**Supplemental Table 5: Examples of Studies Comparing ctDNA and Tissue Biopsy Genomics**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Disease** | **Numbers of Patients (n) with matched Tissue and Liquid Samples** | **Foundation Medicine Tissue Versus Guardant**  **Concordance Information** | **References** |
| Chae et. al. | Breast cancer | 45 | Across all genes, concordance was 91.0% to 94.2%. When only considering genomic alterations in either assay (e.g., excluding wild type/wild type genes), concordance was 10.8% to 15.1% with full plus partial concordance of 13.8% to 19.3% | 23 |
| Riviere et. al. | GI cancers | 105 | Concordance across the 16 genes evaluable for amplifications in both ctDNA and tissue found overall concordance of 97%, kappa correlation of 0.251, and a *P* value by McNemar's exact test of 0.0066. | 24 |
| Schrock et. al. | GI cancers | 25 | 86% of alterations detected in tissue were also detected in ctDNA, 63% of alterations detected in ctDNA were also detected in matched tissue | 25 |
| Schwaederle et. al. | Solid tumors | 101 | 22/ 63 patients (35%) had ≥1 alteration in common between tissue and ctDNA. | 26 |