

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Pathologist-initiated reflex testing for biomarkers in non-small-cell lung cancer: expert consensus on the rationale and considerations for implementation

J. R. Gosney¹, L. Paz-Ares², P. Jänne³, K. M. Kerr⁴, N. B. Leigh⁵, M. D. Lozano⁶, U. Malapelle⁷, T. Mok⁸, B. S. Sheffield⁹, A. Tufman^{10,11,12}, I. I. Wistuba^{13,14} & S. Peters^{15*}

¹Department of Cellular Pathology, Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool, UK; ²Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, H12O-CNIO Lung Cancer Unit, Ciberonc and Complutense University, Madrid, Spain; ³Lowe Center for Thoracic Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, USA; ⁴School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK; ⁵Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, Canada; ⁶Pathology, Universidad de Navarra-Clinica Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain; ⁷Department of Public Health, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy; ⁸Department of Clinical Oncology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China; ⁹Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, William Osler Health System, Brampton, Canada; ¹⁰Department of Internal Medicine V, Thoracic Oncology Centre Munich, Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich; ¹¹Comprehensive Pneumology Center Munich (CPC-M), Munich; ¹²German Center for Lung Research (DZL), Munich, Germany; Departments of ¹³Thoracic/Head and Neck Medical Oncology; ¹⁴Translational Molecular Pathology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, USA; ¹⁵Department of Oncology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV), Lausanne, Switzerland



Available online 23 June 2023

Biomarker tests in lung cancer have been traditionally ordered by the treating oncologist upon confirmation of an appropriate pathological diagnosis. The delay this introduces prolongs yet further what is already a complex, multi-stage, pre-treatment pathway and delays the start of first-line systemic treatment, which is crucially informed by the results of such analysis. Reflex testing, in which the responsibility for testing for an agreed range of biomarkers lies with the pathologist, has been shown to standardise and expedite the process. Twelve experts discussed the rationale and considerations for implementing reflex testing as standard clinical practice.

Key words: reflex testing, non-small-cell lung cancer, NSCLC, predictive biomarkers, turnaround time, molecular pathology

INTRODUCTION

The management and treatment of patients with non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) have evolved rapidly over recent years owing to the progressive increase in the availability of different targeted therapies and novel immunotherapies, which have dramatically improved response rates and survival in patients with metastatic disease. The advent of such targeted therapies has made biomarker testing an essential prerequisite for guiding optimal first-line systemic therapy. More recently, the introduction of targeted therapy in the adjuvant setting has meant that biomarker testing is also becoming important for clinical decision making in early-stage disease. As the number of targeted therapies inexorably increases, so will the demand for timely clinical investigation of numerous biomarkers across multiple different genes. According to the recent international

guidelines, treatment of metastatic non-squamous NSCLC should be guided by the genomic evaluation of mutations and fusions such as epidermal growth factor receptor (*EGFR*), anaplastic lymphoma kinase (*ALK*), ROS proto-oncogene 1 receptor tyrosine kinase (*ROS1*), v-raf murine sarcoma viral oncogene homolog B (*BRAF*), neurotrophic tyrosine receptor kinase (*NTRK*), rearranged during transfection (*RET*), Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog (*KRAS*) and MET proto-oncogene, receptor tyrosine kinase (*MET*), and by assessment of the expression of programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1) by immunohistochemistry (IHC).¹⁻⁴ Given that these tests are a fundamental requirement in the management of patients with NSCLC, reliable processes and methods are required to ensure they are carried out in every appropriate case and that the results are available to the treating oncologist in time to permit planning of treatment for every patient.

Traditionally, the ordering of biomarker tests has been a matter for the treating oncologist, who would consider which were necessary for each individual patient based on the histological diagnosis made by a pathologist and then order those tests. A major problem with this traditional, oncologist-led pathway is that it delays the initiation of

*Correspondence to: Dr Solange Peters, Department of Oncology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV), Rue de Bugnon 46, CH-1011, Lausanne, Switzerland. Tel: +41-21-314-44-62
E-mail: solange.peters@chuv.ch (S. Peters).

2059-7029/© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of European Society for Medical Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

complex and often lengthy testing procedures and, therefore, delays the availability of the information necessary to inform therapy.^{5,6} Because there is a risk of clinical deterioration while waiting for the results of biomarker tests, delays in test reporting can lead to the initiation of sub-optimal therapy before determining complete biomarker status.⁷ Long test turnaround times may also deter clinicians from ordering biomarker tests.^{8,9} A retrospective review of 1203 patients with pulmonary adenocarcinoma reported that the percentage of tumours tested for *EGFR* mutation was 54%, *ALK* mutation 51%, *ROS1* mutation 43%, *BRAF* mutation 29%, *RET* mutation 17%, *MET* exon 14 skipping 15% and Erb-B2 receptor tyrosine kinase 2 (*ERBB2*) mutation 11%.¹⁰

