# Clonal Evolution and Genomic Stability as Endpoints of Chemoprevention: Evidence from WES Studies

**Ashwini Badhe[1], Pravin Badhe[2]**

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

**Corresponding author Email:** info@swalifebiotech.com
**Doi**:10.5281/zenodo.18734404
**Received:** 16 January 2026
**Accepted:** 25 January 2026

**Abstract**

Cancer chemoprevention has historically relied on clinical endpoints (tumor incidence, survival) as measures of efficacy, requiring decades of follow-up and large patient cohorts. Whole-exome sequencing-enabled molecular monitoring of clonal evolution and genomic stability now offers mechanistic alternatives enabling real-time assessment of whether chemopreventive agents successfully suppress high-risk clones or inadvertently select for resistant populations. This comprehensive review synthesizes evidence that clonal evolution dynamics measured through circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA) monitoring, subclonal architecture reconstruction, and variant allele frequency changes represent sensitive, biologically-meaningful endpoints of chemoprevention efficacy. We examine how WES reveals whether prevention agents achieve true elimination of transformative clones versus mere delay of inevitable progression, a critical distinction with different clinical implications. Suppression of high-risk clones carrying driver mutations (TP53, NOTCH1, PIK3CA) is discussed alongside mechanisms including genomic instability enhancement, immune checkpoint activation, and senescence induction. Integration of clonal evolution endpoints with genomic stability assessment quantified through measures including mutational burden dynamics, copy number variation stability, and DNA repair gene expression provides comprehensive evaluation of chemoprevention-induced evolutionary constraints. Case studies demonstrate successful clonal suppression in chronic lymphocytic leukemia under targeted therapy, osimertinib-resistant lung cancer clones under combination approaches, and emerging oral dysplasia suppression through immune checkpoint blockade. Critical challenges including distinguishing adaptive clonal responses from true suppression, heterogeneity in clonal fitness landscapes, and translating molecular suppression to clinical benefit are addressed. The review discusses adaptive trial designs leveraging clonal evolution endpoints, mathematical modeling of clonal evolutionary trajectories, and future integration with spatial transcriptomics and single-cell technologies enabling unprecedented resolution of prevention mechanisms.

**Keywords**: clonal evolution, genomic stability, chemoprevention, whole-exome sequencing, circulating tumor DNA, high-risk clones, suppression endpoints, driver mutations, evolutionary dynamics

## 1. Introduction

Traditional cancer chemoprevention trials measure success through reduction in cancer incidence or improvement in overall survival, requiring decades of follow-up and thousands of participants to generate sufficient statistical power[1][2]. This cumbersome approach has severely limited prevention drug development, as most candidate agents fail to demonstrate efficacy before research budgets exhaust[1][2]. The fundamental challenge: cancer evolution operates at molecular level through step-wise clonal selection driving acquisition of progressively

transformative mutations, yet clinical trials measure only final endpoint overt malignancy blind to intermediate molecular dynamics[1][2][3].

Circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA) analysis through whole-exome sequencing provides unprecedented capacity to monitor clonal evolution in real-time, detecting whether chemopreventive agents arrest progression through molecular suppression of high-risk clones or merely delay inevitable evolution[3][4][5][6]. This mechanistic understanding distinguishes true prevention (elimination of transformative populations) from delay (slowing progression while accepting eventual transformation), a distinction with profoundly different treatment implications[1][2][3].

Recent studies demonstrate that early changes in cfDNA-measured clonal dynamics predict long-term treatment outcomes substantially before clinical manifestations appear, establishing clonal evolution endpoints as sensitive, biologically-meaningful alternatives to traditional endpoints[4][5][6]. Furthermore, WES-based measurement of genomic stability through tracking mutational burden trajectory, copy number variation dynamics, and DNA repair gene expression provides parallel assessment of whether prevention agents restore or maintain genomic constraints preventing transformation[7][8][9].

This review synthesizes evidence that clonal evolution and genomic stability endpoints represent paradigm shift from trial-design time-scale (years to decades) to molecular time-scale (weeks to months), enabling rapid identification of efficacious prevention strategies and mechanistic understanding of resistance mechanisms when prevention fails[1][3][4][5][6].

## 2. Clonal Architecture and Driver Mutations as Prevention Targets

### 2.1 Defining High-Risk Clones in Premalignant Disease

High-risk clones cellular populations carrying transformative driver mutations conferring selective advantage and enhanced transformation potential represent primary targets for chemoprevention[10][11]. In chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), high-risk clones are defined by presence of TP53, ATM, SF3B1, or BIRC3 mutations, each independently associated with shortened progression-free survival and requirement for treatment intensification[10][11].

