

The University of Udine - Department of Medicine S.M. Misericordia University Hospital - Department of Oncology School of Medical Oncology

# **Dissecting the needle in the haystack**

## **Characterizing Circulating tumor cells in Breast Cancer**

Breast Journal Club 2017 - 10.03.2017

Lorenzo Gerratana

## **The Agenda**

#### What's the buzz?

### Is it time to rethink the entire paradigm?

• A snapshot could be not worth the effort

Cristofanilli M et al. NEJM, 351(8), 781–791 Smerage, J. B et al. J Clin Oncol, 32(31), 1–8

### Its time to scrape under the surface

• From counting to characterizing

Mostert B, et al. Annals of Oncology, 26(3), 510–516 Bulfoni M, Gerratana L, Del Ben F, et al. Breast Cancer Res. 2016;18

### The hidden side of the results

Insights from unpublished data

### **Future perspectives**

Why are these informations useful

Guo S, Diep D, Plongthongkum N, et al. Nat Genet. 2017 Shaw JA, Guttery DS, Hills A, et al. Clin Cancer Res 2017 Jan 1;23(1):88–96

## Is it time to rethink the entire paradigm?

#### A snapshot could be not worth the effort



## A long time ago in a galaxy far, far away

Sometimes novelties are not so new

### In 1869 T.R. Ashworth described cells in the blood of a woman

### with metastatic breast cancer that were similar in to her primary

tumor cells



### **CTC** and prognosis in breast cancer

Where it all began



### The SWOG S0500 trial

#### **CTCs only as a prognostic factor?**



- Arm C1: Maintain therapy - Arm C2: Change therapy

# Should we throw everything away?

### The SWOG S0500 trial

#### **CTCs only as a prognostic factor?**



## Time to change the paradigm

### Its time to scrape under the surface

#### From counting to characterizing



#### **Membrane markers selection**



MCF-7

#### **Membrane markers selection**



Brightield Agesenchsmal Nuclei

#### **Membrane markers selection**



## Its time to scrape under the surface

#### From counting to characterizing



56 MBC patients regardless the line of treatment, median follow-up was 33 months, median PFS was 8.12 months.

Cell sorting experiments were performed by DEPArray The sample was injected by the system into a microchamber consisting of 16,000 electrical cages in which individual cells are trapped.

#### **CTC** selection



### Its time to scrape under the surface

#### **Patients' characteristics**

Characteristic	N (%)
ECOG performace status; n (%)	
0	29 (62%)
1	14 (29%)
2	4 (9%)
Immunophenotype; n (%)	
Luminal-like	25 (54%)
HER2 positive	11 (23%)
Triple Negative	11 (23%)
Histotype; n (%)	
Ductal	38 (84%)
Lobular	7 (16%)
Metastatic sites*; n (%)	
Bone	29 (62%)
Liver	22 (47%)
Lung	16 (34%)
CNS	3 (6%)
Number of metastatic sites	
1	16 (34%)
≥2	31 (66%)

#### **CTC** subpopulations and pathological characteristics



	OS (from stage IV diagnosis)			PFS		
Variable	HR	95% CI	р	HR	95% CI	р
E CTC (No.)	1.003	0.982-1.024	0.79	1.004	0.989-1.020	0.6
EM CTC (No.)	1.018	0.994-1.043	0.13	1.020	0.998-1.043	0.81
Е тот (No.)	1.006	0.993-1.019	0.35	1.007	0.996-1.018	0.24
MES (No.)	0.998	0.991-1.005	0.56	0.998	0.992-1.003	0.41
NEG (No.)	0.998	0.981-1.015	0.79	0.997	0.986-1.008	0.58
CD45 <sup>NEG</sup> (No.)	0.999	0.994-1.004	0.79	0.999	0.995-1.003	0.56
EM CTC / CD45 <sup>NEG</sup> (%)	1.022	1.003-1.042	0.022	1.021	1.004-1.039	0.016
Е тот / CD45 <sup>NEG</sup> (%)	1.019	1.004-1.034	0.015	1.010	0.997-1.023	0.12
MES/CD45 <sup>NEG</sup> (%)	0.984	0.968-0.999	0.037	0.993	0.981-1.005	0.26
NEG / CD45 <sup>NEG</sup> (%)	0.999	0.972-1.027	0.95	0.998	0.980-1.017	0.86







# But that's not all

#### **CTC** subpopulations and metastatization pattern



#### **CTC** subpopulations and metastatization pattern



# But what's the point?

### Why are these informations useful

#### **Future perspectives**



CTC before NACT	CTC after NACT		
	CTC-neg	CTC-pos	
CTC-neg	58	9	
CTC-pos	24	1	

# One more thing...

#### Speculative unpublished data



Speculative unpublished data

Multivariate analysis, corrected for ECOG PS and number of lines, confirmed the unfavorable prognostic impact of :

**ETOT** as continuous percentage variable in terms of:

- OS at stage IV diagnosis P = 0.0324
- OS at CTC assessment P = 0.0134)

**EM CTC subpopulation in terms of:** 

- OS at stage IV diagnosis P = 0.0142
- OS at CTC assessment P = 0.0006

#### **CTC** subpopulations treatments received



MCF-7

TAMR-MCF-7



**CTC** subpopulations treatments received



# So, what's next?

### A leap forward

#### And a new perspective



### A leap forward

#### And a new perspective



### Thank you