Implementation of reflex testing is one potential way to reduce the time from diagnosis to the delivery of all clinically actionable biomarker results while also helping to ensure more patients are tested. A roundtable meeting of 12 experts with an even distribution of oncologists and pathologists was convened in May 2022 to discuss the prospect of reflex testing becoming the new standard in clinical practice. The present article presents a summary statement of the expert working group.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE—REFLEX TESTING, A NEW STANDARD OF CARE

Reflex testing is an approach to testing in which the pathologist handling the case is responsible for initiating and controlling testing for a set of prespecified biomarkers, agreed upon within the context of the multidisciplinary team (MDT), but without the need for a formal request from an oncologist.¹¹ This approach was recommended in the earliest days of genomic profiling of NSCLC,^{12,13} and was established as standard practice in some centres at this time. It is still by no means universally practised, however, and the case for it continues to be made, as in a recent publication,¹⁴ which makes a strong argument for it from the point of view of seeking *EGFR* mutations in particular. The case for reflex testing, therefore, has clearly not yet been universally accepted.

Reflex testing allows biomarker testing to begin as soon as the pathological diagnosis is confirmed, rather than waiting until after the patient's first post-biopsy appointment with the oncologist or after discussion by the MDT.¹⁵

Reflex testing has several attributes that make it the optimal approach for ordering biomarker tests in patients with NSCLC. Firstly, through the application of a protocol defined by the MDT, reflex testing ensures that all patients with NSCLC are guaranteed optimal care at a local level regarding the extent of biomarker evaluation. Unlike the traditional oncologist-led testing pathway, which depends on clinical consideration by the oncologist, a reflex testing protocol depends on testing ordered routinely immediately after pathological confirmation of the diagnosis. This means that the ordering process is systematic and bypasses complexities of clinical consideration that might otherwise influence the decision on which tests to request. As a result of

this, fewer patients are overlooked for testing, creating a more systematic and equitable system. Additionally, several socioeconomic and racial factors might create significant disparities in the cancer journey, including and starting with biomarker testing.¹⁶ In real-world studies, the absolute number of patients being tested and, crucially, the overall mutation detection rate increased after the introduction of reflex testing.¹⁷⁻²¹ Reflex testing is expeditious, reducing both turnaround time and the time to optimal first-line systemic therapy.^{6,17,22}

Accelerating the time to initiating first-line treatment is clinically important. Patients with untreated advanced NSCLC can deteriorate rapidly, becoming too ill for therapy or even dying before treatment is initiated.²³ Expediting biomarker testing can help to minimise the risk of such situations significantly, while reducing the additional costs associated with delayed care.²⁴ Reflex testing of patients with early-stage, resectable disease is now also vital. The data that continue to emerge from the ADAURA trial, for example,²⁵ in which adjuvant therapy is applicable to even stage 1b disease, make clear the importance of seeking *EGFR* mutations as early as possible in either the resected tumour or, ideally, presurgical specimens if available, and targeted therapies are now becoming established in the neoadjuvant setting.

The expert working group also discussed how reflex testing facilitates and optimises tissue stewardship, a key factor for the successful completion of biomarker testing in NSCLC, where the amount of material available for testing is often very limited. The traditional two-stage diagnostic and testing pathway—in which initial assessment and diagnosis by a non-specialist pathologist in a community hospital is followed by referral to a specialist thoracic pathologist, usually in an academic centre, who continues the process—does not facilitate optimal handling of precious material.²⁶ After adopting a reflex testing protocol, one study observed significantly fewer unsuccessful tests for *EGFR* mutations and *ALK* fusions (14% before adoption versus 4% after and 17% before adoption versus 3% after, respectively).¹⁷ In addition, optimising tissue stewardship and increasing successful analysis of the initial diagnostic specimen will inevitably reduce the unwelcome requirement for a second biopsy.

The expert working group recognised that one of the barriers to the adoption of reflex testing is concern over the potentially high cost, given that such testing is not generally stratified according to clinical features such as stage, smoking history and performance status, nor by imaging; such information is generally not available to the pathologist guiding the analysis. Inevitably, this means that there is potential for testing that might be deemed unnecessary or inappropriate. In the context of current targeted adjuvant therapy approaches, and the expectation that the use of targeted therapies before stage IV (including in the neoadjuvant setting) will continue to expand, the argument that reflex testing algorithms lead to over-testing in early-stage disease loses traction.

In addition, any potential financial disadvantage must be weighed against the advantages already outlined and also considered in the context of the overall cost of managing a

patient with lung cancer. For a patient whose tumour has a genomic driver or a high level of PD-L1 expression rendering it responsive to immunotherapy, treatment might extend life for many months or even years, over which time the cost of this successful therapy is considerable. As more targets emerge and more drugs active against them are developed, survival will continue to lengthen. The cost of carrying out a range of predictive biomarker tests, especially if next-generation sequencing (NGS)-based and even if repeated, is already minute as a proportion of the overall cost, and will diminish increasingly as we move into the future.

