Article:

Accepted Manuscript

Germline variation at *CDKN2A* and associations with nevus phenotypes among members of melanoma families

Nicholas J. Taylor, Nandita Mitra, Alisa M. Goldstein, Margaret A. Tucker, Marie-Françoise Avril, Esther Azizi, Wilma Bergman, D. Timothy Bishop, Brigitte Bressac-de Paillerets, William Bruno, Donato Calista, Lisa A. Cannon-Albright, Francisco Cuellar, Anne E. Cust, Florence Demenais, David E. Elder, Anne-Marie Gerdes, Paola Ghiorzo, Thais C. Grazziotin, Johan Hansson, Mark Harland, Nicholas K. Hayward, Marko Hocevar, Veronica Höiom, Christian Ingvar, Maria Teresa Landi, Gilles Landman, Alejandra Larre-Borges, Sancy A. Leachman, Graham J. Mann, Eduardo Nagore, Håkan Olsson, Jane M. Palmer, Barbara Perić, Dace Pjanova, Antonia Pritchard, Susana Puig, Nienke van der Stoep, Karin A.W. Wadt, Linda Whitaker, Xiaohong R. Yang, Julia A. Newton Bishop, Nelleke A. Gruis, Peter A. Kanetsky

Please cite this article as: Taylor NJ, Mitra N, Goldstein AM, Tucker MA, Avril M-F, Azizi E, Bergman W, Bishop DT, Bressac-de Paillerets B, Bruno W, Calista D, Cannon-Albright LA, Cuellar F, Cust AE, Demenais F, Elder DE, Gerdes A-M, Ghiorzo P, Grazziotin TC, Hansson J, Harland M, Hayward NK, Hocevar M, Höiom V, Ingvar C, Landi MT, Landman G, Larre-Borges A, Leachman SA, Mann GJ, Nagore E, Olsson H, Palmer JM, Perić B, Pjanova D, Pritchard A, Puig S, van der Stoep N, Wadt KAW, Whitaker L, Yang XR, Newton Bishop JA, Gruis NA, Kanetsky PA, on behalf of the GenoMEL Study Group, Germline variation at *CDKN2A* and associations with nevus phenotypes among members of melanoma families, *The Journal of Investigative Dermatology* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.jid.2017.07.829.

Germline variation at *CDKN2A* and associations with nevus phenotypes among members of melanoma families

Short title: *CDKN2A* mutations among melanoma family members

Nicholas J. Taylor[1], Nandita Mitra[2], Alisa M. Goldstein[3], Margaret A. Tucker[3], Marie-Françoise Avril[4], Esther Azizi[5], Wilma Bergman[6], D. Timothy Bishop[7], Brigitte Bressac-de Paillerets[8], William Bruno[9], Donato Calista[10], Lisa A. Cannon-Albright[11], Francisco Cuellar[12], Anne E. Cust[13,14], Florence Demenais[15], David E. Elder[16], Anne-Marie Gerdes[17], Paola Ghiorzo[7], Thais C. Grazziotin[18], Johan Hansson[19], Mark Harland[7], Nicholas K. Hayward[20], Marko Hocevar[21], Veronica Höiom[19], Christian Ingvar[22], Maria Teresa Landi[3], Gilles Landman[23], Alejandra Larre-Borges[24], Sancy A. Leachman[25], Graham J. Mann[26], Eduardo Nagore[27], Håkan Olsson[22], Jane M. Palmer[20], Barbara Perić[21], Dace Pjanova[28], Antonia Pritchard[20], Susana Puig[12], Nienke van der Stoep[6], Karin A. W. Wadt[17], Linda Whitaker[7], Xiaohong R. Yang[3], Julia A. Newton Bishop[7], Nelleke A. Gruis[6], Peter A. Kanetsky[29], on behalf of the GenoMEL Study Group

