ABSTRACT

Gilteritinib is a potent and selective FLT3 kinase inhibitor with single-agent clinical efficacy in relapsed/refractory FLT3-mutated acute myeloid leukemia (AML). In this context, however, gilteritinib is not curative, and response duration is limited by the development of secondary resistance. To evaluate resistance mechanisms, we analyzed baseline and progression samples from patients treated on clinical trials of gilteritinib. Targeted next-generation sequencing at the time of AML progression on gilteritinib identified treatment-emergent mutations that activate RAS/MAPK pathway signaling, most commonly in NRAS or KRAS. Less frequently, secondary FLT3-F691L gatekeeper mutations or BCR-ABL1 fusions were identified at progression. Single-cell targeted DNA sequencing revealed diverse patterns of clonal selection and evolution in response to FLT3 inhibition, including the emergence of RAS mutations in FLT3-mutated subclones, the expansion of alternative wild-type FLT3 subclones, or both patterns simultaneously. These data illustrate dynamic and complex changes in clonal architecture underlying response and resistance to mutation-selective tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy in AML.

SIGNIFICANCE: Comprehensive serial genotyping of AML specimens from patients treated with the selective FLT3 inhibitor gilteritinib demonstrates that complex, heterogeneous patterns of clonal selection and evolution mediate clinical resistance to tyrosine kinase inhibition in FLT3-mutated AML. Our data support the development of combinatorial targeted therapeutic approaches for advanced AML.

See related commentary by Wei and Roberts, p. 998.
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INTRODUCTION

Driver mutations in the class III receptor tyrosine kinase \textit{FLT3} occur in approximately one third of patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML; ref. 1). \textit{FLT3} internal tandem duplication (\textit{FLT3}-ITD) and tyrosine kinase domain (TKD) mutations cause the constitutive activation of \textit{FLT3} and its downstream signaling pathways, including PI3K/AKT/mTOR, RAS/MAPK, and STAT5 (2–4). \textit{FLT3}-ITD mutations in particular are associated with a poor prognosis, primarily due to an increased risk of relapse (5). As responses to salvage chemotherapy in patients with relapsed and/or refractory \textit{FLT3}-mutant AML are suboptimal (6), a number of small-molecule kinase inhibitors targeting \textit{FLT3} have been developed (7–12).

The addition of the multikinase inhibitor midostaurin to front-line chemotherapy has been shown to improve survival in \textit{FLT3}-mutated AML (13). In the relapsed/refractory setting, the potent and selective second-generation \textit{FLT3} inhibitors gilteritinib, quizartinib, and crenolanib have demonstrated promising activity as monotherapies (12, 14–17). In the pivotal phase III ADMIRAL trial (NCT02421939), which compared gilteritinib with salvage chemotherapy in patients with relapsed and/or refractory \textit{FLT3}-mutant AML, gilteritinib was associated with a significant improvement in overall survival (12). Quizartinib has also been shown to improve survival compared with salvage chemotherapy (18). Based on response rates from ADMIRAL and prior single-agent trials, gilteritinib was recently approved by the FDA.

Despite high initial response rates, monotherapy with \textit{FLT3} inhibitors is limited by the development of resistance leading to leukemia relapse, typically within weeks to months (14–17). \textbf{In vitro} saturation mutagenesis studies predicted that, due to its activity as a type II kinase inhibitor, on-target mutations in the \textit{FLT3} kinase activation loop at D835 or at the gatekeeper residue F691 would generate resistance to quizartinib (8). These predictions were confirmed in clinical studies which found that patients who responded and subsequently became resistant to quizartinib uniformly developed secondary \textit{FLT3} mutations at D835 or, less commonly, at F691L. On-target resistance mutations in \textit{FLT3} at D835 have similarly been reported with sorafenib, another type II \textit{FLT3} inhibitor (19).
Importantly, the diversity of FLT3-D835 mutations that arise and confer resistance to quizartinib is poorly resolved by bulk sequencing. Through single-cell genotyping, we previously found that on-target FLT3-D835 mutations that confer resistance to quizartinib are highly polyclonal and can be identified both in clonal cells containing a FLT3-ITD and in subclones lacking a FLT3-ITD (20). We also showed that clonal populations with a FLT3-ITD but no D835 resistance mutation and wild-type FLT3 (FLT3-WT) may coexist at relapse (20). We therefore hypothesized that both on- and off-target mechanisms underlie resistance to FLT3 tyrosine kinase inhibitors and that off-target mechanisms may be particularly important in driving resistance to agents that are more broadly able to inhibit activating FLT3 mutations.

In contrast to quizartinib, gilteritinib and crenolanib are type I kinase inhibitors and inhibit the FLT3 kinase in both its active and inactive conformations (9–11). For this reason, they retain low nanomolar activity in cellular assays against FLT3-D835 and FLT3-F691 substitutions, although the latter requires a relatively higher drug concentration (9–11). The activity of these agents against FLT3-D835 mutations has been confirmed in clinical trials (14, 17). Zhang and colleagues recently performed whole-exome and targeted sequencing of patient samples collected before and after crenolanib treatment and found that on-target secondary mutations in FLT3 are uncommon (21). Their results suggested that a variety of mechanisms may contribute to crenolanib resistance, including the acquisition of various somatic mutations and the expansion of preexisting FLT3-WT subclones (21). Mechanisms of acquired resistance to gilteritinib have not previously been described.