Another counter to the challenge that reflex testing might incur unnecessary costs is the increasing availability of NGS, which is quickly becoming preferred over 'single-gene' polymerase chain reaction-based analysis for biomarker testing of patients with NSCLC.²⁷ NGS is considered less time-consuming and financially less demanding than single-gene testing when a number of genomic alterations are being sought as is increasingly the case for NSCLC.^{28,29}

Reimbursement of cost also impedes the adoption of reflex testing. Reimbursement practices differ by country and may be limited and/or constrained to specific requirements. For example, reimbursement may be predicated on documented disease stage, or it might be mandated that the order for a particular test or tests comes only from a treating physician. However, it might be possible to navigate this barrier within the MDT by, for example, agreeing on a 'standing order' (remaining disease stage agnostic) for a particular range of tests effectively ordered by the oncologist and instigated automatically by the pathologist, which might evolve over time.

Finally, the argument is sometimes made that the results of biomarker testing on an initial diagnostic specimen might be irrelevant as disease advances and the tumour evolves, developing new genomic alterations and changing its response to immune attack as evidenced by expression of PD-L1. The opinion of the group, however, is that this should be viewed not as an argument against testing the initial diagnostic specimen but as one for routine re-biopsy on progression. In the specific case of addictive oncogenic drivers, e.g. *EGFR* mutation and *ALK* fusion genes, these are almost always truncal and do not evolve during disease progression; therefore, the status of these markers, at least in the initial sample, is likely to be relevant to relapsed disease. Nonetheless, biopsy at progression is valuable for other reasons.

DEFINING THE PROTOCOL FOR REFLEX TESTING

Appropriate implementation of reflex testing must be governed by the availability of a protocol that clearly defines which diagnoses would drive the ordering of biomarker tests and which tests are to be ordered. The details of the protocol will be institution-specific and are a matter for agreement among the MDT, comprising representatives from a range of specialties including pathology, oncology, surgery and radiology.

The expert working group recommends a stage-agnostic reflex testing protocol, where all standard and evidence-based clinically actionable biomarkers are automatically ordered by the pathologist and tested, usually by a combination of NGS and IHC. This approach would ensure complete biomarker profiling, accelerate the time to results and be cost-effective compared with single-gene testing of multiple biomarkers.

Subtyping of NSCLC into squamous and non-squamous by pathologists has been traditional for many years and is embedded in various guidelines.^{4,30-32} It is widely used to guide which tumours should be analysed for which biomarkers and the search for mutations and fusions generally being confined to non-squamous tumours on the grounds that they are only very rarely drivers of squamous cell carcinoma.³³⁻³⁵ Such subtyping is possible on morphological grounds alone in ~70% of tumours; IHC for thyroid transcription factor-1 and p40 should be employed to make the distinction in the remainder and should reduce the 'NSCLC not otherwise specified' rate to 10% or less.^{36,37} The additional IHC testing required for this distinction does contribute to attrition of the specimen, but this group of NSCLCs that are not easily subtyped may still harbour genomic drivers.^{4,31} When IHC is used in this context, pathologists should use only the minimum amount of tissue required to make the distinction.³⁶

Ultimately, each institution needs to define its own protocol for reflex testing. Ideally, this should align with international and, where available, national testing guidelines, while considering the local situation regarding available tests and technology, treatment strategies and available resources.

GUIDANCE FOR IMPLEMENTING REFLEX TESTING

MDT agreement on the concept of reflex testing and the decision to implement

Adopting reflex testing should be an institutional decision involving close communication between radiology, pulmonology, thoracic surgery, oncology and pathology.³⁸ This is needed to ensure that all members of the MDT agree with the concept and that the three principles of reflex testing are followed: (i) testing of predefined biomarkers, (ii) initiated by the pathologist and (iii) upon an appropriate diagnosis. Clearly, the thoracic oncologist is likely to take the lead in discussion and decision making, but all members of the team should have a sense of engagement and feel that they have a role to play. Only after the MDT is convinced of the need to test reflexively can the subtleties of the protocol (discussed in the section 'Defining the protocol for reflex testing') be defined. It is important to remember that implementing reflex testing does not preclude traditional oncologist-led testing in cases not covered by the reflex testing protocol.

Engage with institutional policy makers

The expert working group recommends broader collaboration between not only members of the MDT but also

institutional policy makers such as hospital, regional and national administrations to understand the feasibility of the protocol that has been defined and agreed by the MDT in accordance with local circumstances. In the United States, for example, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) actually requires that such testing be ordered by the treating clinician. As such, there is a need for engagement at the highest levels to encourage flexibility in the conditions for reimbursement in a particular country; it is important to ensure policy makers understand the limitations of the traditional ordering process and the rationale for reflex testing. Commercial laboratories should also be engaged as appropriate. A multidisciplinary-led presentation to hospital and other administrations referring to data in published literature about how reflex testing can improve the quality of care and reduce costs can facilitate rational and operational discussions. Showing the cost benefits in different clinical departments is essential in justifying a potentially increased budget within the laboratory. There is evidence available to help make the case for the improved efficiency and cost-effectiveness of reflex testing using NGS compared with the traditional way of ordering and carrying out biomarker tests.^{6,17-21,23,24,26,27} Ultimately, institutional policy makers need to be convinced that the proposed protocol for reflex testing is efficient and cost-effective, and engagement with payers is necessary to secure reimbursement.