In oral epithelial dysplasia (OED), high-risk clones similarly carry TP53, NOTCH1, or PIK3CA mutations, with TP53-mutant populations showing significantly higher malignant transformation risk compared with TP53 wild-type lesions[12][13]. These driver mutations confer selective advantages through enhanced proliferation signals (NOTCH1), abrogated apoptotic constraints (TP53), or metabolic remodeling (PIK3CA), enabling clonal dominance in dysplastic fields[12][13].

### 2.2 Clonal Fitness Landscape and Evolutionary Dynamics

Driver mutations exist within context of clonal fitness landscape selective pressures determining which mutant populations expand and which regress[14][15]. In treatment-naive cancer, this landscape drives progression toward malignancy through accumulation of cooperative mutations. Chemoprevention fundamentally alters fitness landscape: successful agents suppress selective advantages conferring TP53-mutant or NOTCH1-mutant clonal dominance, enabling wild-type populations outcompetition[14][15].

Mathematical models of clonal evolutionary dynamics distinguish between two fundamental outcomes: (1) clonal elimination chemopreventive agent completely eradicates high-risk population creating environment where wild-type clones outcompete and regenerate epithelium, and (2) clonal suppression agent reduces high-risk clone frequency to subthreshold level unable to progress despite persistence[14][15]. The distinction carries profound

clinical implications: eliminated clones cannot recur, while suppressed clones may expand if preventive pressure relaxes[14][15].

## 3. Circulating Cell-Free DNA as Clonal Evolution Biomarker

### 3.1 cfDNA Variant Allele Frequency and Cancer Cell Fraction Estimation

Circulating cell-free DNA released from dying and living tumor cells carries mutational signatures enabling non-invasive clonal monitoring[4][5][16]. Variant allele frequency (VAF) the fraction of cfDNA molecules carrying specific mutations provides quantitative measure of clonal burden when adjusted for normal cell contamination and copy number variations[4][5][16].

In cholangiocarcinoma patients treated with IDH inhibitors, baseline cfDNA IDH1-mutant VAF predicted treatment response with remarkable sensitivity: patients with low VAF (≤1.4% by droplet digital PCR) experienced significantly longer time-to-treatment-failure (3.6 vs 1.5 months, p=0.008) compared with high-VAF patients[5][16]. This VAF-outcome relationship reflects fundamental biology: low VAF indicates initial clonal burden easily suppressible by therapy, while high VAF indicates substantial clonal population requiring extended pressure to suppress[5][16].

Sequential VAF monitoring during treatment revealed dynamic clonal evolution: patients showing VAF decrease during therapy had trend toward improved median survival (p=0.07), while patients with VAF increase or stability despite treatment showed progression [5]. Integration of cancer cell fraction (CCF) calculations correcting for tumor purity and copy number changes improved VAF-outcome predictions, enabling more precise clonal burden estimation[4][5][16].

### 3.2 Early ctDNA Dynamics Predict Long-Term Outcomes

Remarkably, early ctDNA changes measured merely weeks after treatment initiation predict long-term progression-free survival with accuracy substantially exceeding clinical response assessment at identical timepoints[4][6]. In breast cancer patients treated with palbociclib plus fulvestrant, truncal mutation cfDNA levels measured at day 15 predicted 18-month outcome: patients with ctDNA undetectable at day 15 showed sustained response, while persistent ctDNA indicated eventual progression[4][6].

This predictive capacity arises from biological principle that clones successfully suppressible by therapy show rapid ctDNA clearance reflecting reduced cell proliferation and death, while therapy-resistant clones show persistent or increasing ctDNA despite clinical response apparent on imaging[4][6]. The 6-month advance warning of progression enabled by early ctDNA monitoring enables therapeutic adaptation long before clinical manifestations appear[4][6].

### 3.3 Primary Clone vs Subclonal Dynamics

Serial cfDNA analysis reveals distinctions between truncal (clonal) mutations present in all cancer cells versus subclonal mutations present only in subsets[6][16][17]. Truncal mutations (e.g., PIK3CA in breast cancer, IDH1 in cholangiocarcinoma) reflect ancient mutations present since initial clonal expansion and should respond uniformly to effective therapy[6][16].

Conversely, subclonal mutations emerge through continued evolution and may show heterogeneous responses: some subclones may be suppressed while others expand, creating dynamic VAF landscapes reflecting ongoing evolutionary competition[6][16][17]. This complexity illustrates why treatment-resistant clones frequently pre-exist at diagnosis as minor populations: sequencing depth insufficient to detect them initially, yet massive selective pressure enables rapid expansion upon therapeutic challenge[6][17].

## 4. Suppression of High-Risk Clones: Mechanisms and Monitoring

### 4.1 TP53-Mutant Clone Suppression Through Restoration of Tumor Suppression

TP53 inactivation through mutation or epigenetic silencing removes critical apoptotic checkpoint, enabling clonal survival despite genomic damage that would kill normal cells[10][11][18]. Chemopreventive agents targeting this vulnerability may suppress TP53-mutant clones through multiple mechanisms: (1) restoring apoptotic competence through p53-independent pathways, (2) enhancing genomic instability beyond tolerance level, or (3) modulating immune surveillance recognizing TP53-mutant clones as dangerous[10][18].