To define mechanisms of gilteritinib resistance, we analyzed the mutation profile of paired samples collected from patients with relapsed and/or refractory FLT3-mutated AML pre- and post-gilteritinib therapy. We found that although on-target FLT3-F691L mutations occur on gilteritinib in a minority of patients, the most common mechanism of resistance to gilteritinib is the acquisition of activating RAS pathway mutations. To understand how clonal diversity in AML may contribute to the development of resistance to targeted FLT3 inhibition, we next performed single-cell targeted DNA sequencing on serial samples collected from patients treated with gilteritinib. Our findings highlight the impact of clonal heterogeneity on the development of resistance to selective FLT3 inhibition in AML.

RESULTS

Patient Cohort

Fifty-nine patients with relapsed and/or refractory FLT3-mutated AML who were enrolled on clinical trials of single-agent gilteritinib (NCT02014558, NCT02421939) at three institutions, received gilteritinib at FLT3-inhibitory doses (280 mg/day; ref. 14), and separately consented for institutional tissue banking protocols were considered for inclusion in our cohort. Eighteen subjects were excluded due to a lack of response data and/or samples for analysis (Supplementary Fig. S1). Thus, 41 subjects with paired peripheral blood or bone marrow aspirate samples collected before and after treatment with gilteritinib were studied.

Baseline patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Most subjects (36/41, 87.8%) had FLT3-ITD mutations, including 7 (17.1%) with both ITD and TKD mutations (all D835) at the time of study entry. Five subjects (12.2%) had FLT3-D835 mutations only. Six patients (14.6%) had previously received a FLT3 inhibitor, either sorafenib (n = 5) or quizartinib (n = 1). The 32 subjects in our cohort who were treated on the phase I/II CHRYSALIS study (NCT02014558) were enriched for gilteritinib responders (overall response rate 78.1%) in comparison with the overall study cohort (overall response rate 52% among the patients with FLT3 mutations who received gilteritinib doses ≥ 80 mg/day; ref. 14). Similar to the larger CHRYSALIS trial cohort (14), patients received gilteritinib for a median duration of 20.0 weeks (range, 3.7–76.7 weeks). A majority of subjects ultimately discontinued gilteritinib due to relapse and progression of AML (Supplementary Table S1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender, male</td>
<td>19 (46.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years, median (range)</td>
<td>67 (22–87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of AML</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De novo</td>
<td>27 (65.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary to MDS or MPN</td>
<td>13 (31.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy-related*</td>
<td>2 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of prior therapies, range</td>
<td>2 (1–7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior therapies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive induction chemotherapy</td>
<td>35 (85.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allogeneic HSCT</td>
<td>10 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLT3 inhibitor</td>
<td>6 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorafenib</td>
<td>5 (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizartinib</td>
<td>1 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral WBC x 10^9 cells/L, median (interquartile range)</td>
<td>9.3 (3.4–25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral blast %, median (interquartile range)</td>
<td>56 (13.5–79.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone marrow blast %, median (interquartile range)</td>
<td>75 (49–85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytogenetic risk category (34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>29 (70.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>11 (26.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLT3 mutation status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD positive</td>
<td>36 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both ITD and D835 positive</td>
<td>7 (17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLT3-D835 only positive</td>
<td>5 (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM1 mutation status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>19 (46.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>22 (53.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: MDS, myelodysplastic syndrome; MPN, myeloproliferative neoplasm; NPM1, nucleophosmin 1; WBC, white blood cell count.
*One subject had both therapy-related AML and a history of MDS.

Table 1. Patient characteristics at study entry
RAS Pathway Mutations Are Common Following Gilteritinib Treatment

As gilteritinib is active against FLT3-D835 and other TKD mutations (11), we hypothesized that resistance to gilteritinib might be mediated by other mutations in FLT3 that impair drug binding, mutations that activate common downstream signaling pathways, and/or clonal selection for FLT3-WT leukemic subclones. To study this, we performed targeted next-generation sequencing (NGS) on paired samples collected from patients pre- and post-gilteritinib. Results are summarized in Fig. 1 and described here. At the time of initiating therapy, all patients studied had FLT3 mutations, and the majority had cooperating mutations in DNMT3A and/or NPM1 (Fig. 1, top, note blue and gray boxes).

Treatment-emergent RAS/MAPK pathway mutations were identified in 15 of 41 (36.6%) patients (Fig. 1, bottom plot, shown in red; and Table 2). Activating mutations in NRAS

![Figure 1](https://example.com/figure1.png)

**Figure 1.** Mutations detected during gilteritinib therapy in relapsed and/or refractory FLT3-mutated AML. Each column shows the results of targeted NGS performed on paired samples collected from a unique patient before (top plot) and after (bottom plot) treatment with gilteritinib monotherapy. All patients had a FLT3-ITD and/or FLT3-D835 mutation at baseline (represented by blue boxes), and in the majority of patients these FLT3 mutations were also identified at the completion of gilteritinib therapy. Other mutations present in the baseline samples are shown in gray. New mutations detected after gilteritinib are indicated by red boxes, and purple boxes indicate that cytogenetic evolution was observed. NRAS and/or KRAS mutations were the most common new mutations detected after gilteritinib. Secondary mutations in FLT3 at the F691L residue and new BCR-ABL1 fusions were also identified following gilteritinib therapy. RTK, receptor tyrosine kinase.
were detected in 13 subjects (31.7%) and mutations in KRAS in 3 patients (7.3%). In 8 of 15 (53.3%) patients, multiple RAS pathway mutations were observed, including 2 patients with both KRAS and NRAS mutations and 2 additional subjects with ≥2 mutations in NRAS, suggesting the presence of multiple RAS-mutated subclones. Of note, no patients in our cohort had detectable NRAS or KRAS mutations at baseline at the level of sensitivity of our targeted NGS assay [4% variant allele frequency (VAF)]. Following gilteritinib, new FLT3-F691 mutations were detected in 3 subjects (7.3%), whereas CBL mutations were detected in 2 subjects (4.9%) and a BRAF mutation in 1 subject (2.4%). These results demonstrate that RAS/MAPK pathway mutations are common following gilteritinib in patients with relapsed/refractory AML and suggest that this is a clinically significant mechanism of resistance.

