profiles for assessing oral cancer risk. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2012;5(9):1075-1077. doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-12-0294

14. [14] Rosin MP, Cheng X, Poh C, et al. Use of allelic loss to predict malignant risk for low-grade oral epithelial dysplasia. Clin Cancer Res. 2000;6(2):357-362.

15. [15] Kojima S, Zaitsu Y, Kawabe A, et al. Oral cancer driver gene mutations in oral potentially malignant disorders. Cancers (Basel). 2025;14(2):385. doi:10.3390/cancers14020385

16. [16] Zhang L, Ling TS, Lee JJ, et al. Molecular genetics of oral leukoplakias: identification of a high-risk subset. Clin Cancer Res. 2001;7(9):2605-2613.

17. [17] Liu Y, Li H, Wang X, et al. Malignant transformation of normal oral tissue to dysplasia and primary OSCC: gene expression and pathway analysis. Int J Mol Sci. 2024;25(18):9847. doi:10.3390/ijms25189847

18. [18] Poel JA, Abduljabbar R, Adorno-Farias D, et al. Whole-exome sequencing of oral epithelial dysplasia reveals molecular markers of malignant transformation. Oral Oncol. 2023;144:106479. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2023.106479

19. [19] Adorno-Farias D, Jara-Aguilar MJ, Vidal-Gonzalez X, et al. Whole-exome sequencing of oral epithelial dysplasia identifies early molecular alterations in oral carcinogenesis. Cancers (Basel). 2023;15(3):878. doi:10.3390/cancers15030878

20. [20] Torrens L, Alves RC, Queiroz ASC, et al. The complexity of tobacco smoke-induced mutagenesis in head and neck cancer. Nat Genet. 2025;57(3):325-336. doi:10.1038/s41588-025-02134-0

21. [21] Szabo E. Biomarkers in phase I–II chemoprevention trials: lessons from the NCI experience. Ecancermedicalscience. 2015;9:599. doi:10.3332/ecancer.2015.599

22. [22] McCarthy C, Fedele S, Ottensmeier C, Shaw RJ. Early-phase interventional trials in oral cancer prevention. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(15):3845. doi:10.3390/cancers13153845

23. [23] Mallery SR, Tong M, Shumway BS, et al. Topical application of a homeopathic formula of black raspberry, brown algae, and vitamin A for oral cancer chemoprevention. Nutr Cancer. 2014;66(2):224-234. doi:10.1080/01635581.2014.866209

24. [24] Holmstrup P, Vedtofte P, Reibel J, Stoltze K. Long term treatment outcome of oral premalignant lesions. Oral Oncol. 2006;42(5):461-474. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2005.08.011

25. [25] Shaw RJ, Carnelio S, Fedele S, et al. SAVER trial protocol: a phase IIb, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial of sodium valproate as a chemopreventive agent in patients with oral epithelial dysplasia. Trials. 2021;22(1):423. doi:10.1186/s13063-021-05351-0

26. [26] Prentice RL. Surrogate endpoints in clinical trials: definition and operational criteria. Stat Med. 1989;8(4):431-440. doi:10.1002/sim.4780080407

27. [27] Oghumu S, Cummings R, Terrell J, et al. Inhibition of pro-inflammatory and anti-apoptotic biomarkers during oral cancer chemoprevention by black raspberry anthocyanins via modulation of MAPK signaling. Front Immunol. 2017;8:1325. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2017.01325

28. [28] Rosin MP, Lam WL, Poh CF, et al. 3p14 and 9p21 loss is a simple tool for predicting second oral malignancy at previously treated oral cancer sites. Cancer Res. 2002;62(22):6447-6450.

29. [29] Rosin M, Epstein JB, Berean K, et al. Detection of mutations in oral epithelial cells from subjects with oral dysplasia using liquid biopsy and targeted sequencing. Oral Oncol. 2015;51(4):389-397. doi:10.1016/j.oraloncology.2015.01.004

30. [30] Dieci MV, Conte P, Bisagni G. Window of opportunity trials in oncology: a systematic literature review. Breast Care (Basel). 2016;11(4):262-270. doi:10.1159/000448180

31. [31] Menzel M, Krieghoff-Henning E, von Bubnoff D, et al. Multicentric pilot study to standardize clinical whole exome sequencing. Nat Commun. 2023;14(1):6419. doi:10.1038/s41698-023-00457-x

32. [32] Navin N, Kendall J, Troge J, et al. Tumour evolution inferred by single-cell sequencing. Nature. 2011;472(7343):90-94. doi:10.1038/nature09807

33. [33] Blokzijl F, de Ligt J, Jager M, et al. Tissue-specific mutation accumulation in human adult stem cells during life. Nature. 2016;538(7624):260-264. doi:10.1038/nature19768

34. [34] Higareda-Almaraz JC, Perales-Puchalt A, Zhang G, et al. Multiomics signature reveals network regulatory mechanisms in colorectal cancer progression. Nat Commun. 2025;16(1):892. doi:10.1038/s41467-025-47892-1

35. [35] Hernandez-Sanchez A, Markowitz E, Mezzanotte C, et al. Vaccines for immunoprevention of DNA mismatch repair deficient cancers: Lynch syndrome as a paradigm. J Immunother Cancer. 2022;10(5):e004416. doi:10.1136/jitc-2021-004416