[1] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Texas A&M Health Science Center, College Station, TX, USA
[2] Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
[3] Human Genetics Program, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA
[4] Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Cochin et Université Paris Descartes, Paris, France
[5] Department of Dermatology, Sheba Medical Center, Tel Hashomer, Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
[6] Department of Dermatology, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands
[7] Section of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Leeds Institute of Cancer and Pathology, Cancer Research UK Clinical Centre at Leeds, St James's University Hospital, Leeds, UK
[8] Gustave Roussy, Université Paris-Saclay, Département de Biologie et Pathologie Médicales and and INSERM, U1186, Villejuif, F-94805, France
[9] Department of Internal Medicine and Medical Specialties, University of Genoa and IRCCS AOU San Martino-IST Genoa, Italy
[10] Dermatology Unit, Maurizio Bufalini Hospital, Cesena, Italy
[11] Departments of Genetic Epidemiology and Biomedical Informatics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
[12] Melanoma Unit, Dermatology Department, Hospital Clinic, IDIBAPS, Barcelona, Spain and CIBER de Enfermedades Raras, Barcelona, Spain
[13] Sydney School of Public Health, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia
[14] Melanoma Institute Australia, North Sydney, NSW, Australia
[15] Genetic Variation and Human Diseases Unit, UMR-946, INSERM, Université Paris Diderot, Université Sorbonne Paris Cité, Paris, France
[16] Departments of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA
[17] Department of Clinical Genetics, University Hospital of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
[18] Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre RS, Brazil
[19] Department of Oncology-Pathology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
[20] QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Herston, QLD, Australia
[21] Institute of Oncology Ljubljana, Zaloska, Ljubljana, Slovenia
[22] Departments of Clinical Sciences and Surgery, Lund University, Lund, Sweden
[23] Department of Pathology, Escola Paulista de Medicina, UNIFESP, São Paulo, Brazil
[24] Unidad de Lesiones Pigmentadas, Cátedra de Dermatología, Hospital de Clínicas, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay
[25] Huntsman Cancer Institute and Department of Dermatology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
[26] Westmead Institute for Cancer Research, University of Sydney at Westmead Millennium Institute and Melanoma Institute Australia, Westmead, NSW, Australia

[27] Department of Dermatology, Instituto Valenciano de Oncologia, Valencia, Spain
[28] Latvian Biomedical Research and Study Centre, Riga, Latvia
[29] Department of Cancer Epidemiology, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, FL USA

Address for correspondence and reprints: Dr. Peter A. Kanetsky, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, 12902 Magnolia Dr., MRC bldg. #213, Tampa, FL 33612. E-mail: peter.kanetsky@moffitt.org

Conflict of interested statement: None declared

Abstract

Germline mutations in the cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor 2A gene (*CDKN2A*) are frequently identified among melanoma kindreds, and are associated with increased atypical nevus counts. However, a clear relationship between pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation carriage and other nevus phenotypes including counts of common acquired nevi has not yet been established. Using data from GenoMEL, we investigated the relationships between *CDKN2A* mutation carriage and 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus counts among blood-related members of melanoma families. Compared to individuals without a pathogenic mutation, those who carried one had an overall higher prevalence of atypical (OR=1.64; 95% CI: 1.18, 2.28) nevi, but not 2 mm nevi (OR=1.06; 95% CI: 0.92, 1.21) or 5 mm nevi (OR=1.26; 95% CI: 0.94, 1.70). Stratification by case status revealed more pronounced positive associations among non-case family members, who were nearly three times (OR=2.91; 95% CI: 1.75, 4.82) as likely to exhibit nevus counts at or above the median in all three nevus categories simultaneously when harboring a pathogenic mutation (vs. not harboring one). Our results are supportive of the hypothesis that unidentified nevogenic genes are co-inherited with *CDKN2A* and may influence carcinogenesis.

Introduction

Germline mutations in the cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor 2A (*CDKN2A*) gene are frequently identified in familial melanoma (Goldstein *et al.*, 2006; Goldstein *et al.*, 2007), with prevalence in families with three or more members diagnosed with melanoma ranging between 20 and 50% (Goldstein and Tucker, 2001; Harland *et al.*, 2014; Kefford *et al.*, 1999). In contrast, these mutations account for only 1-2% of population-based melanoma cases (Harland *et al.*, 2014). Germline mutations in *CDKN2A* have also been associated with familial atypical multiple mole melanoma (FAMMM) syndrome, an autosomally dominant condition exemplified by a family history of melanoma and high numbers of atypical nevi (Eckerle Mize *et al.*, 2009; Goldstein *et al.*, 2007). However, estimating the prevalence of FAMMM has been difficult due to intra- and inter-family variability in the FAMMM phenotype (Goldstein *et al.*, 2000; Lynch *et al.*, 2002; Rulyak *et al.*, 2003), and a clear relationship between *CDKN2A* mutation classification and number of atypical nevi has not yet been established (Bishop *et al.*, 2000; de Snoo *et al.*, 2008; Nielsen *et al.*, 2010).

