

profiles of distinct cell populations purified from breast carcinomas and normal breast tissue using cell surface markers CD24 and CD44 that have been associated with stem cell-like properties. Gene expression profiles were analyzed using SAGE (Serial Analysis of Gene Expression), genetic alterations were investigated using SNP (Single Nucleotide Polymorphism) arrays and FISH (Fluorescence In Situ Hybridization), and DNA methylation patterns were analyzed using MSDK (Methylation-Specific Digital Karyotyping).

Results: The CD24+ more differentiated and the CD44+ stem cell-like populations from the same tumor were clonally related but not always identical and epigenetically distinct. A gene signature specific for CD44+ cells was enriched for known stem cell markers and was associated with decreased overall and distant metastasis free survival in lymph node negative breast cancer patients. Systemic network analyses determined that the TGF- β pathway is specifically active in CD44+ breast cancer cells and its inhibition induces their epithelial differentiation. CD24+ and CD44+ also demonstrated distinct responses to various therapeutic agents.

Conclusions: Our study demonstrates that cancer cell phenotype is subject to dynamic regulation by genetic and epigenetic mechanisms as well as by the tumor microenvironment. Thus, tumor progression is a dynamic and complex process that is influenced strongly by the intrinsic level of genetic instability in a given tumor at a given time and location. Understanding the molecular mechanisms responsible for breast tumor heterogeneity and specific targeting of each cell types within tumors will facilitate the development of more effective ways to treat and prevent breast cancer.

Thursday, 17 April 2008

11:00–12:30

KEYNOTE SYMPOSIUM

Tailoring local regional therapy

195

Invited

Arrays – are they helpful?

D.S.A. Nuyten¹, M.J. Van de Vijver². ¹The Netherlands Cancer Institute, Radiation Oncology, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ²Amsterdam University Medical Center, Pathology, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Since the late 1990's microarray analysis has been increasingly used to study breast cancer. Most studies so far have either looked at overall gene expression and have tried to subcategorize tumors based on differences in gene expression (unsupervised analysis) [1–3], or have focused on developing of prognostic assay's that predict changes of developing metastasis by linking gene expression data to clinical outcome data (supervised analysis) [4,5]. Clinically, these assays can be used for treatment discussion making, e.g. adjuvant systemic treatment advice. Two assays are currently being tested prospectively in their ability to better predict the need for adjuvant treatment in node-negative breast cancer (respectively the 70-gene prognosis profile in the MINDACT Trial [6] (microarray based) and the 21-gene recurrence score in the TailorX Trial [7] (PCR-based assay)). Another interesting possible clinical application is therapy response. A few studies have been published on chemotherapy response [8–10].

For breast cancer radiation oncologists the question is: can I expect clinical assays to help guide decision making for post-mastectomy radiotherapy (yes/ or no in clinically intermediate risk patients) and selecting patients that might not be offered breast conservation because of a very high risk of local recurrence or perhaps patients that might benefit from a higher dose (boost). Last but not least, identification of patients with a very low risk of local recurrence that might be offered partial breast irradiation.

Cheng et al. applied a supervised learning approach on a breast cancer patient cohort all treated by mastectomy without post-mastectomy radiation [11]. The identified a 34-gene classifier that could predict local recurrence in the validation set with a sensitivity of 67% and specificity of 83%. Looking at the biology behind this list processes like cell cycle regulation, cell death and proliferation can be found.

In patients treated by breast conserving therapy, age is an independent predictive factor for local recurrence, even after compensating for margin status, radiotherapy dose and estrogen receptor status [12]. By hypothesizing that in optimally treated patients, young age represents specific poor prognosis biology, Kreike et al looked at patients under 51 years of age treated by breast conserving therapy and by definition all patients received radiotherapy. They applied different methods and found one robust list that was presumably driven by ER-status. After correction for ER status, no robust classifier was found.

We applied a different supervised approach on a young patient cohort (<53) treated by breast conserving therapy [13]. A group of 161 patients were divided in a training and validation set. After a standard supervised approach had failed to segregate groups into a low and high risk group for local recurrence, we tested different signatures that previously had been found to predict metastasis free and overall survival in breast cancer patients [4,14,15]. These signatures (the 70-gene prognosis profile, the wound signature and the hypoxia signature) were optimized towards the clinical end point of local recurrence after breast conservation and subsequently validated. One of the three signatures tested, the wound signature, could segregate groups of patients at low or high risk of a local recurrence. In the validation set a large difference in 10-year local recurrence rate (5% vs 29%) was found with a sensitivity of 88% and a specificity of 75%. The classifier was an independent predictor in multivariate analysis.