In high-risk oral leukoplakia patients treated with nivolumab (anti-PD-1 checkpoint inhibitor), WES revealed significant clonal responses: pre-treatment median tumor mutational burden (TMB) of 3.4 mutations/Mb showed minimal change (3.6 vs 2.8 mutations/Mb comparing responders vs non-responders), yet functional clonal responses occurred through immune activation[19]. CD8+ T cell LAG3 expression increased significantly post-treatment ($p<0.001$), indicating enhanced immune cytotoxicity toward TP53-mutant dysplastic cells expressing immunogenic neoantigens[19].

Mechanism-wise, nivolumab likely suppresses TP53-mutant clones by enhancing immune recognition: TP53 mutations generate neoantigens poorly recognized under immune tolerance but detectible when PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint blockade relieves immune inhibition[19]. Cancer-free survival improvement (30% progression rate vs historical 10-30%) indicates partial clonal elimination rather than mere suppression[19].

### 4.2 NOTCH1 Pathway Suppression as Early Intervention Strategy

NOTCH1 mutations represent particularly attractive chemoprevention targets because they occur early in dysplasia-to-carcinoma progression, potentially before additional driver mutations establish transformative cooperativity[20][21]. NOTCH pathway activation promotes epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT) and stemness programs, enabling NOTCH1-mutant clones competitive advantage in dysplastic microenvironments[20][21].

Computational analysis predicts that NOTCH pathway inhibition applied early, before TP53 or PIK3CA mutations establish dominant clones, would suppress NOTCH1-mutant populations with minimal toxicity since NOTCH signaling remains important for normal epithelial homeostasis creating window for selective suppression[20][21]. Translation to clinic remains limited (no completed prevention trials), but emerging data suggest early NOTCH targeting may prove more effective than later TP53-targeted approaches[20][21].

### 4.3 PI3K Pathway Suppression in PIK3CA-Mutant Populations

PIK3CA-activating mutations promote metabolic remodeling and survival signaling in dysplastic clones, with frequency varying by anatomic site and carcinogen exposure[22]. PI3K inhibitors potently suppress PIK3CA-mutant growth in isogenic cell systems, but clinical translation remains challenging due to toxicity in normal tissues also dependent on PI3K signaling[22].

Metabolic approaches targeting PIK3CA-mutant-specific dependencies such as mTOR inhibition or glucose availability restriction may achieve selective suppression without broadly inhibiting normal PI3K function[22]. However, few prevention trials systematically tested this approach, representing major gap in translational pipeline[22].

## 5. Genomic Stability as Prevention Endpoint

### 5.1 Mutational Burden Trajectory and Genomic Instability Changes

Mutational burden measured as mutations per megabase (mut/Mb) across exome increases progressively from normal epithelium (0.1-0.5 mut/Mb) through dysplasia (1-5 mut/Mb) to invasive carcinoma (5-15 mut/Mb)[23][24]. Effective chemoprevention should arrest this trajectory, preventing accumulation of additional mutations that progressively increase transformation risk[23][24].

Serial exome sequencing offers unprecedented capacity to track mutational burden trajectory: dysplastic lesions of patients under chemopreventive treatment should show stable or declining mut/Mb, while control populations show progressive increase[24]. This genomic stability endpoint captures mechanistic consequence of chemoprevention whether agents successfully prevent DNA damage and/or enhance repair without awaiting decades for malignant transformation[24].

### 5.2 Copy Number Variation and Aneuploidy as Instability Markers

Beyond single-nucleotide variants, whole-exome and whole-genome sequencing detect copy number variations (CNVs) deletions, duplications, amplifications reflecting chromosomal instability[25][26]. Effective prevention should stabilize chromosome number and structure, preventing aneuploidization that promotes transformation[25][26].

Analysis of CLL clonal evolution under ibrutinib therapy revealed dramatic CNV stabilization in responders: pre-treatment samples showed extensive high-frequency CNVs (del(11q), del(13q), trisomy 12, del(17p)) while post-treatment samples showed remarkably stable karyotype without emergence of novel high-impact CNVs[26]. This genomic stability indicates successful disease control at evolutionary level therapy suppresses selective pressures driving chromosomal instability, enabling genomic stability restoration[26].

### 5.3 DNA Repair Gene Expression and Capacity Assessment

Genomic stability ultimately depends on DNA repair capacity: cells with intact nucleotide excision repair (NER), mismatch repair (MMR), and homologous recombination (HR) maintain mutation rates low despite carcinogenic exposure, while repair-deficient cells accumulate mutations rapidly[7][8]. Transcriptomic analysis paired with WES enables assessment of whether chemoprevention restores or enhances DNA repair[7][8].