Among the patients who did not have RAS pathway mutations following gilteritinib, secondary FLT3-F691L mutations were identified in 5 (12.2% of patients overall). An additional 2 patients acquired variants of uncertain significance (VUS) in FLT3 that have not previously been characterized (FLT3-M837K and FLT3-C35S; Supplementary Table S2). Based on its location in the kinase activation loop and the activity of gilteritinib against activation loop mutations, we considered the M837K mutation an unlikely source of clinical resistance. Expression of both FLT3-M837K and FLT3-C35S in Ba/F3 cells validated that they do not confer resistance to gilteritinib (Supplementary Fig. S2A and S2B).

Additional disease-associated mutations detected after gilteritinib included WT1 in 2 subjects and CEBPA, IDH2, RUNXI, and TBL1XR1 in 1 subject each. In all but one of these cases, additional mutations in RAS, FLT3-F691L, or new cytogenetic abnormalities were also seen at the time of progression, and thus the role of these mutations in promoting resistance is uncertain. Cytogenetic evolution was common on gilteritinib. Of the 29 patients with available cytogenetic data both pre- and post-gilteritinib, 16 (55.2%) had new chromosomal abnormalities identified (shown in Supplementary Table S3). This includes 2 patients with new BCR-ABL1 fusions detected, consistent with a prior case report from another group (22). These data suggest that ongoing clonal hematopoiesis with the acquisition of new genetic alterations may contribute to the development of resistance to gilteritinib mono-therapy in FLT3-mutated AML.

### Heterogeneous Patterns of Clonal Evolution Mediate Resistance to Gilteritinib

Significant intratumoral heterogeneity has been well documented in AML (23–26). Only recently have the first reports of alterations in clonal architecture in response to mutation-specific targeted therapy in AML been published (21, 27). To characterize the clonal selection and evolution that occur in response to selective FLT3 inhibition in AML, we initially tracked the VAF of mutations identified by targeted NGS of bulk DNA extracted from paired patient samples collected prior to and at the conclusion of gilteritinib treatment.

Several distinct patterns of clonal selection on gilteritinib were evident. In a minority of patients (n = 5), FLT3 mutations were not detected at the conclusion of gilteritinib therapy. All 5 of these patients acquired new RAS/MAPK pathway mutations at the time of clinical progression, suggesting that FLT3-negative subclones harboring RAS mutations had expanded (a representative patient is shown in Fig. 2A). In 36 of 41 (87.8%) patients, however, the FLT3 mutations persisted throughout the course of gilteritinib therapy and/or returned at the time of clinical progression. Within this group of patients, the expansion of subclones containing RAS pathway mutations on gilteritinib was observed in 10 of 36 (27.8%) cases (example shown in Fig. 2B). A subset of patients with this pattern of resistance also appeared to have a FLT3-WT subclonal population that expanded on gilteritinib. Results from an illustrative subject are shown in Fig. 2C. This patient had a persistent FLT3-ITD and a new NRAS mutation at the time of disease progression on gilteritinib and also had a subclone containing IDH2 and SF3B1 mutations that expanded on gilteritinib. Clinical responses to gilteritinib and laboratory data from selected timepoints for the patients included in Fig. 2 are summarized in Supplementary Table S4.

In contrast to the variability observed in patients who developed RAS/MAPK pathway mutations on gilteritinib, FLT3-ITD mutations persisted in all 5 patients who developed FLT3-F691L mutations (Fig. 2D). These results are consistent with a model in which a secondary gatekeeper FLT3-F691L mutation impairs binding of the kinase inhibitor. Of note, the development of secondary FLT3-F691 mutations and RAS mutations was mutually exclusive in our cohort, suggesting that either the activation of downstream RAS signaling or the disruption of gilteritinib activity at FLT3 itself is sufficient to confer resistance to gilteritinib.

### Single-Cell Sequencing Reveals Complex and Early Selection of Drug-Resistant Clones

To further define the changes in clonal architecture imputed by bulk targeted NGS analysis, we next performed single-cell DNA sequencing on patient samples using a novel...
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A microfluidic platform (Tapestri). Tapestri technology utilizes a “two-step” droplet-based workflow that prepares single-cell genomic DNA for molecular barcoding (28). Cells are first lysed and chromatin/protein complexes are digested using proteases. After heat inactivation of the proteases, molecular barcodes and PCR reagents are microfluidically added to the lysate drops containing single-cell nucleic acids; droplets are thermocycled and the barcodes are incorporated into amplicons from multiple genomic loci (29). This approach allows for amplicon-based, targeted sequencing of hotspot mutations in a panel of genes that are recurrently mutated in myeloid malignancies at the single-cell level. Because the FLT3-F691L residue is not captured by the current Tapestri sequencing primers, we focused on samples collected from patients with new RAS mutations detected.