Establish roles and responsibilities between the referring pathologist, specialist thoracic pathologist and molecular pathologist/scientist

Once institutional policy makers have agreed to the protocol, it is important to define roles and responsibilities between the referring pathologist (who has responsibility for the earliest stewardship of the specimen and must be aware of the need for its judicious management), the specialist thoracic pathologist (who is best-placed to consider how to manage the need for genomic profiling with the requirement for other tests such as PD-L1 assessment by IHC) and the molecular pathologist or scientist (who is not always in-house, but may be part of a centralised, regional or supra-regional molecular testing facility).

The initial step in any reflex testing protocol is making the pathological diagnosis, and this responsibility is likely to remain with the referring pathologist. Although diagnosis of tumour (sub)-type is the priority, it is imperative that the referring pathologist does not waste tissue by carrying out unnecessary diagnostic IHC tests. If there is any doubt about specimen sufficiency for complete biomarker testing, the expert working group recommends that an assessment of sample adequacy should be made by the pathologist in, or in discussion with, the laboratory carrying out the molecular tests because sample requirements differ depending on the testing modality and strategy used. Establishing procedures for quality control is also crucial.

It is imperative to regularly check whether the reflex testing protocol is being implemented effectively and

having the desired impact on patient care. The expert working group recommends establishing a process for measuring protocol performance such as tracking the percentage or number of patients who present to their first oncology visit with a complete set of biomarkers available.

Maintenance of the protocol

Given that change in diagnostics and profiling of lung cancer is fast-paced and continually evolving, the expert working group recommends frequent evaluation of the reflex testing protocol to ensure it complies with the latest local and international guidelines and reimbursement conditions.

CONCLUSION

Biomarker testing is critical to appropriately guide the selection of systemic therapy for NSCLC, in the adjuvant setting as well as in patients with metastatic disease. However, patients with lung cancer are often inadequately tested for biomarkers due to non-standardised ordering practices and long turnaround times associated with traditional oncologist-led testing. According to the expert working group, reflex testing should be regarded as the optimal strategy for biomarker testing in NSCLC and this is also the recommendation of recent international guidelines.²

The practice of reflex testing must be guided by the availability of and adherence to a protocol, defined and agreed by the MDT, in accordance with local circumstances. Where possible, comprehensive reflex biomarker testing, ideally via NGS and IHC, in all patients with an appropriate NSCLC diagnosis, and irrespective of disease stage, is recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Medical writing support was funded by AstraZeneca and provided by Oliver McGurk of Indigo Medical in accordance with Good Publication Practice 2022.

FUNDING

This work was supported by AstraZeneca (no grant number). The content represents the views of the authors and not necessarily those of AstraZeneca.

DISCLOSURES

BSS: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. grants or contracts from any entity—Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Biocartis, Boehringer Ingelheim, Cell Marque, Elevation Oncology, Eli Lilly, EMD Serono, Incyte, Janssen, Merck, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Thermo Fisher, Turning Point Therapeutics. Consulting fees—Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Biocartis, Boehringer Ingelheim, Cell Marque, Elevation Oncology, Eli Lilly, EMD Serono, Incyte, Janssen, Merck, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Thermo Fisher, Turning Point Therapeutics. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Biocartis, Boehringer Ingelheim, Cell Marque, Elevation Oncology, Eli Lilly, EMD

Serono, Incyte, Janssen, Merck, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Thermo Fisher, Turning Point Therapeutics. **IHW**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Grants or contracts from any entity—personal fees: Asuragen, Genentech/Roche, Bristol Myers Squibb, AstraZeneca/MedImmune, HTG Molecular, Merck, Guardant Health. Consulting fees—AstraZeneca/MedImmune, Asuragen, Bayer, Bristol Myers Squibb, Genentech/Roche, GlaxoSmithKline, Guardant Health, HTG Molecular Diagnostics, Merck, MSD Oncology, OncoCyte, Novartis, Flame Inc., Pfizer, Regeneron, Merus. Other financial or non-financial interests—personal fees: GlaxoSmithKline, OncoCyte, Daiichi Sankyo, Roche, AstraZeneca, Pfizer, Bayer; research funding to institution: 4D Molecular Therapeutics, Adaptimmune, Adaptive Biotechnologies, Akoya Biosciences, Amgen, Bayer, EMD Serono, Genentech, Guardant Health, HTG Molecular Diagnostics, Lovance Biotherapeutics, Johnson & Johnson, Karus Therapeutics, MedImmune, Merck, Novartis, OncoPlex Diagnostics, Pfizer, Takeda, Novartis. **AT**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Consulting fees—personal fees: Lilly, Boehringer Ingelheim, Pfizer, Takeda, Roche, AstraZeneca, Novartis, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Bristol Myers Squibb, Amgen, Janssen. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—personal fees: Lilly, Boehringer Ingelheim, Pfizer, Takeda, Roche, AstraZeneca, Novartis, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Bristol Myers Squibb. Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board—AstraZeneca (COMPEL study) and AIO (ROSE study). Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society, committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid—leadership roles (unpaid): AIO, ERS, TZM. Other financial or non-financial interests—research funding: AstraZeneca, Takeda, Celgene. **JRG**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Grants or contracts from any entity—Medical Research Council (MRC), Eli Lilly and Company, AstraZeneca. Consulting fees—AbbVie, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Janssen, Eli Lilly and Company, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi, Takeda Oncology. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—personal fees: AbbVie, Amgen, AstraZeneca Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Diaceutics, Janssen, Eli Lilly and Company, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi, Takeda Oncology. Support for attending meetings and/or travel—Takeda Oncology. Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society, committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid—Association of Pulmonary Pathologists, President. **KMK**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Consulting fees—AstraZeneca, Amgen, Diaceutics, Bristol Myers Squibb, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Debiopharm, Merck Serono, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Janssen, Sanofi, AbbVie, Daiichi Sankyo, Takeda. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—AstraZeneca,

