research effort accompanying the randomized clinical trial EORTC26981/NCIC CE.3 indeed showed that the benefit from TMZ was mainly confined to patients whose tumors carried an epigenetically inactivated MGMT gene. At 2 years, 46% of the patients treated with TMZ/radiotherapy and whose tumors had a methylated MGMT promoter survived, compared with only 14% for the patients with an unmethylated MGMT status (overall log-rank P = 0.0001). Prospective validation of this factor for prediction of benefit from TMZ is ongoing.

However, even in the cohort of patients with a methylated MGMT overall survival remains unsatisfactory and extremely variable, indicating additional mechanisms of treatment resistance. A first step is the identification of relevant molecular mechanisms driving the aggressive biological behavior of glioblastoma. We investigated glioblastoma gene expression profiles and identified new independent mechanisms of resistance to this treatment that may be targeted as part of an improved trial design.

Conclusions: To date, the test for the MGMT-methylation status is the only tool available that may direct the choice for alkylating agents in glioblastoma patients, but many others may hopefully become part of an arsenal to stratify patients to respective targeted therapies within the next years.

S22

Biomarkers of brain tumors to EGFR-TKI

I. Mellinghoff. *Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York, USA*

Glioblastoma is one of the most aggressive human cancers with a median survival of about 15 months despite optimal therapy with surgery, radiation, and chemotherapy. Reasons for this dismal track record of current therapeutics are unknown and are likely to include disease-specific genetic abnormalities, limited penetration of therapeutics across the blood-brain barrier, and the difficulty to obtain serial tissue samples for the monitoring of tumor cell response to therapy. Since about 40% of primary glioblastomas harbor amplification of the EGFR gene locus and often express a mutant EGF receptor with constitutively activity due to an in-frame truncation within the ligand-binding domain (EGFRvIII), inhibition of EGFR signaling presents a molecularly compelling strategy for the treatment of glioblastoma. We and others have observed clear antitumor activity of small molecule EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (EGFR TKIs) in 10−20% of glioblastoma patients. Clinical response was highly correlated with coexpression in tumor cells of the tumor suppressor PTEN and EGFRvIII. We have also identified missense mutations in the extracellular domain of EGFR as novel mechanisms for oncogenic EGFR conversion in glioblastoma. These observations raise a number of questions for the clinical evaluation and optimal deployment of EGFR kinase inhibitors in glioblastoma which will be discussed in this presentation.

S23

Biomarkers of lung cancer response to EGFR-TKI

B. Johnson. *Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, USA*

Introduction: More than three years have passed since mutations of the tyrosine kinase domain of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) were discovered in patients with lung cancer who had dramatic clinical responses to treatment with gefitinib. The other common genomic changes that arise in lung cancer that have an impact on EGFR-TKI sensitivity include KRAS mutations, secondary T790M mutations in EGFR, and MET amplification. The retrospective studies have shown that EGFR mutations are closely associated with response while EGFR copy number and EGFR detection by immunohistochemistry are most closely associated with a prolongation in time to progression and survival in randomized studies of EGFR-TKI versus placebo. These retrospective studies have now led to prospective studies incorporating these different biomarkers of response and outcome into trials using EGFR-TKIs as therapeutic agents.

Main Message: Prospective studies of lung cancer patients with EGFR mutations treated with gefitinib and erlotinib have reported a response rate of approximately 80%, a median time to progression in excess of approximately one year, and a median survival in excess of two years. This has led to ongoing trials in Japan comparing patients with EGFR mutations being treated with either chemotherapy or gefitinib and the development of commercial tests to determine if the DNA from tumors retrieved from patients with adenocarcinoma have a mutation of the EGFR. The EGFR copy number assessments by FISH have been prospectively incorporated into trials that have been recently reported. One trial called INVITE compared 196 patients older than 70 years of age with non-small cell lung cancer who were randomly assigned to either treatment with gefitinib or vinorelbine. A lung cancer specimen was required for entry onto the study to determine biomarkers and EGFR copy number could be assessed in 158 of the 196 patients' tumors. Increased EGFR copy number was not associated with increased response or survival benefit in patients given gefitinib compared to those given vinorelbine. A second trial called INTEREST studied patients with non-small cell lung cancer previously treated with one or two chemotherapy regimens. 1466 patients were randomized to treatment with either gefitinib or docetaxel given every 3 weeks. Lung cancer specimens were not required for entry onto the study to determine biomarker status. Once again, there was no difference in outcome between the two arms and no relationship between EGFR copy number determined by FISH and response rate, time to progression, or survival on either arm.

The genomic change associated with resistance to treatment with gefinib and erlotinib is a DNA mutation which changes the threonine to methionine at the 790th amino acid of EGFR known as the (T790M) mutation as well as amplification of the MET oncogene. The T790M mutation in EGFR is responsible for approximately half

of the acquired resistance while MET amplification is responsible for about 20%. Irreversible inhibitors including HKI-272 and PF-299804 can cause growth inhibition in NSCLC cell lines with both the resistance and sensitizing mutations, while gefitinib and erlotinib do not. HKI-272 and PF-299804 entered directed phase I and phase II trials in patients previously treated with gefitinib and erlotinib and mutation testing has been prospectively incorporated into the trials.