Initially, to validate the single-cell analysis, we compared the VAFs of mutations identified with the single-cell Tapestri platform with the VAFs of the same mutations identified by our clinical bulk targeted NGS assay for 3 patients and found a high degree of correlation (Pearson $r^2 \geq 0.9$; Fig. 3A). We next performed single-cell analysis of relapse samples collected from 4 patients in whom RAS mutations were detected at the time of progression. In all 4 cases, single-cell sequencing revealed that the RAS mutations developed in the same clonal populations harboring FLT3 mutations (Fig. 3B; note that each clonal population is shown in a distinct color and that clones with both RAS and FLT3 mutations are shown in red). Of note, in subject #33, additional RAS/MAPK pathway mutant cell populations without concomitant FLT3 mutations were detected by single-cell sequencing. Further single-cell sequencing studies with larger cell numbers will be needed to better understand these observations, as these populations could be artifacts of allele dropout, a recognized limitation of single-cell sequencing assays. Despite this, our finding that RAS mutations develop in FLT3-mutant cells during FLT3 inhibitor therapy supports the concept that activating RAS mutations confer resistance to gilteritinib in vivo.
Figure 3. Single-cell DNA sequencing demonstrates early selection for RAS-mutant clonal populations after treatment with gilteritinib. A, Correlation of VAFs of mutations identified by single-cell sequencing (y-axis) and bulk targeted NGS (x-axis) in samples collected from 3 patients after treatment with gilteritinib. B, Single-cell sequencing after relapse on gilteritinib revealed multiple subclonal populations and demonstrated that RAS mutations develop in subclonal populations harboring FLT3 mutations. Each column represents a different patient, and the different colors represent the unique clonal populations identified. FLT3-mutant/RAS-WT populations are shown in blue. FLT3 and RAS double-mutant populations are shown in red. C–E, Serial single-cell analysis of samples collected from 3 patients at baseline, during gilteritinib therapy, and at the time of AML progression. For each patient, results are shown in both bar graph and fish plot format. The total number of cells sequenced for each sample is listed under the bar graphs. NRAS-mutant populations are shown in red. A small NRAS-mutant population was detected at baseline in the subject shown in D and after only 28 days of gilteritinib treatment in the subject shown in E. In subject #21 (shown in E), a FLT3-WT subclonal population (shown in green) also expanded on gilteritinib. BM, bone marrow; Pt, patient.
We next performed serial single-cell analysis on samples collected from 3 patients at baseline, on treatment, and at progression (Fig. 3C–E). The total number of cells sequenced for each sample is shown under each bar graph and summarized in Supplementary Table S5. In subject #12 (Fig. 3C), no evidence of the NRAS-mutant population (shown in red) was detected until the patient developed overt clinical progression of AML. In contrast, for the other 2 patients, NRAS-mutant subclones that contributed to disease relapse could be detected at low levels prior to gilteritinib treatment (Fig. 3D) or after only 28 days on gilteritinib (Fig. 3E), indicating that, in some cases, drug-resistant clones preexist or are selected for very early on treatment, well before clinical evidence of AML progression.

In the case of subject #30 (shown in Fig. 3D), the NRAS-mutant population, which was detected before treatment in 0.6% of cells, was no longer detectable at the second timepoint. In this case, gilteritinib had been held for elevated liver function tests for 22 days prior to obtaining the second sample (after the patient had achieved a morphologic bone marrow response 28 days into gilteritinib treatment). The FLT3-ITD/NRAS double-mutant clone subsequently reemerged at the third timepoint, after gilteritinib had been reinitiated. The expansion of the FLT3-ITD/NRAS double-mutant clone only under the selective pressure of gilteritinib may reflect a proliferative disadvantage in the absence of drug, which we have also observed in vitro (Fig. 4A), or it could be a result of sampling error related to the limited number of cells sequenced. Of potential clinical importance, in this patient the relapse clone was detectable by single-cell sequencing in the peripheral blood 46 days prior to overt clinical relapse, despite the fact that the patient had only rare detectable circulating blasts.

Another pattern of clonal evolution was evident in subject #21 (shown in Fig. 3E), who in addition to the expansion of a FLT3/NRAS double-mutant clone also had a preexisting FLT3-WT/NRAS-WT subclone containing IDH2 and SF3B1 mutations that expanded on gilteritinib (Fig. 3E). The various clone sizes at several timepoints during therapy illustrate the remodeling of the AML ecosystem that occurs over the course of gilteritinib therapy, with the slow suppression of the remodeling of the AML ecosystem that occurs over the course of drug treatment (Fig. 4A), gilteritinib at a concentration of 25 nmol/L inhibits growth of the parental cell line but not the NRAS-mutated cells (Fig. 4B). Treatment of the MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cell lines with gilteritinib resulted in sustained activation of downstream RAS/MAPK signaling as measured by ERK phosphorylation, despite suppression of AKT and STAT3 phosphorylation immediately downstream of FLT3 (Fig. 4C). NRAS-mutated MOLM-14 cells were also more resistant to apoptosis after gilteritinib treatment, shown in Fig. 4D as the fraction of live cells negative for caspase-3 staining after 48 hours of treatment with 25 nmol/L gilteritinib relative to untreated controls (green bars). To assess the hypothesis that MEK inhibition would abrogate the resistance to gilteritinib observed in NRAS-mutated MOLM-14 cells, we next treated MOLM-14 parental, MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K, and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C cells with gilteritinib-alone (25 nmol/L), trametinib-alone (10 nmol/L), or both and measured the effect on apoptosis and cell growth. Treatment with a combination of gilteritinib and trametinib overcame the resistance to apoptosis and inhibited cell growth in the mutant NRAS cell lines (Fig. 4D and E, shown in purple).