Few studies have examined the relationship between germline *CDKN2A* mutational status and number of common melanocytic nevi among melanoma families, even though evidence from previous genome-wide association studies (GWAS) suggests that variation near the *CDKN2A* locus is associated with nevus count (Barrett *et al.*, 2011; Falchi *et al.*, 2009). Here, we evaluate associations between germline *CDKN2A* pathogenic mutation classification and nevus phenotype among participants in research performed by the GenoMEL consortium (www.genomel.org). A better understanding of *CDKN2A*'s influence on nevogenesis among blood-related cases and non-cases of melanoma may aid in the search of other risk modifying nevogenic genes. In addition, robust phenotypic indicators of *CDKN2A* pathogenic mutation carriers, especially

2

among non-case members (*i.e.* individuals who have not been diagnosed with melanoma) of melanoma families, could influence clinicians' surveillance and prevention strategies in this high-risk population.

Results

CDKN2A genotype was available for at least one member of 896 (78%) families comprising 3,990 individuals, of whom 1,651 (41%) also submitted to nevus phenotyping (Table 1). All analyses were confined to this final analytic cohort of 1,651 participants. The median values of 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus counts were similar among those with and without a pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation, although we observed a higher degree of variation among pathogenic mutation carriers compared to those without a pathogenic mutation (Figure 1). Total nevus count (*i.e.* the sum of 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus counts) was highly correlated (r=0.99) with number of 2 mm nevi. Median 2 mm nevus counts for those with and without a pathogenic mutation were 54 (interquartile range (IQR)=102) and 47 (IQR=87) respectively. For 5 mm nevus counts, those with a pathogenic mutation had a median value of 2 (IQR=5) whereas a median value of 1 (IQR=5) was observed among individuals without a pathogenic mutation. Those with and without a pathogenic mutation had a median value of 0 for atypical nevus counts with an IQR of 2 for pathogenic mutation carriers and 1 for those without a pathogenic mutation.

Compared to individuals without a pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation, pathogenic mutation carriers had an overall higher prevalence of atypical nevi (OR=1.64; 95% CI: 1.18, 2.28). Moreover, pathogenic mutation carriers were almost twice as likely as those without a pathogenic mutation (OR=1.83; 95% CI: 1.25, 2.67) to exhibit nevus counts at or above the center-specific medians in all three categories of nevi (mole gestalt scores of 3 vs. 0). Pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation carriage was not associated with common acquired (2 mm, 5 mm)

3

nevus counts (Table 2). Total nevus count was not associated with carriage of *CDKN2A* mutations and, as expected, point estimates were nearly identical to those observed for 2 mm nevus counts (data not tabulated).

Upon stratification by melanoma case status, we observed more pronounced positive associations between *CDKN2A* pathogenic mutation carriage and nevus counts among the non-case family members. Among non-case participants, those harboring a pathogenic mutation were nearly three times as likely to demonstrate the highest mole gestalt score (3 vs. 0) compared to those without a pathogenic mutation (OR=2.91; 95% CI: 1.75, 4.82) and exhibited approximately twice as many atypical nevi compared to non-cases without a pathogenic mutation (OR=1.98; 95% CI: 1.34, 2.90). In contrast, carriage of a pathogenic mutation among melanoma cases was inversely associated with mole gestalt score (3 vs. 0) compared to those without a pathogenic mutation (OR=0.90; 95% CI: 0.53, 1.53) and showed a modest, but statistically nonsignificant, positive association with number of atypical nevi compared to wildtype carriage (OR=1.47; 95% CI: 0.92, 2.33) (Table 2).

We further explored associations stratified by GenoMEL study centers grouped according to proximity to the equator to assess the relative influence of increasing daylight hours; and one stratified by anatomic site of first melanoma classified by relative duration of UV exposure. Latitude did not demonstrate a statistically significant influence on the association between any *CDKN2A* mutation carriage and nevus phenotype (p-interaction >0.05 for all nevus phenotype categories), nor could we discern any clear patterns of association according to relative UV exposure of anatomic site of first verified melanoma (Supplemental Tables 2 and 3).

Discussion

4

Within melanoma families, we observed higher mole gestalt scores among pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation carriers compared to those without a pathogenic mutation, indicating that carriers tended to have more nevus laden phenotypes. Estimates within individual nevus phenotype categories (*i.e.* 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus counts) indicate pathogenic mutation carriers exhibit greater numbers of atypical nevi compared to non-carriers.