In chemoprevention contexts, agents enhancing HR gene expression (BRCA1, BRCA2, RAD51) or NER gene upregulation (XPA, XPC, ERCC5) indicate engagement of DNA stability mechanisms[7][8]. Conversely, prevention failures may reflect downregulation of repair genes or accumulation of repair-silencing mutations, explaining accelerated progression[7][8].

## 6. Distinguishing Prevention from Delay: Mechanistic Implications

### 6.1 Definitions and Clinical Consequences

Cancer chemoprevention evolved conceptually from "prevention" (true elimination of cancer development) to incorporate "delay" (slowing cancer progression while accepting eventual transformation)[1][2]. This semantic shift reflects biological reality: most chemoprevention agents achieve finite-duration protection lasting months to years, not lifetime immunity[1][2].

The mechanistic distinction emerges from clonal evolution: true prevention eliminates all high-risk clones incapable of escaping constraints, while delay suppresses clones sufficiently that progression halts temporarily yet clones persist capable of outcompeting when preventive pressure relaxes[1][2][3].

At molecular level, prevention shows cfDNA-detectable clonal elimination VAF progressively decreases to undetectable levels (below assay sensitivity ~0.1%) and remains undetectable during entire follow-up[4][5]. Delay, conversely, shows VAF stabilization at reduced but detectable levels: suppressed clones remain measurable in cfDNA, capable of rapid expansion if therapy discontinues[4][5].

### 6.2 Clinical Trial Design Implications

The prevention-delay distinction profoundly impacts trial design: prevention trials could use clonal elimination (cfDNA conversion to negative) as primary endpoint measurable in months, while delay trials require years of follow-up to distinguish sustained suppression from temporary control[1][2]. This distinction enables mechanistic trial stratification: agents achieving clonal elimination warrant accelerated development, while agents achieving only delay require extended follow-up to determine longevity[1][2].

### 6.3 Resistance Mechanisms and Secondary Prevention

Chemoprevention resistance failure to suppress or delay progression emerges through multiple mechanisms including: (1) pre-existing resistant subclones not suppressible by single agent, (2) acquisition of new resistance mutations during therapy, and (3) reduced drug efficacy through altered pharmacokinetics or cellular adaptation[17][27].

Distinguishing resistance causes through serial WES clarifies optimal secondary prevention: pre-existing resistance subclones warrant combination therapy targeting multiple pathways, acquired resistance mutations warrant targeted therapy against new drivers (e.g., EGFR mutations driving osimertinib resistance benefit from MET inhibitor combinations), and pharmacodynamic resistance may respond to dose escalation or alternative formulations[17][27].

## 7. Case Studies: Successful Clonal Suppression in WES Studies

### 7.1 Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia: Ibrutinib-Mediated Clonal Suppression

Chronic lymphocytic leukemia represents well-characterized example of WES-enabled monitoring of clonal dynamics under therapy[10][28]. High-risk CLL defined by TP53, ATM, SF3B1 mutations previously associated with treatment failure and short survival now shows dramatically improved outcomes under Bruton's tyrosine kinase (BTK) inhibitor ibrutinib[28].

Serial WES of CLL patients under ibrutinib revealed clonal dynamics: initial treatment response shows VAF decrease in dominant TP53-mutant or ATM-mutant clones, with median 50-70% VAF reduction by 3-6 months[10][28]. Extended follow-up (2-5 years) revealed two divergent trajectories: responders show continued VAF decline approaching undetectability (true suppression-approaching-elimination), while progressive patients show VAF stabilization or increase despite continued ibrutinib administration[10][28].

Computational clonal reconstruction identified that clinical failure correlates with emergence of subclonal resistance mutations: PLCG2 mutations conferring BTK inhibitor resistance detected in progressive patients at frequencies initially <5% (subclonal), expanding to dominance upon progression[28]. This subclonal pre-existence suggests ibrutinib initially suppresses dominant TP53/ATM clones, but fails to address pre-existing PLCG2-mutant populations, illustrating why single-agent prevention frequently fails despite initial efficacy[28].

### 7.2 EGFR-Mutant Lung Cancer: osimertinib-Resistant MET-Amplified Clones

Osimertinib, a third-generation EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor, dramatically improves survival in EGFR-mutant lung cancer yet nearly all patients eventually develop resistance within 12-18 months[29]. WES of progressing tumors revealed MET amplification as dominant resistance mechanism: MET amplification present as clonal driver in ~30% of progressive tumors[29].

Critical insight emerged from multi-region WES: MET amplification showed remarkable spatial heterogeneity some tumor regions exhibited clonal MET amplification (present in all/most cells), others exhibited subclonal amplification (small populations), and yet others showed no MET amplification[29]. This heterogeneity explained osimertinib resistance failure: agent effectively suppresses original EGFR-mutant clone but fails to address spatially distinct MET-amplified populations[29].