To independently validate these results, we stably transduced MOLM-14 parental cells and a second FLT3-ITD-AML cell line, MV4;11, with doxycycline-inducible NRAS-WT, NRAS-G12C, and NRAS-Q61K overexpression constructs (immunoblots shown in Supplementary Fig. S4A and S4B). Dose-response assessment confirmed that mutant NRAS confers resistance to gilteritinib in both cell lines (Fig. 4F and G), which is abrogated by trametinib (Supplementary Fig. S5A–S5H). A caspase-3 apoptosis assay recapitulated the results from the quinazolinib-selected cell lines (Supplementary Fig. S6). Overall, these data are consistent with the hypothesis that mutant RAS facilitates reactivation of downstream ERK signaling in the presence of a FLT3 inhibitor and that this is sufficient to confer gilteritinib resistance.

As noted above, we observed that patients acquired either FLT3-F691L or RAS pathway mutations on gilteritinib, but not both. Dose-response assessment suggested that FLT3-F691L mutations only modestly increase resistance to gilteritinib (Supplementary Fig. S7), consistent with prior in vitro work (11), and our clinical observations suggested that FLT3-F691L mutations may be selected for at relatively lower doses of gilteritinib. Although this may simply be consistent with the response of FLT3-F691–mutant cells to higher doses of gilteritinib, it suggested to us an approach to model clonal selection in AML cell lines. To do so, we performed a mixing experiment with MOLM-14 parental cells mixed with MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C or MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells expressing a green fluorescent protein and MOLM-14 cells containing a FLT3-F691L mutation [MOLM-14(QS)-FLT3-F691L] and expressing red fluorescent protein (mCherry) at a ratio of 8:1:1. The cell mixtures
Figure 4. NRAS mutations mediate resistance to gilteritinib in vitro which is abrogated by combination therapy with trametinib. A, In the absence of drug treatment, MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C cells (orange line) and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells (red line) are at a growth disadvantage relative to MOLM-14 parental cells (blue line). The y-axis shows fold change in number of viable cells compared with day 0 of treatment. B, Growth of MOLM-14 parental cells (blue line) but not MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C cells (orange line) or MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells (red line) is inhibited when cultured in the presence of gilteritinib (25 nmol/L). C, Immunoblot analysis demonstrated sustained activation of RAS/MAPK signaling as measured by ERK phosphorylation in MOLM-14 parental cells (blue line) but not MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C cells (orange line) or MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells (red line). D, Live cells after 48 hour treatment with gilteritinib at the noted concentrations. Total protein extracts were resolved on a 10% Bis-Tris gel and subjected to immunoblot analysis with the indicated antibodies. Band intensities from images obtained on a LI-COR Odyssey Infrared Imaging System and normalized to a β-actin loading control are shown underneath the relevant bands. E, Gilteritinib (25 nmol/L) and trametinib (10 nmol/L) combination treatment (shown in purple) suppresses growth of MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells. F, Gilteritinib (25 nmol/L) and trametinib (10 nmol/L) combination treatment (shown in purple) suppresses growth of MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells. G, Dose-response curves for MV4-11 cells transduced with tetracycline-inducible NRAS-WT, NRAS-G12C, and NRAS-Q61K constructs. H, Dose-response curves for MV4-11 cell lines. Error bars represent the SD, and statistical analyses were performed using one-way ANOVA, *P ≤ 0.0332, **P ≤ 0.0021, ***P ≤ 0.0002, h, hours, nM, nanomolar; QS, quazatinib-selected.
were cultured for 2 weeks in the presence of gilteritinib at a low (25 nmol/L) or high (250 nmol/L) concentration and analyzed by flow cytometry every 2 to 3 days to assess the proportion of each cell line over time. At a low dose of gilteritinib, both the MOLM-14(QS)-FLT3-F691L and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS cell lines were resistant to gilteritinib, and the MOLM-14(QS)-FLT3-F691L cells became the predominant population over time (Fig. 5A–D). At a high concentration of gilteritinib, however, more NRAS-mutant cells survived. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that dose of inhibitor may affect clonal selection in AML.

**DISCUSSION**

Until recently AML has been treated with nonspecific chemotherapy, but targeted therapies are being rapidly developed and approved. Although response rates to the selective FLT3 inhibitors gilteritinib, quizartinib, and crenolanib are high in patients with relapsed and refractory FLT3-mutated AML, nearly all responders eventually develop secondary resistance to therapy and disease progression [with the possible exception of select patients bridged to allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT)]. Here, we have shown that the expansion of clones containing mutations in the RAS pathway, primarily NRAS and KRAS, is a common and clinically important mechanism of secondary resistance to the potent and selective FLT3 inhibitor gilteritinib. Gilteritinib was approved by the FDA in November 2018 based on response rates observed on the phase III trial and prior studies in relapsed/refractory FLT3-mutated AML (12, 14, 18); quizartinib has also been submitted for FDA review for a similar patient population. Thus, the results described here have immediate clinical relevance.