To date, few studies have examined the influence of germline *CDKN2A* mutation carriage on common acquired nevus counts among melanoma-prone families. A longitudinal study of a large melanoma family from Utah reported increasing nevus counts among carriers of the specific V126D mutation compared to wildtype over a 15 year interval (Florell *et al.*, 2004). However, the impact of the mutation on atypical nevi is unclear as total nevus count was reported. Twin studies identified a quantitative-trait locus (microsatellite marker D9S942) for nevus density in a noncoding region of *CDKN2A* (Falchi *et al.*, 2006; Zhu *et al.*, 1999; Zhu *et al.*, 2007), which may suggest a broader role of *CDKN2A* in nevogenesis among the majority of individuals who do not harbor a rare germline mutation. However, an adolescent twin study from the UK found no evidence for D9S942 as a quantitative-trait locus influencing nevus density (Barrett *et al.*, 2003) and a familial-based investigation of a potentially nevogenic variant (A148T) near D9S942 also found no association with common acquired nevus counts (Bertram *et al.*, 2002). Germline mutations in *CDKN2A* are strongly associated with FAMMM syndrome, and individual members of these families often have abundant numbers of atypical and common nevi (Gruis *et al.*, 1995; Hussussian *et al.*, 1994; Soura *et al.*, 2016). However, not all individuals with *CDKN2A* mutations present with excessive or even higher nevus counts. Studies of Dutch and Swedish melanoma kindreds have reported low atypical and common nevus counts among *CDKN2A* mutation carriers (Ipenburg *et al.*, 2016; Nielsen *et al.*, 2010).

Similar findings were reported among melanoma families from the UK (Newton Bishop *et al.*, 1994). The range of atypical nevi (0-94) observed in GenoMEL family members with pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutations further highlights the influence of *CDKN2A* on phenotypic heterogeneity.

Evaluating individual nevus types among GenoMEL participants suggests that germline pathogenic mutations at *CDKN2A* are more predictive of number of atypical nevi compared to common acquired nevi (2 mm and 5 mm nevi), a result which is consistent with previous findings (Bishop *et al.*, 2000). These results are also interesting in light of recent research that suggests intermediate lesions, a classification that includes atypical/dysplastic nevi, are likely to exhibit hemizygous loss of *CDKN2A*, supporting a role for this locus in the development of histological atypia in nevi (Shain *et al.*, 2015). It is important to note that the defining criteria of atypical nevi in the present study were clinical and not pathologically-based; it is possible that very subtle atypical nevi could have been misclassified as 5 mm nevi. Furthermore, although we took a conservative approach when assigning pathogenicity to *CDKN2A* variants/mutations, it is possible that our designation of some common variants as not pathogenic is not accurate. We based our assessment on evidence of a deleterious effect, and for some of the common variants there is no such evidence to date.

Our observation of distinct differences in associations according to case status is interesting. Non-case members of melanoma-prone families demonstrated relatively strong associations of *CDKN2A* pathogenic mutation carriage with mole gestalt score and number of atypical nevi, while corresponding associations among case family members tended to be attenuated. Pathogenic germline mutations in *CDKN2A* and number of nevi are both important risk factors for melanoma. The observed pronounced difference in the relationship between

6

CDKN2A mutational status and nevus phenotype according to case status may be due, in part, to the higher proportion of pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutations among cases (42%) compared to non-cases (25%). If *CDKN2A* influences nevogenesis, we might expect to see diminished associations between pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation carriage and nevus phenotype among cases compared to non-cases. The higher nevus count distributions we observed among cases compared to non-cases tends to support this hypothesis (Supplemental Figure 1). It is also possible that case members are affected by yet-to-be-discovered nevogenic genes that cosegregate with *CDKN2A* and either modify *CDKN2A*'s nevogenic function or influence nevogenesis independently. Another possible explanation is that non-case family members may be more likely to inherit unidentified lower penetrance genes that are important risk modifiers of nevus formation, potentially hinder melanoma initiation, and cosegregate with *CDKN2A*.

Zhu *et al.* have speculated that environmental factors affecting spontaneous somatic mutation rates (*e.g.* UV exposure) in tumor suppressor genes may help to explain nevus count variation between individuals as well as familial correlations in nevus counts (Zhu *et al.*, 2007). However, our analyses by latitude of ascertainment center and anatomic site of melanoma— arguably two proxy measures of UV exposure—did not reveal meaningful nevus phenotype differences across strata. This exploratory analysis did not take into consideration behaviors that influence UV exposure (*e.g.* sunbathing/tanning, sunscreen usage, apparel).