Amgen, Janssen, Bristol Myers Squibb, Springer, PeerVoice, Medscape, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Ecancer, TouchIME. Support for attending meetings and/or travel—Amgen. **LP-A**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Grants or contracts from any entity—Merck Sharp & Dohme, AstraZeneca, Pfizer, Bristol Myers Squibb. Consulting fees (personal)—Lilly, Merck Sharp Dohme, Roche, PharaMar, Merck, AstraZeneca, Novartis, Servier, Amgen, Pfizer, Sanofi, Bayer, Bristol Myers Squibb, Mirati, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Takeda, Daiichi Sankyo. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—AstraZeneca, Janssen, Merck, Mirati. Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board—Altum Sequencing, Genomic. **MDL**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—AstraZeneca, Roche, Pfizer, Merck Sharp Dohme. Support for attending meetings and/or travel—Roche, Merck Sharp Dohme. **NBL**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Grants or contracts from any entity—AstraZeneca, Bristol Myers Squibb. Consulting fees—EMD Serono. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—Merck Sharp & Dohme, Bristol Myers Squibb. **PJ**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Grants or contracts from any entity—Astellas Pharmaceuticals, AstraZeneca, Daiichi Sankyo, PUMA, Eli Lilly, Boehringer Ingelheim, Revolution Medicines, Takeda. Royalties or licenses—Labcorp (post-marketing royalties from DFCI owned intellectual property on *EGFR* mutations). Consulting fees—AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Pfizer, Roche/Genentech, Chugai Pharmaceuticals, ACEA Biosciences, Ignyta, LOXO, Eli Lilly, Araxes, SFJ Pharmaceuticals, Voronoi, Daiichi Sankyo, Novartis, Sanofi, Takeda, Nuvalent, Eisai, Bayer, Silicon Therapeutics, Syndax, Allorion Therapeutics, Accutar Biotech, AbbVie, Monte Rosa, Scorpion Therapeutics, Merus. Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board—Mirati Therapeutics, Biocartis, Transcenta, Frontier Medicines, Hongyun Biotechnology, Duality. Stock or stock options—Gatekeeper Pharmaceuticals. **SP**: all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca (funding to institution to support study conduct; medical writing support [no direct transfer of funds]). Grants or contracts from any entity—principal investigator in trials (institutional financial support for clinical trials) sponsored by Amgen, AstraZeneca, BeiGene, Bristol Myers Squibb, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Roche/Genentech. All fees to institution. Consulting fees—AbbVie, AiCME, Amgen, Arcus, AstraZeneca, Bayer, BeiGene, Biocartis, BioInvent, Blueprint Medicines, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Clovis, Daiichi Sankyo, Debiopharm, ecancer, Eli Lilly, Elsevier, F-Star, Fishawack, Foundation Medicine, Genzyme, Gilead, GlaxoSmithKline, Illumina, Imedex, IQVIA, Incyte, Ipsen, iTeos, Janssen, Medscape, Medtoday, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Merck Serono, Merrimack, Novartis, Novocure, OncologyEducation, PharmaMar, Phosphatin Therapeutics, PER,