We note some limitations of our study. Our mutational analysis was performed on 41 paired samples from three medical centers. The original trial designs did not mandate end-of-treatment genetic analysis, so our results may reflect a selection bias for patients who had cells or DNA available. Furthermore, we have defined mechanisms of resistance involving reactivation of signaling in only 22 of the 41 patients studied (15 RAS pathway, 5 FLT3-F691L, 2 BCR-ABL1 fusions) using targeted sequencing and chromosome metaphase analysis. Whole-exome sequencing of the remaining patient samples may reveal additional resistance mechanisms.

It is notable that we often observed mutations in multiple genes in the RAS/MAPK pathway in the same patient at the time of AML progression on gilteritinib. Zhang and colleagues recently performed whole-exome sequencing on samples collected before and after at least 28 days of crenolanib therapy in patients with relapsed and/or refractory FLT3-mutated AML and identified a number of genetic and epigenetic factors that may contribute to crenolanib resistance, including mutations in TET2, IDH1, IDH2, NRAS, PTPN11, and TP53, among others (21). In their analysis of 30 paired baseline and on-treatment samples, only 1 new NRAS mutation and 2 new PTPN11 mutations were detected after initiation of crenolanib (21). However, a number of subjects in their study (20%; 10/50) had RAS pathway mutations present at baseline prior to the initiation of crenolanib, which may relate to the high proportion of patients in their cohort (62%; 31/50) who had previously received other FLT3 inhibitors including sorafenib, quizartinib, and/or gilteritinib (21). In contrast, only 14.6% (6/41) of patients in our gilteritinib cohort had received a prior FLT3 inhibitor, and only 2 patients had RAS pathway mutations (both PTPN11) detectable by standard NGS at baseline.

Zhang and colleagues did observe an enrichment in RAS pathway mutations in patients who did not have a clinical response to crenolanib and that these mutations tended to persist and/or expand on crenolanib (21), consistent with our data suggesting that RAS pathway activation mediates resistance to selective FLT3 inhibition. Their analysis of the VAFs of the mutations identified in serial samples collected during crenolanib treatment suggested that PTPN11 but not NRAS or KRAS mutations may occur in the same clonal populations harboring FLT3 mutations (21). However, our single-cell analysis showed that the NRAS and KRAS mutations identified following gilteritinib therapy were present in clonal cell populations containing FLT3 mutations in the samples tested and that PTPN11 mutations occurred in both FLT3-WT and FLT3-mutated populations, illustrating the value of single-cell sequencing methods for elucidating mechanisms of resistance to targeted therapies.

Our single-cell sequencing analysis also demonstrated that the expansion of clones containing RAS mutations may significantly precede the development of overt clinical resistance to gilteritinib. Whether samples collected from the marrow may be more sensitive than those collected from peripheral blood for the early detection of mutations is currently unknown and will need to be assessed in future studies. It is also notable that a small NRAS-mutant population was detectable by single-cell sequencing prior to the start of gilteritinib therapy in only 1 of the 3 patients that had longitudinal samples analyzed, although this could be a result of the limited number of cells that are able to be sequenced by current single-cell DNA-sequencing technology. Regardless, our data suggest that monitoring for RAS and other MAPK pathway mutations from the start of gilteritinib therapy could provide a window for early intervention prior to overt relapse. In particular, our studies show that combinatorial signal inhibition with FLT3 and MEK inhibitors may overcome RAS/MAPK pathway-mediated resistance to gilteritinib and suggest an avenue for further exploration.

Of the 5 patients with FLT3-F691L mutations detected after gilteritinib treatment, 4 were treated at gilteritinib doses of 80 to 120 mg per day, raising the question of whether relatively lower doses of gilteritinib (as opposed to 200 mg daily) may preferentially select for FLT3-F691L mutations. Only 1 patient developed a new FLT3-F691L mutation while on a gilteritinib dose of 200 mg daily, although this patient was on gilteritinib maintenance therapy following allogeneic HSCT and developed the FLT3-F691L mutation at the time of disease relapse. Our functional modeling also suggested that clone sizes may be actively modified depending on the dose of inhibitor. Previous preclinical work demonstrated that although gilteritinib retains activity against FLT3-F691L mutations, a relatively higher concentration of gilteritinib is required in comparison to FLT3-ITD or FLT3-D835 mutations in vitro (11). We hypothesize that, in patients, lower doses of gilteritinib (i.e., 80–120 mg daily) may not achieve
in vivo drug levels that are sufficient to prevent development of FLT3-F691L gatekeeper mutations; however, an inadequate number of patients with this mutation were identified in our study to confirm this, and so this question will need to be evaluated in larger patient cohorts.

Multiple studies have demonstrated the importance of clonal diversity in AML in understanding resistance to molecularly targeted agents, including a recent study that outlined alterations in clone size during response and resistance to the mutant IDH2 inhibitor enasidenib (27). In this study, secondary resistance to enasidenib appeared to occur largely via acquisition of a diverse number of off-target leukemogenic mutations (27). On-target secondary resistance through mutational activation of mutant IDH1 was also observed in this study and has also been described in a separate report (30), but appears to be rare. Our results provide a detailed analysis of clonal evolution after FLT3 inhibitor therapy in AML. Through single-cell targeted resequencing, we have...
demonstrated the expansion of FLT3^+^ RAS-mutant clones and the expansion of previously present but small FLT3-WT clones in response to single-agent FLT3 inhibition in relapsed and refractory FLT3-mutated AML. The complex patterns of clonal evolution we observed in some patients—including the simultaneous expansion of cells lacking either FLT3-ITD or MAPK pathway activating mutations and those gaining a RAS mutation—indicate that a broader approach to enhance antileukemic cytotoxicity will be needed to effectively treat AML. Current approaches being studied include adding FLT3 inhibitors to frontline chemotherapy and combining gilteritinib with drugs that act on the apoptotic machinery (e.g., the BCL2 antagonist venetoclax).