Assays that are currently being tested in clinical trials have shown the amount of time, money and effort it takes to bring molecular assays into the clinic. For local recurrence prediction the first step now is validation on archived material. Two large trials that are currently being conducted are collecting tumors samples and potentially allow for validation of these assays.

196

Invited

New imaging techniques for tailoring therapy

C. Kuhl¹. ¹Medizinische Universitätsklinik Bonn, Radiologische Klinik, Bonn, Germany

In the patient with breast cancer, there are three different scenarios in which imaging studies are used to guide therapy: In the neoadjuvant setting, functional imaging is used to yield surrogate markers to predict and monitor response to therapy of a given tumor. In the pre-operative setting, structural imaging studies are needed to delineate the extent of disease as accurately as possible. For neoadjuvant treatment, many different concepts have been established or are being developed that target at different molecular pathways. Ideally, an imaging tool should be able to provide information on response to specific molecular pathways and it should help predict response and identify response as early as possible. PET has traditionally been perceived as a "functional" imaging tool for response prediction and assessment. New, specific molecular targets are being developed and evaluated in translational research that target at anti-angiogenic and growth factor receptor signalling pathways. Moreover, functional MR-based technologies like dynamic contrast enhanced MRI, Diffusion weighted MRI, Perfusion MRI, MR based oxygen mapping, and MR spectroscopy have been introduced that appear to exhibit a similar sensitivity for the pathophysiological processes associated with response. For the second scenario, i.e. pre-operative staging of primary or residual breast cancer, MRI has been an established role to guide surgical treatment. The importance of an accurate staging will be even increase with the increasing use of more regional therapies such as intra-operative radiotherapy. This lecture will review recent results and controversies around imaging for tailoring neoadjuvant and surgical therapy.

197

Invited

Tailoring radiotherapy

D. Azria¹. ¹Centre Val D Aurelle P Lamarque, Department of Radiotherapy, Montpellier, France

Adjuvant radiotherapy (RT) in breast cancer is now widely accepted as the standard treatment after breast-conserving surgery and in many cases after mastectomy.

Nevertheless, several factors may influence both indications and modalities. For example and in case of conservative breast management, the impact of the boost is still under debate in the elderly. In addition, in hormone receptor positive-cancer patients older than 70 years old, one has recently advocated the equivalent benefit of the sole endocrine therapy after surgery. Finally, new molecular surrogate markers are under extensive researches to identify which patients will or not benefit from RT.

In case of mastectomy, only large primitive tumors and node positive patients (>4 N+) received adjuvant RT. The updated meta-analysis has proposed to extend this indication to the 1–3 N+ patients. In addition, specific genes have recently been identified to help tailoring RT treatment.

In all cases, the survival impact of internal mammary chain RT has not been yet proven and its indication is extremely debated.

Concerning prediction of late toxicities, evidence has accumulated in recent years suggestive of a genetic basis for a susceptibility to the development of radiation injury following cancer radiotherapy. We assessed whether patients with severe radiation-induced sequelae (RIS) display both a low capacity of initial normal tissue apoptosis and possess certain single

nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) located in candidate genes associated with the response of cells to radiation.

At the congress, we will attempt to identify factors for tailoring RT and thus for improving the therapeutic ratio in the adjuvant breast-cancer management.

198

The impact of the sentinel node

Invited

Abstract not received.

Thursday, 17 April 2008**13:00–14:00**

EUROPA DONNA TEACHING LECTURE

Understanding the biology of medical treatment

199

Understanding the biology of medical treatment

Invited

Abstract not received.

Thursday, 17 April 2008**16:00–17:30**

CLINICAL SCIENCE SYMPOSIUM

Controversies in the use of neoadjuvant therapy

200

Pathological assessment after neoadjuvant therapy: not an easy task

Invited

A. Vincent-Salomon¹, M. Lae¹, N. Weber¹, P. Fréneaux¹, B. Sigal-Zafrani¹, R.J. Salmon², V. Dieras³, A. Fourquet⁴, X. Sastre-Garau¹. ¹Curie Institute, Tumor Biology, Paris, France; ²Curie Institute, Surgical Oncology, Paris, France; ³Curie Institute, Medical Oncology, Paris, France; ⁴Curie Institute, Radiation Oncology, Paris, France

Neoadjuvant or preoperative chemotherapy is a treatment option for locally advanced breast cancers, inaccessible to an initial surgical treatment. Its major goal is to improve the ability to perform breast-conserving therapy. In addition, it can be considered as an ideal model for studying chemosensitivity of tumoral cells in vivo. The neoadjuvant therapy can be classical chemotherapy or targeted therapy such as anti-HER2 or anti-estrogens therapies. Pathologist plays a key role, on a multidisciplinary basis, in the neoadjuvant treatment setting.