PeerView, Pfizer, PRIME, Regeneron, RMEI, Roche/Genentech, RTP, Sanofi, Seattle Genetics, Takeda, Vaccibody. All fees to institution. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—AicME, AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, ecancer, Eli Lilly, Foundation Medicine, Illumina, Imedex, Medscape, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Mirati, Novartis, Peerview, PER, Pfizer, Prime, Roche/Genentech, RTP, Sanofi, Takeda. All fees to institution. Support for attending meetings and/or travel—AstraZeneca, Bristol Myers Squibb, Daiichi Sankyo, Eli Lilly, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche/Genentech, Takeda. All fees to institution. Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board—AbbVie, AicME, Amgen, Arcus, AstraZeneca, Bayer, BeiGene, Biocartis, BioInvent, Blueprint Medicines, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Clovis, Daiichi Sankyo, Debiopharm, ecancer, Eli Lilly, Elsevier, F-Star, Fishawack, Foundation Medicine, Genzyme, Gilead, GlaxoSmithKline, Illumina, Imedex, IQVIA, Incyte, Ipsen, iTeos, Janssen, Medscape, Medtoday, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Merck Serono, Merrimack, Novartis, Novocure, OncologyEducation, PharmaMar, Phosplatin Therapeutics, PER, PeerView, Pfizer, PRIME, Regeneron, RMEI, Roche/Genentech, RTP, Sanofi, Seattle Genetics, Takeda, Vaccibody. All fees to institution. **TM:** all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. Grants or contracts from any entity—Bristol Myers Squibb, G1 Therapeutics Inc., Merck Serono, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, SFJ Pharmaceuticals, Takeda, Xcovery. Consulting fees—personal fees: AbbVie, Inc., ACEA Pharma, Adagene, Alpha Biopharma Co., Ltd., Amgen, Amoy Diagnostics Co., Ltd., AstraZeneca (before 2019); Aurora, Bayer Healthcare Pharmaceuticals Ltd., BeiGene, BerGerBio ASA, Berry Oncology, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bowtie Life Insurance Company Limited, Bridge Biotherapeutics Inc., Bristol Myers Squibb, Blueprint Medicines Corp., C4 Therapeutics, Inc., Cirina Ltd., Covidien LP, CStone Pharmaceuticals, Curio Science, Da Volterra, Daiichi Sankyo, D3 Bio Ltd., Elevation Oncology, Eisai, F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd., Fishawack Facilitate Ltd., Foundation One, G1 therapeutics Inc., geneDecode (uncompensated), Genetech, Gilead Sciences, Inc., Gritstone Oncology Inc., Guardant Health, Hengrui Therapeutics Inc, Hutchmed, Ignyta Inc., Inivata, IQVIA, Incyte Corp., Inivata, Janssen, Lakeshore Biotech Ltd., Lilly, Loxo Oncology, Lucense Health Inc., Lunit USA, Inc., Medscape LLC/WebMD, Medtronic, Merck Serono, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Mirati Therapeutics, Inc., MiRXES, MoreHealth, Novartis, Omega Therapeutics Inc, OrigiMed, OSE Immunotherapeutics, PeerVoice, Pfizer, Puma Biotechnology, Inc., Qiming Development (HK) Ltd., Roche Diagnostics, Roche Pharmaceuticals, Sanofi-Aventis, SFJ Pharmaceuticals, Simcere of America Inc., Synergy Research, Takeda Pharmaceuticals HK Ltd., Tiermed, Vertex Pharmaceuticals, Virtus Medical Group, Yuhan Corp. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—ACEA Pharma, Alpha Biopharma Co., Ltd., Amgen, Amoy Diagnostics Co., Ltd., AstraZeneca

(before 2019), BeiGene, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Daiichi Sankyo, Fishawack Facilitate Ltd., Foundation One, InMed Medical Communication, Janssen Pharmaceutica NV, Jiahui Holdings Co. Limited, Lilly, Lunit USA, Inc., MD Health Brazil, Medscape LLC, Merck Serono, Merck Sharp & Dohme, MiRXES, Novartis, OrigiMed Co. Ltd., PeerVoice, Physicians' Education Resource, P. Permanyer SL, Pfizer, Inc., PrIME Oncology, Research to Practice, Roche Pharmaceuticals, Roche Diagnostics, Sanofi-Aventis, Shanghai Promedican Pharmaceuticals Co., Ltd., Takeda, Touch Medical Media, Daz Group, Lucence Health, Inc., Merck Pharmaceuticals HK Ltd., Shanghai BeBirds Translation & Consulting Co., Ltd., Liangyhui Network Technology Co., Ltd., Takeda Oncology, Taiho Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd, Touch Independent Medical Education Ltd. Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board—AbbVie, Inc., ACEA Pharma, Amgen, AstraZeneca, BerGenBio ASA, Berry Oncology, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bowtie Life Insurance Co Ltd, Bristol Myers Squibb, Blueprint Medicines Corp., Covidien LP, CStone Pharmaceuticals, D3 Bio Ltd., Daiichi Sankyo Inc., Eisai, Fishawack Facilitate Ltd., geneDecode (uncompensated), Gritstone Oncology Inc., Guardant Health, Hengrui Therapeutics, Ignyta Inc, IQVIA, Incyte Corp., Janssen, Lakeshore Biotech, Lilly, Loxo Oncology, Lunit USA, Inc., Merck Serono, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Mirati Therapeutics Inc., MiRXES Group, Novartis, OrigiMed, Pfizer, Puma Biotechnology Inc., Roche, Sanofi-Aventis R&D, Simcere of America Inc., Takeda, Virtus Medical Group, Yuhan Corp., HutchMed, SFJ Pharmaceuticals, Curio Science, Inivata, Berry Oncology, G1 Therapeutics, Gilead Sciences, Inc., Vertex Pharmaceuticals, C4 Therapeutics, Inc. Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid—American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), 2018-2022, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); Asian Thoracic Oncology Research Group (ATORG), 2016-present, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); Chinese Lung Cancer Research Foundation Limited (CLCRF), 2005-2012, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); Chinese Society of Clinical Oncology (CSCO), 2009-2020, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); Hong Kong Cancer Fund (HKCF), 2011-present, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); Hong Kong Cancer Therapy Society (HKCTS), 2004-present, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer (IASLC), 2007-2019, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); St. Stephen's College & Prep. School, 2017-present, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated); Hong Kong Academy of Sciences (ASHK), 2022-present, Board of Directors/Leadership (non-remunerated). Stock or stock options—Lunit USA, Inc., stock options; HutchMed, shareholder; Prenetics, shareholder; Aurora Tele-Oncology Ltd., shareholder; Bowtie Life Insurance Co. Ltd, stock options; Lakeshore Biotech Ltd, stock options; D3 Bio, stock options; Biolidics Ltd., shareholder; AstraZeneca, shareholder. **UM:** all support for the present manuscript—AstraZeneca. consulting fees—Boehringer Ingelheim, Merck Sharp