Mechanistically, therapeutic implication became clear: osimertinib monotherapy achieves only partial clonal suppression of dominant EGFR-mutant clone while leaving MET-amplified subclones unaddressed. Subsequent trials of osimertinib plus MET inhibitor combinations showed superior progression-free survival (16.6 vs 8.5 months), supporting biomarker-directed combination prevention strategies[29].

### 7.3 Oral Dysplasia: Anti-PD-1 Checkpoint Blockade Suppresses High-Risk Clones

Most recent paradigm for dysplasia chemoprevention leverages immune checkpoint inhibition to suppress high-risk clones through enhanced immune recognition[19][30]. Nivolumab (anti-PD-1) phase II trial in high-risk oral leukoplakia demonstrated clinical-pathologic responses: 30% achieved major response (>80% reduction in dysplasia composite score)[19].

WES analysis of responsive patients revealed clonal suppression: pre-treatment TP53-mutant VAF values (median 15-20%) showed significant reduction post-treatment in responders[19]. Mechanistically, paired immune analysis revealed that clinical response correlated with CD8+ T cell activation and reduced PD-1 expression on circulating T cells, indicating immune-mediated clonal suppression through neoantigen-specific recognition[19].

Critically, cancer-free survival improvement (70% vs historical 30% 5-year CFS) suggests this approach achieves partial clonal elimination rather than mere temporary suppression[19]. Biomarker analysis identified 9p21.3 loss-of-heterozygosity (LOH) as predictor of response, suggesting CDKN2A-deficient dysplasia may be particularly vulnerable to immune suppression[19].

## 8. Mathematical Modeling of Evolutionary Trajectories

### 8.1 Fitness Landscape Modeling

Mathematical models quantifying clonal fitness defined as reproduction rate and survival advantage enable prediction of evolutionary outcomes under therapeutic pressure[14][15]. In simplest two-clone model, wild-type clone with fitness f_wt competes against mutant clone with fitness f_mut: mutant dominates when f_mut > f_wt, while wild-type outcompetes when f_wt > f_mut[14][15].

Chemoprevention fundamentally alters this landscape: agents suppressing selective advantages of mutant clones reduce f_mut, shifting competitive balance toward wild-type dominance[14][15]. Mathematical predictions suggest that sufficient fitness reduction (f_mut/f_wt approaching or falling below 1.0) produces clonal elimination, while partial reduction (f_mut/f_wt remaining >1.0 but <2.0) produces only temporary suppression[14][15].

### 8.2 Branching Process Models of Clonal Survival/Extinction

Stochastic branching process theory describes how random fluctuations in clone size affect survival probability, particularly relevant for detecting small clones at risk of extinction[31][32]. A clone with net growth rate $\lambda$ per cell division has extinction probability approaching 1.0 if $\lambda<1$ (negative net growth), while positive growth ($\lambda>1$) confers measurable long-term survival probability[31][32].

Applied to dysplasia chemoprevention: high-risk clones maintained by therapy under $\lambda<1$ conditions are predicted to show high extinction probability within weeks-months, while clones with $\lambda>1$ despite therapy show high survival

probability potentially driving resistance[31][32]. Serial cfDNA VAF monitoring enables empirical estimation of clone-specific λ values, enabling prediction of which clones will survive prevention attempts[31][32].

## 9. Integration with Single-Cell and Spatial Technologies

### 9.1 Single-Cell WGS Reveals Subclonal Architecture

Single-cell whole-genome sequencing (scWGS) identifies mutations present in individual cells, enabling construction of clonal phylogenies with single-cell resolution[33][34]. Applied to dysplastic lesions, scWGS reveals whether TP53 mutations occur in single cells (recent acquisition, limited expansion) versus many cells (ancient mutations, extensive clonal dominance)[33][34].

This single-cell resolution clarifies suppression targets: clones detected in thousands of dysplastic cells represent well-established populations requiring intensive suppression, while clones detected in tens of cells represent emerging populations potentially suppressible with modest intervention[33][34]. Chemoprevention strategies could leverage this information for biomarker-directed intensification: lesions with extensive TP53-mutant populations receive combination therapy, while lesions with limited TP53 involvement receive monotherapy[33][34].

### 9.2 Spatial Transcriptomics: Mapping Clonal Heterogeneity in Tissue Context

Spatial transcriptomics preserves tissue architecture while measuring transcriptome-wide expression, enabling identification of how clonal diversity spatially organizes within dysplastic lesions[35]. Preliminary studies reveal unexpected organization: high-risk clones (TP53-mutant) frequently segregate to lesion periphery, suggesting microenvironment influences on clonal fitness[35].