Our data demonstrate that clonal evolution in AML after targeted therapy can be elucidated at high resolution by single-cell sequencing and support the hypothesis of Peter Nowell that cure of human malignancies will require eradication of multiple co-occurring subclones (31). Our hope is that such studies will one day lead to rational, targeted, and dynamic combinatorial approaches that prolong response or facilitate cure in AML without transplantation or reliance on a traditional cytotoxic backbone, as is now true for acute promyelocytic leukemia (32). These results also enhance our understanding of the diversity of clonal evolution that may also be seen in other tumors treated with targeted therapies and provide a starting point to illustrate how therapy could theoretically be dynamically modified to prolong clinical response.

**METHODS**

**Patients and Samples**

We studied a subset of patients with relapsed and/or refractory FLT3-mutated AML who were enrolled on two large multicenter clinical trials of gilteritinib monotherapy at one of three institutions: the University of Pennsylvania, the University of California, San Francisco, or Roswell Park Cancer Institute. The larger gilteritinib study protocols and consent forms did not include end-of-treatment sample collection for genetic analyses; therefore, samples from all of the patients treated on these trials were not available for analysis. Details of the phase I/II study (CHRYSalIS, NCT02104558) have previously been published (14). Initial results from the phase II trial (ADMIRAL, NCT02421939) were recently presented (12), and detailed results will be published elsewhere.

Patients considered for inclusion in our study cohort were treated with FLT3-inhibitory doses of gilteritinib (280 mg/day; ref. 14) and separately consented for sample collection in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki under local Institutional Review Board–approved tissue banking protocols. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Patients included in this analysis had clinical response data as well as paired pre- and post-gilteritinib peripheral blood and/or bone marrow aspiration samples available for analysis. The majority of the post-gilteritinib samples were collected while the patient was still on gilteritinib or within 1 week of when the drug was withheld, often during the end-of-treatment study visit. There were 2 patients whose samples were collected >1 week (10 days and 24 days) after gilteritinib discontinuation. All post-gilteritinib samples were collected before the patients received any subsequent lines of therapy.

**Cell Lines**

The FLT3-ITD-positive AML cell lines MOLM-14 and MV4;11 were a gift from Dr. Scott Kogan (University of California, San Francisco) in 2008. Cell lines resistant to FLT3 inhibitors were generated by culturing parental MOLM-14 cells in media containing escalating doses of quizartinib (0.5 to 20 nmol/L). Resistant cells were subcloned, and Sanger sequencing performed. Two cell lines generated by this method were observed to have activating NRAS mutations at G12C and Q61K, referred to as MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K, respectively. Another cell line generated in the same manner has a secondary FLT3 mutation (FLT3-f691l) and is referred to as MOLM-14(QS)-FLT3-f691L. To generate MOLM-14- and MV4;11-inducible expression cell lines, NRAS mutations in a Gateway entry pDONR223 backbone (Addgene) or FLT3 mutations in a Gateway entry pENTR 2B backbone (Invitrogen) were cloned into a Gateway tetracycline-inducible destination vector, pCW57.1 (Addgene), using Gateway LR Clonase II Enzyme mix (Invitrogen). Forty-eight hours following lentiviral infection, cells were selected with puromycin. Cells lines were cultured in RPMI-1640 with 10% FBS and 1% penicillin/streptomycin/1-glutamine and tested negative for Mycoplasma by the MycoAlert PLUS Mycoplasma Detection Kit (Lonza). Experiments were performed within 1 month of cell line thawing. Cell line authentication was performed at the University of California, Berkeley, DNA Sequencing Facility using short tandem repeat DNA profiling.

**Inhibitors**

Gilteritinib was a gift from Astellas Pharma Inc. Trametinib was purchased from Selleckchem.

**Cell Growth and Apoptosis Assays**

MOLM-14 parental cells, MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C, and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells were seeded in triplicate at a concentration of 2 × 10^5^ cells/mL in 3 mL total volume in a 12-well tissue-culture dish with the indicated inhibitor concentrations. Cells were counted every 2 to 3 days by Trypan blue exclusion and normalized to viable cell count on day 0. Apoptosis experiments were conducted using flow cytometry after staining for cleaved caspase-3 using anti-active caspase-3 antibody (BD Biosciences) in cells fixed and permeabilized after 48 hours of drug treatment. Percentage of cells negative for caspase-3 staining in each treatment condition was normalized to caspase-3-negative live cells from a vehicle-treated control population.

**Immunoprecipitation and Immunoblotting Assays**

MOLM-14, MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C, and MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells were plated in RPMI-1640 with 10% FBS and 1% penicillin/streptomycin/glutamine and treated with small-molecule inhibitors at the indicated concentrations. After a 1-hour incubation, cells were washed in PBS and lysed in buffer (50 mmol/L HEPES, pH 7.4, 10% glycerol, 150 mmol/L NaCl, 1% Triton X-100, 1 mmol/L EDTA, 1 mmol/L EGTA, and 1.5 mmol/L MgCl2) supplemented with protease and phosphatase inhibitors. The lysate was clarified by centrifugation and quantitated by BCA assay (Thermo Scientific). FLT3 was immunoprecipitated from 400 μg of total protein using anti-FLT3 (8F2) antibody (Cell Signaling Technology) with samples then resolved on a 10% Bis-Tris gel and transferred to nitrocellulose membranes. Immunoblotting was performed using anti-phosphotyrosine clone 4G10 antibody (EMD Millipore) and anti-FLT3 (8F2) antibody. Remaining lysate was separately used for Western immunoblotting using anti–phospho-STAT5 (Tyr 694), anti-STAT5 (D206Y), anti-phospho-ERK1/2 (Thr202/Tyr204), anti-ERK1/2 (3A7), and anti–phospho-AKT (Ser473), anti-AKT, and anti–β-Actin (Cell Signaling Technology).