Dohme, Roche, Amgen, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Eli Lilly, Diaceutics, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck, AstraZeneca, Janssen, Diatech, Novartis, Hedera. Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events—Boehringer Ingelheim, Merck Sharp Dohme, Roche, Amgen, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Eli Lilly, Diaceutics, Janssen, Novartis, AstraZeneca. Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society, committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid—Scientific Secretary of International Society of Liquid Biopsy. Receipt of equipment, materials, drugs, medical writing, gifts or other services—Thermo Fisher, Qiagen.

DATA SHARING

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

REFERENCES

- Hendriks L, Kerr K, Menis J, et al. Oncogene-addicted metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol*. 2023;34:339-357.
- Passaro A, Leigh N, Blackhall F, et al. ESMO expert consensus statements on the management of *EGFR* mutant non-small-cell lung cancer. *Ann Oncol*. 2022;33:466-487.
- Hanna NH, Schneider BJ, Temin S, et al. Therapy for stage IV non-small-cell lung cancer without driver alterations: ASCO and OH (CCO) joint guideline update. *J Clin Oncol*. 2020;38:1608-1632.
- Aisner DL, Akerley W, Bauman JR, et al. NCCN guidelines version 5. 2022 non-small cell lung cancer continue NCCN guidelines panel disclosures. 2022. Available at National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (Version 3.2023). https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/nscl.pdf. Accessed June 13, 2023.
- Thunnissen E, Weynand B, Udovicic-Gagula D, et al. Lung cancer biomarker testing: perspective from Europe. *Transl Lung Cancer Res*. 2020;9:887-897.
- Anand K, Phung TL, Bernicker EH, Cagle PT, Olsen RJ, Thomas JS. Clinical utility of reflex ordered testing for molecular biomarkers in lung adenocarcinoma. *Clin Lung Cancer*. 2020;21:437-442.
- Kerr KM, Bibeau F, Thunnissen E, et al. The evolving landscape of biomarker testing for non-small cell lung cancer in Europe. *Lung Cancer*. 2021;154:161-175.
- Winkelman DF, Varkhedkar VM, Stellander-Amato H, Bailey L, Kachadourian A. Why are oncologists not testing all NSCLC patients for biomarkers in the U.S. market? *J Clin Oncol*. 2021;39(suppl 15):e21003.
- Pennell NA, Arcila ME, Gandara DR, West H. Biomarker testing for patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer: real-world issues and tough choices. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book*. 2019;39:531-542.
- Gierman HJ, Goldfarb S, Labrador M, et al. Genomic testing and treatment landscape in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (aNSCLC) using real-world data from community oncology practices. *J Clin Oncol*. 2019;37(suppl 15):1585.
- Braxton DR, Huang Y, Darabi S, Chavez F, Das PM, Bowen T. Pathology molecular reflex testing improves turn-around-time and overall molecular testing rates in NSCLC. *J Clin Oncol*. 2021;39(suppl 15):e13507.
- Mino-Kenudson M, Mark EJ. Reflex testing for epidermal growth factor receptor mutation and anaplastic lymphoma kinase fluorescence in situ hybridization in non-small cell lung cancer. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2011;135:655-664.
- D'Angelo SP, Park B, Azzoli CG, et al. Reflex testing of resected stage I through III lung adenocarcinomas for *EGFR* and *KRAS* mutation: report on initial experience and clinical utility at a single center. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2011;141:476-480.
- Aggarwal C, Bubendorf L, Cooper WA, et al. Molecular testing in stage I-III non-small cell lung cancer: approaches and challenges. *Lung Cancer*. 2021;162:42-53.
- Levy BP, Chioda MD, Herndon D, et al. Molecular testing for treatment of metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: how to implement evidence-based recommendations. *Oncologist*. 2015;20:1175-1181.
- Bruno DS, Hess LM, Li X, Su EW, Zhu YE, Patel M. Racial disparities in biomarker testing and clinical trial enrollment in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *J Clin Oncol*. 2021;39(suppl 15):9005.
- Cheema PK, Menjak IB, Winterton-Perks Z, et al. Impact of reflex *EGFR/ALK* testing on time to treatment of patients with advanced non-squamous non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Oncol Pract*. 2017;13:e130-e138.
- Lim C, Tsao MS, Le LW, et al. Biomarker testing and time to treatment decision in patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Ann Oncol*. 2015;26:1415-1421.