In summary, our results are consistent with previous studies reporting that *CDKN2A* plays a role in nevogenesis (Bishop *et al.*, 2000; Cannon-Albright *et al.*, 1994; Florell *et al.*, 2004; Shain *et al.*, 2015; Zhu *et al.*, 1999). In general, pathogenic mutation carriers are significantly more likely to exhibit higher than median nevus counts in all three categories of nevus phenotype simultaneously compared to those without a pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutations, as

evidenced by our mole gestalt score results. Acknowledging the potential nevus phenotype overlap between those with and without a pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation (Bishop *et al.*, 2000), we examined associations based on case status among melanoma family members. Associations between *CDKN2A* pathogenic mutational status and nevus phenotype according to case status contrasted sharply. These differences may be explained if *CDKN2A* possesses a degree of nevogenic function since case family members exhibited higher nevus counts and were more likely to harbor a pathogenic *CDKN2A* mutation compared to non-case members, which could result in diminished associations among case members. Our findings are generally supportive of the hypothesis that unidentified nevogenic genes are co-inherited with *CDKN2A* (Florell *et al.*, 2004).

Materials & Methods

Over the past two decades, GenoMEL has aggregated data from individuals belonging to melanoma families from around the globe. We refer to participants with a melanoma diagnosis at the time of recruitment as cases, whereas family members who had not been diagnosed with melanoma at the time of recruitment are referred to as non-cases. Currently, GenoMEL consists of 29 centers from Australia, Europe, the Middle East, and North and South America.

GenoMEL employed a common protocol for data collection from prospectively enrolled participants, although family identification and recruitment procedures were allowed to differ among study centers. Additionally, centers had a degree of autonomy over the data collection process, which resulted in different contributions across various protocol components. Thus, not all centers completed all portions of the research protocol for each enrolled participant. Regulatory approval was obtained by the institutional review boards of each GenoMEL study center, and written informed consent was obtained for each participant. Individuals who signed

informed consent were asked about their personal and familial melanoma history and to submit

to a full phenotypic examination by research staff, which included an evaluation of nevus counts

by anatomic site. Training was carried out for all staff performing phenotyping on participants in

the prospective study in the UK. Consolidation of that training was subsequently carried out in

Italy. Several GenoMEL study centers had extant data previously collected from members of

melanoma families under local regulatory approval, and where possible this information was

harmonized with data arising from participants enrolled in the prospective GenoMEL study.

A melanoma family was defined by the presence of three or more cases of confirmed

cutaneous melanoma in the same lineage, or two cases of confirmed cutaneous melanoma in

first-degree relatives. Melanoma case family members with a diagnosis of mucosal or ocular

melanoma did not contribute to defining a melanoma family and were excluded from analysis.

Confirmation of diagnosis was made by: pathology report (75%), physician letter or clinical

document verifying melanoma diagnosis (19%), death certificate (2%), or cancer registry data

(4%). Individuals who are members of melanoma families by virtue of marriage and not

ancestry, or for whom family relationship information was ambiguous or missing, were excluded

from this study. Family members who reported a melanoma, but for whom verification of

diagnosis was not available, were also excluded from analyses.

Nevi ≥ 2 mm but <5 mm in diameter (hereinafter referred to as 2 mm nevi) were counted

on exposed skin, in addition to nevi ≥ 5 mm in diameter (hereinafter referred to as 5 mm nevi)

and clinically atypical nevi; sites not examined were the genitalia and female breasts. An

atypical nevus was defined as a nevus ≥ 5 mm in diameter and containing a flat component, with

at least two of the following characteristics: variable pigmentation, asymmetrical shape or

diffuse border. We also derived a summary variable from 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus

counts to describe an individual's overall nevus phenotypic landscape. Specifically, individuals were assigned a dichotomous score within each category of 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus count according to the study center-specific median. Individuals with at least the median nevus count were scored as 1, with those exhibiting fewer than the median nevus count scored as 0; each individual then received an aggregate "mole gestalt" summary score between 0 and 3 based on the sum of these three dichotomous scores.

Germline DNA of consenting participants was screened for mutations in *CDKN2A* (exons 1α, 1β, 2 and 3) as previously described (Harland *et al.*, 2008). Mutation evaluation, predominantly by sequencing or denaturing high performance liquid chromatography followed by sequencing, was conducted at each study center. Previous evaluation has confirmed consistent mutation detection across the consortium (Harland *et al.*, 2008). Sequencing results were collated and mutational status was assigned according to pathogenicity as outlined in Supplemental Table 1. Briefly, pathogenic variants were adjudicated based on demonstrated (*i.e.* published) impact on the biological function of *CDKN2A* or bioinformatically inferred deleterious impact on *CDKN2A* function, and evidence of cosegregation within melanoma families. Variants not meeting any of these criteria were classified as benign (Taylor *et al.*, 2016). Individual participants were classified based on presence of a pathogenic mutation; benign variant carriers and wildtype individuals were combined for analyses and classified as having "no known pathogenic" mutations at *CDKN2A*. Individuals who carried both a pathogenic mutation and a benign mutation were classified as pathogenic.