**Doxycycline-Inducible NRAS and FLT3 Cell Line Experiments**

MOLM-14 and MV4;11 cells stably transduced with a tetracycline-inducible NRAS-mutant or FLT3-mutant vector were stimulated for
24 hours with doxycycline at a dose of 0.1 or 1.0 μg/mL, respectively, and then maintained in RPMI media with the same concentration of doxycycline for the duration of an experiment. Caspase experiments and Western blotting were performed using the same protocols described above. Phospho-FLT3 and NRAS induction were detected by Western blot using anti-phospho-FLT3 (Tyr 591) antibody (Cell Signaling Technology) and anti-RAS (clone RAS10) antibody (EMD Millipore). For viability studies, cells were seeded in 96-well plates and exposed to an increasing concentration of gilteritinib for 48 hours, either alone or in combination with a fixed 10 nmol/L dose of trametinib. Cell viability for each treatment condition (plated in technical triplicate) was measured using CellTiter-Glo Luminescent Cell Viability Assay (Promega) and normalized to an untreated control (Cell Signaling Technology) and anti-RAS (clone RAS10) antibody by Western blot using anti–phospho-FLT3 (Tyr 591) antibody and Western blotting were performed using the same protocols and then maintained in RPMI media with the same concentration of xycycline at a dose of 0.1 or 1.0 μg/mL, respectively.

Mixing Experiments
MOLM-14 parental cells were mixed with MOLM-14(QS)-FLT3-F691L cells expressing a red fluorescent protein (mCherry) and with MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-G12C or MOLM-14(QS)-NRAS-Q61K cells expressing a green fluorescent protein (ZsGreen or GFP) at a ratio of 8:1:1 at a concentration of 1 × 10^6 total cells/mL. The cell mixtures were treated with 25 or 250 nmol/L gilteritinib for 2 weeks and passed into media with fresh drug when necessary. Every 2 to 3 days, the cell mixtures were incubated with DAPI to stain dead cells and analyzed on a Becton Dickinson Fortessa flow cytometer to determine the viable proportion of each cell line over time.

Targeted NGS
Following DNA extraction, targeted NGS of hotspots in a panel of 33 genes (version 1) or 68 genes (version 2; Supplementary Table S6) associated with hematologic malignancies was performed by the Center for Personalized Diagnostics at the University of Pennsylvania as previously described (33). The mean coverage was 2,500× across the panel, and the minimum read depth for each amplicon was 250×. The lowest reportable VAF was 4% for all genes in the panel except FLT3-ITD and NPM1 where the lowest reportable VAF was 2%. Mutations were classified as disease-associated (either pathogenic or probably disease-associated), VUS, likely benign, or benign based on review of the literature and publicly available databases. Only disease-associated mutations are included in this analysis.

Single-Cell DNA Sequencing
Single-cell sequencing was performed using Mission Bio’s Tapestry platform, which assesses hotspot mutations in ASXL1, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, GATA2, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, NRAS, PTEN, RUNX1, SF3B1, SRSF2, TP53, U2AF1, and WTI, according to the manufacturer’s protocol. Briefly, cryopreserved bone marrow aspirates or peripheral blood mononuclear cells were thawed and counted prior to loading approximately 150,000 cells onto the Tapestry microfluidic cartridge. Cells were emulsified with lysis reagent and incubated at 50°C prior to thermally inactivating the protease. The emulsion containing the lysates from protease-treated single cells was then microfluidically combined with targeted gene-specific primers, PCR reagents, and hydrogel beads carrying cell-identifying molecular barcodes using the Tapestry instrument and cartridge. Following generation of this second PCR, PCR-ready emulsion, molecular barcodes were photoconvertably released from the hydrogels with UV exposure, and the emulsion was thermocycled to incorporate the barcode identifiers into amplified DNA from the targeted genomic loci. The emulsions were then broken using perfluoro-1-octanol and the aqueous fraction was diluted in water and collected for DNA purification with SPRI beads (Beckman Coulter). Sample indexes and illumina adapter sequences were then added via a 10-cycle PCR reaction, and the amplified material was then SPRI purified a second time. Following the second PCR and SPRI purification, full-length amplicons were ready for quantification and sequencing. Libraries were analyzed on a DNA 1000 assay chip with a Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies), and sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq with either 150 or 250 bp paired-end chemistry. A single sequencing run was performed for each barcoded single-cell library prepared with our microfluidic workflow. A 5% ratio of PhiX DNA was used in the sequencing runs. Sequencing data were processed using Mission Bio’s Tapestry Pipeline (trim adapters using cutadapt, sequence alignment to human reference genome hg19, barcode demultiplexing, cell-based genotype calling using GATK/ Haplotypecaller). Data were analyzed using Mission Bio’s Tapestry Insights software package and visualized using R software.
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