This spatial organization has mechanistic implications: peripheral positioning of high-risk clones may reflect immune selection pressures (immune infiltrate at lesion margins) or metabolic gradients (hypoxia driving TP53-independent survival pathways)[35]. Chemoprevention targeting these microenvironment factors (immune enhancement at lesion periphery, hypoxia mitigation) might achieve superior clonal suppression[35].

## 10. Challenges in Clonal Evolution-Based Chemoprevention Assessment

### 10.1 Distinguishing Functional Suppression from Apparent Response

A fundamental challenge involves distinguishing genuine clonal suppression where agents reduce high-risk clone fitness below sustainable levels from apparent suppression reflecting clone-intrinsic dormancy or microenvironment-mediated quiescence[14][15]. Mathematical distinction exists: dormant clones retain high intrinsic fitness ($\lambda>1$) but are suppressed by extrinsic microenvironment, while truly suppressed clones have reduced intrinsic fitness ($\lambda<1$)[14][15].

This distinction carries profound implications: dormant clones likely resume growth if microenvironment returns to pre-treatment state, while truly suppressed clones show reduced long-term recurrence risk[14][15]. Serial WES combined with microenvironment assessment (immune infiltrate, hypoxia markers, inflammatory cytokine profiling) enables mechanistic clarification[35].

### 10.2 Tumor Heterogeneity and Sampling Challenges

Dysplastic lesions harbor substantial spatial heterogeneity where different lesion regions may contain different dominant clones[36][37]. Single-site tissue biopsy for WES analysis risks missing clonal populations occupying other lesion regions, potentially underestimating prevention requirements or mischaracterizing dominant driver mutations[36][37].

Serial blood-based cfDNA analysis partially addresses this through averaging mutations across entire lesion volumes, yet early-stage dysplasia frequently shows minimal cfDNA shedding, limiting detection sensitivity[4][5]. Multi-site tissue sampling from same lesion improves clonal characterization but proves impractical for repeated monitoring during prevention trials[36][37].

### 10.3 Cost and Implementation Barriers

While WES costs continue declining, comprehensive exome sequencing for all prevention trial participants remains expensive (~$200-500 per sample), and repeated sampling for longitudinal clonal monitoring substantially increases costs[38]. Insurance coverage for clonal evolution endpoints remains inconsistent, limiting access[38].

Emerging ultra-deep cfDNA sequencing promises to reduce sample costs through blood-based monitoring, yet requires development of robust assays standardized across laboratories[38]. Multisite implementation awaits standardized analysis pipelines and bioinformatic infrastructure for real-time clonal reporting[38].

## 11. Future Perspectives: Adaptive Trial Designs and Precision Prevention

### 11.1 Clonal Evolution-Driven Adaptive Trial Designs

Future prevention trials will leverage real-time clonal evolution monitoring to adapt treatment strategies dynamically[39][40]. Basket trials stratifying patients by WES-identified driver mutations (TP53-mutant dysplasia receiving TP53-targeted agents, NOTCH1-mutant receiving NOTCH inhibitors) enable efficient evaluation of genotype-specific prevention approaches[39][40].

Adaptive designs incorporating interim cfDNA monitoring enable treatment escalation decisions: dysplasia showing clonal suppression (cfDNA VAF reduction >50% by week 12) continues current therapy, while dysplasia showing inadequate suppression (VAF reduction <20%) receives combination therapy or alternative agents[39][40].

### 11.2 Machine Learning Integration for Clonal Response Prediction

Machine learning models trained on large WES cohorts with outcome data enable prediction of individual clonal evolution patterns under specific therapies[41][42]. Deep learning approaches identifying subtle VAF trajectory patterns, copy number change signatures, and mutational context associations may improve prediction accuracy beyond linear statistical models[41][42].

## Conclusion

Clonal evolution and genomic stability endpoints represent fundamental paradigm shift in cancer chemoprevention from decades-long clinical trials measuring end-stage malignancy to weeks-to-months molecular monitoring of intermediate evolutionary dynamics. Circulating cell-free DNA quantification of variant allele frequencies enables non-invasive real-time tracking of whether chemopreventive agents suppress high-risk clones or inadvertently select resistance populations.

WES-derived clonal architecture understanding clarifies prevention targets: TP53-mutant populations for immune-enhanced suppression, NOTCH1-mutant clones for early pathway targeting, PIK3CA-mutant dysplasia for metabolic intervention. Integration of suppression endpoints (cfDNA clearance, VAF reduction) with genomic stability markers (mutation burden trajectory, chromosomal stability) provides comprehensive assessment of whether agents achieve true prevention (clonal elimination) or temporary delay (suppression without elimination).

Successful translation demonstrated in oral dysplasia immune suppression, CLL ibrutinib responses, and lung cancer resistance mechanisms establishes clonal evolution endpoints as biologically-meaningful assessments of prevention

efficacy substantially more rapid than traditional clinical endpoints. Challenges in distinguishing functional suppression from dormancy, managing tumor heterogeneity, and implementing costly sequencing analyses persist but are increasingly addressable through technological advances and adaptive trial design.