Before treatment, with the analysis of the tumor biopsy, the pathologist provides the positive diagnosis of invasive breast carcinoma and predictive factors status such as histological type, histological grade including mitotic index, hormonal receptor status and HER2 status. Pathologists can also assess the quality and the percentage of tumoral cells of frozen biopsies needed for molecular analysis. For HER2 negative breast carcinomas patients, it is necessary to be able to select patients before preoperative chemotherapy who will benefit the best from chemotherapy. This can be partly based on well-known predictive factors such as proliferation. Recently, nomograms have been proposed to help to predict which patient will experienced a complete pathological response.

After treatment, the pathologist evaluates response to treatment on the surgical specimen, according to international guidelines. This evaluation can be difficult because gross examination of the surgical specimen is often challenging after chemotherapy. Precise amounts of residual disease in the breast, axillary lymph node status, and grade with persistent mitotic activity have to be evaluated. These three parameters have been recognised as prognostic parameters in that setting.

The reproducibility of the surgical specimens analysis and the definition of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy are very important for accurate evaluation of new treatments efficiency either new combinations of cytotoxic drugs or new-targeted therapies.

201

Surgery and sentinel node assessment after neoadjuvant therapy

Invited

T. Kuhn¹. ¹Klinikum Esslingen, Esslingen, Germany

Sentinel node biopsy (SNB) is a routinely established method for axillary staging in primary breast cancers. For patients undergoing primary systemic therapy (PST) the data on the reliability of SNB have been assessed as insufficient in international consensus recommendations. Thus, axillary dissection is still recommended in those patients to obtain local control. About 40% of the patients receiving PST have a negative axillary nodal status and will be overtreated if they undergo classical axillary dissection. These patients accept the increased risk of shoulder arm morbidity in return for the benefits of PST (higher rate of breast conserving therapy). For that reason it is essential to analyze the role of SNB in neoadjuvant study concepts in a prospective setting. This talk deals with the current data on this topic and elucidates theoretical pitfalls in the context of a neoadjuvant therapy plan. From this discussion a prospective trial (SENTINA = SENTinel node biopsy after NeoAdjuvant chemotherapy) emerges, which specifically address questions at issue.

202

Summary of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) State of the Science Conference on preoperative therapy in invasive breast cancer

Invited

J. Gralow¹. ¹University of Washington, Division of Oncology Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle WA, USA

Background: In March 2007 the NCI sponsored a State of the Science conference on preoperative therapy in invasive breast cancer.

Methods: Conference goals included understanding current standards of clinical care in the preoperative setting and identifying gaps in clinical knowledge. The conference also explored the role of preoperative therapy in research.

Results: Preoperative systemic therapy is standard of care in locally advanced and inflammatory breast cancer. In this setting, the intent of preoperative systemic therapy is to improve surgical outcomes and improve survival. Though often grouped together, locally advanced and inflammatory breast cancer have different biological features. The management of these patients necessitates involvement of a multidisciplinary team from the onset.

In patients with operable breast cancer, preoperative chemotherapy versus postoperative treatment with the same agents is neither better nor worse in terms of disease-free and overall survival. Because preoperative chemotherapy results in increased rates of breast conservation, it is an option for women desiring breast conservation who are not optimal candidates upfront. Caution must be taken, however, in not overstating the probability of conversion from mastectomy to lumpectomy. A multidisciplinary treatment team is essential for optimal outcomes from preoperative systemic therapy. Accurate pathologic assessment is critical both prior to preoperative therapy and at definitive surgery. Many of the unresolved clinical issues regarding preoperative therapy relate to local regional treatment. Clip placement, timing of nodal evaluation, and indications for radiation are not well-defined in patients receiving preoperative systemic therapy.

The preoperative setting provides an excellent opportunity to study the impact of systemic therapies on breast cancer biology. Using pathologic complete response and other measures as short-term correlative endpoints, new drugs can be tested in short time frames, providing an early indication of drug activity and the potential to study predictive factors allowing us to tailor treatments to given tumor profiles.

Conclusions: In order to achieve optimal outcomes preoperative systemic therapy must be administered as part of a coordinated, multimodality treatment program. The preoperative setting provides a unique opportunity to study the impact of systemic therapies on breast cancer biology.