We used the generalized estimating equation (GEE) method implemented in SAS v.9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) to calculate odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for associations between nevus phenotypes and *CDKN2A* mutational status. For our nevus count outcomes we

used Poisson regression (2 mm nevi) or negative binomial regression when nevus counts were right skewed (5 mm and atypical nevi), whereas a multinomial model was used to evaluate the "mole gestalt" variable. Designating a Type I. error rate of α=0.05, we performed score tests of the null hypothesis that no differences exist between nevus counts within strata of mutational status. Analyses were adjusted for age at phenotyping, sex, the interaction between age and sex, melanoma status and, study center, and we accounted for the non-independence of observations arising from familial clustering within study center using the repeated subject statement of the GENMOD SAS procedure.

We examined associations by latitude by grouping GenoMEL ascertainment centers according to equatorial proximity. Among family members with a diagnosis of melanoma, we also examined associations between *CDKN2A* mutational status and nevus phenotype by anatomic location of an individual's first verified melanoma. Anatomic sites were classified as those usually exposed (head, neck, lower arms and scalp-male), intermittently exposed (trunk, back, upper arms, lower legs, and scalp-female), and usually unexposed (buttock, upper legs) to UV radiation.

Conflict of Interest

The authors state no conflict of interest.

14

References

Barrett JH, Gaut R, Wachsmuth R, Bishop JA, Bishop DT. Linkage and association analysis of nevus density and the region containing the melanoma gene CDKN2A in UK twins. Br J Cancer 2003;88(12):1920-4.

Barrett JH, Iles MM, Harland M, Taylor JC, Aitken JF, Andresen PA, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies three new melanoma susceptibility loci. Nat Genet 2011;43(11):1108-13.

Bertram CG, Gaut RM, Barrett JH, Pinney E, Whitaker L, Turner F, et al. An assessment of the CDKN2A variant Ala148Thr as a nevus/melanoma susceptibility allele. J Invest Dermatol 2002;119(4):961-5.

Bishop JA, Wachsmuth RC, Harland M, Bataille V, Pinney E, Mac KP, et al. Genotype/phenotype and penetrance studies in melanoma families with germline CDKN2A mutations. J Invest Dermatol 2000;114(1):28-33.

Cannon-Albright LA, Meyer LJ, Goldgar DE, Lewis CM, McWhorter WP, Jost M, et al. Penetrance and expressivity of the chromosome 9p melanoma susceptibility locus (MLM). Cancer Res 1994;54(23):6041-4.

de Snoo FA, Hottenga JJ, Gillanders EM, Sandkuijl LA, Jones MP, Bergman W, et al. Genome-wide linkage scan for atypical nevi in p16-Leiden melanoma families. Eur J Hum Genet 2008;16(9):1135-41.

Eckerle Mize D, Bishop M, Resse E, Sluzevich J. Familial Atypical Multiple Mole Melanoma Syndrome. In: Riegert-Johnson DL, Boardman LA, Hefferon T, Roberts M, editors. Cancer Syndromes. Bethesda (MD); 2009.

Falchi M, Bataille V, Hayward NK, Duffy DL, Bishop JA, Pastinen T, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies variants at 9p21 and 22q13 associated with development of cutaneous nevi. Nat Genet 2009;41(8):915-9.

Falchi M, Spector TD, Perks U, Kato BS, Bataille V. Genome-wide search for nevus density shows linkage to two melanoma loci on chromosome 9 and identifies a new QTL on 5q31 in an adult twin cohort. Hum Mol Genet 2006;15(20):2975-9.

Florell SR, Meyer LJ, Boucher KM, Porter-Gill PA, Hart M, Erickson J, et al. Longitudinal assessment of the nevus phenotype in a melanoma kindred. J Invest Dermatol 2004;123(3):576-82.

Goldstein AM, Chan M, Harland M, Gillanders EM, Hayward NK, Avril MF, et al. High-risk melanoma susceptibility genes and pancreatic cancer, neural system tumors, and uveal melanoma across GenoMEL. Cancer Res 2006;66(20):9818-28.

Goldstein AM, Chan M, Harland M, Hayward NK, Demenais F, Bishop DT, et al. Features associated with germline CDKN2A mutations: a GenoMEL study of melanoma-prone families from three continents. J Med Genet 2007;44(2):99-106.