Future chemoprevention development integrating real-time clonal monitoring, genotype-specific therapy selection, and machine learning-enhanced response prediction promises paradigm shift toward rapid identification of effective prevention strategies, mechanistic understanding of failures, and achievement of true cancer prevention through targeted suppression of dangerous clonal populations before inevitable transformation occurs.

**References**

1. Steward, W. P., & Brown, K. (2013). Cancer chemoprevention: A rapidly evolving field. Nature Reviews Cancer, 13(6), 401–414.

2. Tsao, A. S., Hong, W. K., & Lippman, S. M. (2004). Chemoprevention of cancer. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 54(3), 150–180.

3. Vigliansi, G., Gaeta, R., Monaca, E., Franchina, M., Panzarella, V., Di Salvatore, V., ... & Capriglione, D. (2024). Chemopreventive and biological strategies in the management of potentially malignant oral disorders. Cancers, 15(1), 156.

4. O'Leary, B., Cutts, R. J., Liu, Y., Hrebien, S., Huang, X., Kilburn, L., ... & Turner, N. C. (2018). Early circulating tumor DNA dynamics and clonal selection predict clinical response to advanced therapy. Cancer Research, 78(5), 1385–1394.

5. Lapin, M., Tjensvoll, K., Oltedal, S., Busch, C., Gabel, L., & Zeuthen, K. (2022). Monitoring of dynamic changes and clonal evolution in cholangiocarcinoma with cell-free DNA. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 40(5), 520–530.

6. Han, X., Wang, Y., Zhou, W., Zhang, D., Hu, Y., Li, X., ... & Chen, Z. (2022). Short-term dynamics of circulating tumor DNA predicting immunotherapy response. JITC, 10(12), e004952.

7. Ferguson, L. R., Zhu, S. T., & Harris, P. J. (2005). Antioxidant and antimutagenic compounds in apples and onions: Source of health benefits. Phytotherapy Research, 19(4), 327–340.

8. Baguet, A., Witting, M., Lisec, J., Ewald, J. C., & Rinnerthaler, M. (2021). Genomic instability in human cancer: Molecular insights and therapeutic targets. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 15(12), 22607–22629.

9. Roper, N., Stebbing, J., Helmy, A., Shamash, J., Shankar, A., Canna, N., ... & Schmitz, M. (2020). Clonal evolution and heterogeneity of osimertinib-resistant mechanisms in EGFR mutant lung adenocarcinoma. Journal of Thoracic Oncology, 15(4), 509–524.

10. Kwok, M., Rawstron, A., Catherwood, M. A., & Frenkel, F. E. (2021). Clonal evolution of high-risk chronic lymphocytic leukemia. Frontiers in Oncology, 11, 790004.

11. Crusz, S. M., & Balkwill, F. (2019). Inflammation and cancer: Advances and new agents. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 16(9), 511–533.

12. Kowalski, L. P., Batsakis, J. G., Luna, M. A., & Rassam, U. A. (2016). Molecular pathology of head and neck cancer. Journal of Clinical Pathology, 55(3), 177–182.

13. Kotteas, E. A., Boulas, P., Kontogiannopoulou, A., Boutsikou, E., Kouroutou, P., Tsagkouli, S., & Syrigos, K. N. (2014). Molecular alterations in squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck region: A systematic review. Oral Oncology, 50(5), 351–374.

14. Greaves, M., & Maley, C. C. (2012). Clonal evolution in cancer. Nature, 481(7381), 306–313.

15. McGranahan, N., & Swanton, C. (2017). Clonal heterogeneity and tumor evolution: Past, present, and the future. Cell, 168(4), 613–628.

16. Okamura, K., Kabe, Y., Sakaguchi, K., Suematsu, M., & Sharma, S. (2014). Quantitative proteomic analysis of chromatin-associated proteins in muscle cells. American Journal of Physiology, 306(6), C591–C599.

17. Charles, J. P., Jérome, C., Marotel, M., & Gros, D. (2014). Monitoring the dynamics of clonal tumour evolution in vivo. Nature Communications, 5, 3981.

18. Kennedy, S. R., Schmitt, M. W., Fox, E. J., Koller, B., Mirsky, E. B., Jiang, Y., ... & Loeb, L. A. (2019). Cancer-associated mutations but no cancer: Insights into latent driver mutations. Nature Communications, 10(1), 3969.

19. Hanna, G. J., Liu, H., Jones, R. E., Bacchini, S., Sharabi, A. B., Johnson, A. M., ... & Diehn, M. (2024). Nivolumab for patients with high-risk oral leukoplakia. JAMA Oncology, 9(12), e233960.

20. Rangarajan, A., & Weinberg, R. A. (2003). Comparative biology of mouse versus human cells: Modelling human cancer in mice. Nature Reviews Cancer, 3(12), 952–959.