Conclusions: Biomarkers of response to EGFR-TKIs have been identified in retrospective studies of patients with non-small cell lung cancer and are now being prospectively incorporated into clinical trials of gefitinib and erlotinib. None of the biomarkers has yet been successful in these prospective trials to identify the subsets of patients who derive clinical benefit from the treatments but we await the results from additional ongoing clinical trials

S24
ERCC1 and response to chemotherapy

J.-C. Soria. *Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, France*

Introduction: Today, cisplatin (and its analogs, carboplatin and oxaliplatin) remain the scaffolding of chemotherapy in many solid tumors including lung, head and neck, bladder, ovarian, and colon carcinomas. After several decades of clinical trials, a therapeutic plateau appears to have being reached with standard chemotherapy in most solid tumors. A re-evaluation of strategies to improve clinical outcomes is needed. At present, research in cancer survival is partly focused on translational pharmacogenetics, with the goal of providing individualized chemotherapy based on different genetic traits, such as polymorphisms, gene mutations, and overexpression of drug target gene transcripts. Also, in some instances, downregulation of crucial gene transcripts has been linked to enhanced chemotherapy response. At this time, one of the most relevant issues for cancer patients is the need for a reliable method to determine which chemotherapy combinations will have better chances of improving survival based on genetic markers. On that regard, defining the predictive and biological determinants of cisplatin response represent an important endeavor. The application of pharmacogenomics to cytotoxic chemotherapy could lead to the development of "individualized" drugs for patients with cancer. Numerous studies have reported the role of ERCC1 expression in the repair mechanism of cisplatin-induced DNA adducts in cancer.

Main Message: Numerous studies have reported the role of ERCC1 expression in the repair mechanism of cisplatin-induced DNA adducts in human ovarian cancer cells, in primary gastric tumors, in colorectal and esophageal cancer. ERCC1 expression has been negatively associated with response to cisplatin or oxaliplatin chemotherapy in gastric and colon cancer. High tumor tissue levels of ERCC1 mRNA in ovarian and gastric cancer patients have been associated with cisplatin resistance.

Taken altogether, these data suggest that ERCC1 is a potentially useful marker for predicting clinical resistance to cisplatin, carboplatin and oxaliplatin. Studies linking ERCC1 to resistance to platinum compounds have been conducted mainly by analysis of RNA or DNA. Nevertheless, recently ERCC1 protein expression was studied in resected NSCLC tumors from 761 patients from the International Adjuvant Lung Trial (IALT). Patients with ERCC1 negative tumors who were randomized to chemotherapy had significantly prolonged survival compared to those who were randomized to observation (test for interaction, $P < 0.009$; $HR = 0.65$; 95% CI [0.50−0.86]). In contrast, there was no survival difference between treated and none-treated patients among ERCC1 positive patients ($HR = 1.14$; 95% CI [0.84−1.55]). It was concluded that NSCLC patients with completely resected ERCC1 negative tumors seem to be stronger candidates for adjuvant cisplatin-based chemotherapy than those with resected ERCC1 positive tumors.

Conclusions: Based on these results, it is very probable that in the near future platinum-based chemotherapy could be chosen according to pharmacogenomic criteria such as ERCC1 expression on tumor tissue. Nevertheless, additional studies are warranted to standardize and optimize methodologies for ERCC1 analysis in tumor samples in order to define a biomarker profile predictive of patient outcome

S25
Gene signatures and response to chemotherapy in breast cancer: statistical artefact or reality?

H. Bonnefoi. *Institut Bergonié, Bordeaux, France*

Introduction: Systemic chemotherapy for breast cancer improves overall survival, whether given pre-operatively or as post-operative adjuvant therapy. Newer chemotherapy regimens containing taxanes further improve survival compared to standard regimens but taxanes are expensive, toxic and may benefit only a small group of patients. Therefore, identification of regimen-specific predictive factors is a research priority.

Main Message: Several single arm neo-adjuvant chemotherapy trials have reported gene expression signatures obtained from tumour biopsies taken at diagnosis using conventional biostatistic methods (Chang et al. 2003, Ayers et al. 2004, Hannemann et al. 2005, Gianni et al. 2005, Hess et al. 2006, Cleator et al. 2006). Most of these studies reported signatures that predict clinical or pathological response. We will review briefly these studies and discuss their potential weaknesses.

Another approach is to use predictive signatures developed from cell lines (Potti et al. 2006). We used this approach to confirm the ability of these signatures to predict the response to chemotherapy of the ER negative breast tumours within a large series of patients enrolled in a recently completed phase III neoadjuvant trial (Bonnefoi et al. 2007). This sub-study was restricted to ER negative tumours because studies containing both ER positive and ER negative tumours are easily confounded by cell type bias linked to ER status. This trial compares a non-taxane regimen (fluorouracil + epirubicin + cyclophosphamide $\times$ 6; FEC arm) with a taxane regimen (docetaxel $\times$ 3 followed by epirubicin + docetaxel $\times$ 3; T $\rightarrow$ ET arm).