Goldstein AM, Struewing JP, Chidambaram A, Fraser MC, Tucker MA. Genotype-phenotype relationships in U.S. melanoma-prone families with CDKN2A and CDK4 mutations. J Natl Cancer Inst 2000;92(12):1006-10.

Goldstein AM, Tucker MA. Genetic epidemiology of cutaneous melanoma: a global perspective. Arch Dermatol 2001;137(11):1493-6.

Gruis NA, van der Velden PA, Sandkuijl LA, Prins DE, Weaver-Feldhaus J, Kamb A, et al. Homozygotes for CDKN2 (p16) germline mutation in Dutch familial melanoma kindreds. Nat Genet 1995;10(3):351-3.

Harland M, Cust AE, Badenas C, Chang YM, Holland EA, Aguilera P, et al. Prevalence and predictors of germline CDKN2A mutations for melanoma cases from Australia, Spain and the United Kingdom. Hered Cancer Clin Pract 2014;12(1):20.

Harland M, Goldstein AM, Kukalizch K, Taylor C, Hogg D, Puig S, et al. A comparison of CDKN2A mutation detection within the Melanoma Genetics Consortium (GenoMEL). Eur J Cancer 2008;44(9):1269-74.

Hussussian CJ, Struewing JP, Goldstein AM, Higgins PA, Ally DS, Sheahan MD, et al. Germline p16 mutations in familial melanoma. Nat Genet 1994;8(1):15-21.

Ipenburg NA, Gruis NA, Bergman W, van Kester MS. The absence of multiple atypical nevi in germline CDKN2A mutations: Comment on "Hereditary melanoma: Update on syndromes and management: Genetics of familial atypical multiple mole melanoma syndrome". J Am Acad Dermatol 2016;75(4):e157.

Kefford RF, Newton Bishop JA, Bergman W, Tucker MA. Counseling and DNA testing for individuals perceived to be genetically predisposed to melanoma: A consensus statement of the Melanoma Genetics Consortium. J Clin Oncol 1999;17(10):3245-51.

Lynch HT, Brand RE, Hogg D, Deters CA, Fusaro RM, Lynch JF, et al. Phenotypic variation in eight extended CDKN2A germline mutation familial atypical multiple mole melanoma-pancreatic carcinoma-prone families: the familial atypical mole melanoma-pancreatic carcinoma syndrome. Cancer 2002;94(1):84-96.

Newton Bishop JA, Bataille V, Pinney E, Bishop DT. Family studies in melanoma: identification of the atypical mole syndrome (AMS) phenotype. Melanoma Res 1994;4(4):199-206.

Nielsen K, Harbst K, Masback A, Jonsson G, Borg A, Olsson H, et al. Swedish CDKN2A mutation carriers do not present the atypical mole syndrome phenotype. Melanoma Res 2010;20(4):266-72.

Rulyak SJ, Brentnall TA, Lynch HT, Austin MA. Characterization of the neoplastic phenotype in the familial atypical multiple-mole melanoma-pancreatic carcinoma syndrome. Cancer 2003;98(4):798-804.

Shain AH, Yeh I, Kovalyshyn I, Sriharan A, Talevich E, Gagnon A, et al. The Genetic Evolution of Melanoma from Precursor Lesions. N Engl J Med 2015;373(20):1926-36.

Soura E, Eliades PJ, Shannon K, Stratigos AJ, Tsao H. Hereditary melanoma: Update on syndromes and management: Genetics of familial atypical multiple mole melanoma syndrome. J Am Acad Dermatol 2016;74(3):395-407; quiz 8-10.

Taylor NJ, Handorf EA, Mitra N, Avril MF, Azizi E, Bergman W, et al. Phenotypic and Histopathological Tumor Characteristics According to CDKN2A Mutation Status among Affected Members of Melanoma Families. J Invest Dermatol 2016.

17

Zhu G, Duffy DL, Eldridge A, Grace M, Mayne C, O'Gorman L, et al. A major quantitative-trait locus for mole density is linked to the familial melanoma gene CDKN2A: a maximum-likelihood combined linkage and association analysis in twins and their sibs. Am J Hum Genet 1999;65(2):483-92.

Zhu G, Montgomery GW, James MR, Trent JM, Hayward NK, Martin NG, et al. A genome-wide scan for naevus count: linkage to CDKN2A and to other chromosome regions. Eur J Hum Genet 2007;15(1):94-102.