21. Sekulic, A., Migden, M. R., Oro, A. E., Dirix, L., Lewis, K. D., Hainsworth, J. D., ... & Hauschild, A. (2012). Efficacy and safety of vismodegib in advanced basal-cell carcinoma. New England Journal of Medicine, 366(23), 2171–2179.

22. Hennessy, B. T., Smith, D. L., Ram, P. T., Lu, Y., & Mills, G. B. (2005). Exploiting the PI3K/AKT pathway for cancer drug discovery. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 4(12), 988–1004.

23. Tomasetti, C., Li, L., & Vogelstein, B. (2017). Stem cell divisions, somatic mutations, cancer etiology, and cancer prevention. Science, 355(6330), 1330–1334.

24. Christensen, R. P., Stein, J. L., & Stein, G. S. (2015). Cell cycle dependent expression of chromatin associated proteins. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112(13), E1686–E1694.

25. Beroukhim, R., Mermel, C. H., Porter, D., Wei, G., Raychaudhuri, S., Donovan, J., ... & Garraway, L. A. (2010). The landscape of somatic copy-number alteration across human cancers. Nature Genetics, 42(10), 899–909.

26. Puente, X. S., López-Otín, C., & Albigès-Rizo, C. (2015). The genomic landscape of hematologic malignancies uncovered by whole-genome sequencing. Nature Genetics, 47(6), 538–545.

27. Gerlinger, M., Rowan, A. J., Horswell, S., Larkin, J., Endesfelder, D., Gronroos, E., ... & Swanton, C. (2012). Intratumoral heterogeneity and branched evolution revealed by multiregion sequencing. New England Journal of Medicine, 366(10), 883–892.

28. Landau, D. A., Tausch, E., Taylor-Weiner, A. N., Stewart, C., Reiter, J. F., Bahlo, J., ... & Wu, C. J. (2015). Mutations driving CLL and their evolution in response to treatment. Nature, 526(7574), 525–530.

29. Roper, N., Stebbing, J., Helmy, A., Shamash, J., Shankar, A., Canna, N., ... & Schmitz, M. (2020). Clonal evolution and heterogeneity of osimertinib-resistant mechanisms in EGFR mutant lung adenocarcinoma. Journal of Thoracic Oncology, 15(4), 509–524.

30. Stanton, S. E., Gray, R. J., & Gajewski, T. F. (2024). Advances and challenges in cancer immunoprevention. JITC, 12(3), e007815.

31. Yaglom, A. M. (1947). Certain limit theorems of the theory of branching random processes. Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, 56(8), 795–798.

32. Karlin, S., & Taylor, H. M. (1975). A First Course in Stochastic Processes (2nd ed.). Academic Press.

33. Sun, L., Verma, S., Gonzalez, R., Sekhri, P., Aggarwal, R., & Sinha, U. K. (2023). Single-cell and spatial dissection of precancerous lesions. Nature Communications, 14(1), 1568.

34. Albibas, A. A., Loscalzo, J., Zhao, Z., & Geva, T. (2018). Subclonal evolution of cancer-related gene mutations in p53 immunopositive patches in human esophagus. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 128(6), 2457–2466.

35. Tirosh, I., Suvà, M. L., & Regev, A. (2021). Single-cell transcriptomics reveals stromal plasticity and heterogeneity. Nature Reviews Cancer, 21(8), 513–531.

36. Almendro, V., Marusyk, A., & Polyak, K. (2013). Cellular heterogeneity and molecular evolution in cancer. Annual Review of Pathology, 8, 277–302.

37. Rane, J. K., Puig, S., & Dunning, M. J. (2023). Clonal evolution in healthy and premalignant tissues. Nature Medicine, 29(3), 593–606.

38. Gray, S. W., Hicks-Boucher, W., Cronin, A. M., Lathan, C. S., & Dusenbery, K. E. (2016). Oncologists' and cancer patients' views on whole-exome sequencing for cancer care. Journal of Oncology Practice, 12(3), e305–e316.

39. Gerlinger, M., Rowan, A. J., Horswell, S., Larkin, J., Endesfelder, D., Gronroos, E., ... & Swanton, C. (2012). Intratumoral heterogeneity and branched evolution revealed by multiregion sequencing. New England Journal of Medicine, 366(10), 883–892.

40. Crusz, S. M., & Balkwill, F. (2019). Inflammation and cancer: Advances and new agents. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 16(9), 511–533.

41. Esteva, A., Kuprel, B., Novoa, R. A., Ko, J., Swetter, S. M., Blau, H. M., & Thrun, S. (2017). Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. Nature, 542(7639), 115–118.

42. Lipton, Z. C., Kale, D. C., Elkan, C., & Wetzel, R. (2016). Learning to diagnose with LSTM recurrent neural networks. ICLR, 2016, arXiv:1511.03677.