- Cheema PK, Raphael S, El-Maraghi R, et al. Rate of *EGFR* mutation testing for patients with nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer with implementation of reflex testing by pathologists. *Curr Oncol*. 2017;24:16-22.
- Marmarelis M, Berman A, Scholes D, et al. P59.21 Impact of reflex testing on pathology based molecular testing in patients with advanced non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *J Thorac Oncol*. 2021;16:S1157.
- Inal C, Yilmaz E, Cheng H, et al. Effect of reflex testing by pathologists on molecular testing rates in lung cancer patients: experience from a community-based academic center. *J Clin Oncol*. 2014;32(suppl 15):8098.
- Takahashi T, Nishio M, Nishino K, et al. Real-world study of next-generation sequencing diagnostic biomarker testing for patients with lung cancer in Japan. *Cancer Sci*. 2023;114:2524-2533.
- Stewart DJ, Maziak D, Gomes M, et al. Abstract 5489: The cost of delaying therapy for advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): a population kinetics assessment. *Cancer Res*. 2020;80(suppl 16):5489.
- Sheffield B, Eaton K, Emond B, et al. MA12.05 Economic impact of delaying care with single-gene testing versus next-generation sequencing in non-small cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2022;17:S86-S87.
- Herbst RS, Wu Y-L, John T, et al. Adjuvant osimertinib for resected *EGFR*-mutated stage IB-III non-small-cell lung cancer: updated results from the phase III randomized ADAURA trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2023;41:1830-1840.
- Penault-Llorca F, Kerr KM, Garrido P, et al. Expert opinion on NSCLC small specimen biomarker testing - Part 1: tissue collection and management. *Virchows Arch*. 2022;481:335-350.
- Robert NJ, Nwokeji ED, Espirito JL, et al. Biomarker tissue journey among patients (pts) with untreated metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (mNSCLC) in the U.S. Oncology Network community practices. *J Clin Oncol*. 2021;39(suppl 15):9004.
- Pruneri G, de Braud F, Sapino A, et al. Next-generation sequencing in clinical practice: is it a cost-saving alternative to a single-gene testing approach? *Pharmacoecoon Open*. 2021;5:285-298.
- Pennell NA, Mutebi A, Zhou Z-Y, et al. Economic impact of next-generation sequencing versus single-gene testing to detect genomic alterations in metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer using a decision analytic model. *JCO Precis Oncol*. 2019;3:1-9.
- Travis WD, Brambilla E, Nicholson AG, et al. The 2015 World Health Organization classification of lung tumors: impact of genetic, clinical and radiologic advances since the 2004 classification. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2015;10:1243-1260.
- Planchard D, Popat S, Kerr K, et al. Metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol*. 2018;29(suppl 4):iv192-iv237.
- Singh N, Temin S, Baker S Jr, et al. Therapy for stage IV non-small-cell lung cancer with driver alterations: ASCO living guideline. *J Clin Oncol*. 2022;40:3310-3322.

33. Cheung AHK, Tong JHM, Chung LY, et al. *EGFR* mutation exists in squamous cell lung carcinoma. *Pathology*. 2020;52:323-328.
34. Lu S, Lu C, Xiao Y, et al. Comparison of *EML4-ALK* fusion gene positive rate in different detection methods and samples of non-small cell lung cancer. *J Cancer*. 2020;11:1525-1531.
35. Ho HL, Kao HL, Yeh YC, Chou TY. The importance of *EGFR* mutation testing in squamous cell carcinoma or non-small cell carcinoma favor squamous cell carcinoma diagnosed from small lung biopsies. *Diagn Pathol*. 2019;14:59.
36. Travis WD, Brambilla E, Noguchi M, et al. Diagnosis of lung cancer in small biopsies and cytology: implications of the 2011 International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer/American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society classification. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2013;137:668-684.
37. Loo PS, Thomas SC, Nicolson MC, Fyfe MN, Kerr KM. Subtyping of undifferentiated non-small cell carcinomas in bronchial biopsy specimens. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2010;5:442-447.
38. Lindeman NI, Cagle PT, Aisner DL, et al. Updated molecular testing guideline for the selection of lung cancer patients for treatment with targeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors: guideline from the College of American Pathologists, the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer, and the Association for Molecular Pathology. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2018;142:321-346.