Table 1. *CDKN2A* status in melanoma families and family members participating in the GenoMEL Study by ascertainment center[*]

Center	Total # of families	Number of families with ≥1 member who is *CDKN2A* genotyped	Number of family members with known *CDKN2A* genotype	Number of family members phenotyped with known *CDKN2A* genotype
Barcelona, ES	25	25	116	83
Bethesda, US	49	48	782	468
Cesena, IT	24	24	116	17
Copenhagen, DK	18	15	18	0
Genoa, IT	14	14	45	31
Leeds, GB	76	74	282	216
Leiden, NL	61	59	600	240
Ljubljana, SI	4	4	11	10
Lund, SE	8	8	97	74
Montevideo, UY	4	4	23	23
Paris, FR	181	181	588	161
Philadelphia, US	36	36	104	47
Porto Alegre, BR	10	5	12	4
Queensland, AU	230	22	172	11
Riga, LV	5	5	8	5
Salt Lake City, US	1	1	3	3
Santiago, CL	2	2	6	6
São Paulo, BR	12	7	28	25
Stockholm, SE	27	25	118	113
Sydney, AU	319	311	820	85
Tel Aviv, IL	28	21	25	25
Valencia, ES	15	5	16	4
Total	**1,149**	**896**	**3,990**	**1,651**

[*] Melanoma families are defined by 3 or more members with a verified melanoma or 2 first degree relatives with verified melanomas. Married-in relatives not belonging to a melanoma family lineage are excluded.

Table 2. Associations between nevus phenotypes and *CDKN2A* mutational status among members of melanoma families

Nevus Phenotype	Individual *CDKN2A* mutational status	Overall[1]		Cases only (n=757)[2]		Non-cases only (n=894)[2]		
		OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value	p-interaction[6]
2 mm nevi	No known pathogenic Pathogenic	1.00 1.06 (0.92, 1.21)	0.45	1.00 1.06 (0.90, 1.26)	0.49	1.00 0.99 (0.83, 1.19)	0.93	0.45
5 mm nevi	No known pathogenic Pathogenic	1.00 1.26 (0.94, 1.70)	0.18	1.00 1.21 (0.87, 1.69)	0.31	1.00 1.31 (0.86, 1.99)	0.27	0.95
Atypical nevi	No known pathogenic Pathogenic	1.00 1.64 (1.18, 2.28)	0.02	1.00 1.47 (0.92, 2.33)	0.16	1.00 1.98 (1.34, 2.90)	0.01	0.27
Mole gestalt (3 vs. 0)[3]	No known pathogenic Pathogenic	1.00 1.83 (1.25, 2.67)	0.004	1.00 0.90 (0.53, 1.53)	0.69	1.00 2.91 (1.75, 4.82)	0.0001	0.002
Mole gestalt (2 vs. 0)[4]	No known pathogenic Pathogenic	1.00 1.38 (1.00, 1.91)	0.05	1.00 0.79 (0.48, 1.29)	0.35	1.00 1.96 (1.26, 3.06)	0.004	0.02
Mole gestalt (1 vs. 0)[5]	No known pathogenic Pathogenic	1.00 1.21 (0.86, 1.71)	0.28	1.00 0.80 (0.50, 1.29)	0.36	1.00 1.42 (0.89, 2.25)	0.15	0.25

[1]Adjusted for age at phenotyping, gender, age at phenotyping*gender, melanoma affected status, center, and familial clustering within study center. Married-in relatives not belonging to a melanoma family lineage are excluded. P-values correspond to overall score tests.

[2]Adjusted for age at phenotyping, gender, age at phenotyping*gender, center, and familial clustering within study center; Married-in relatives not belonging to a melanoma family lineage are excluded. P-values correspond to overall score tests.

[3] Mole gestalt is modeled in a GEE model excluding individuals with values of "1" and "2" for mole gestalt to achieve the contrast estimates.

[4] Mole gestalt is modeled in a GEE model excluding individuals with values of "1" and "3" for mole gestalt to achieve the contrast estimates.

[5] Mole gestalt is modeled in a GEE model excluding individuals with values of "2" and "3" for mole gestalt to achieve the contrast estimates.

[6] P-value for the association between the interaction of *CDKN2A* mutation carriage with case status and nevus phenotype.

Figure Legend

Figure 1. 2 mm, 5 mm, and atypical nevus count distributions among GenoMEL melanoma family members across all ascertainment centers according to *CDKN2A* mutational status. Crude nevus counts are plotted and are not representative of center-specific measures adopted for statistical modeling. Heavy horizonal lines indicate 50th percentile counts, boxes indicate 25th and 75th percentile counts, whiskers indicate 5th and 95th percentile counts, and circles represent values in the top or bottom 5% of counts.