

Diagnosis and Treatment of Patients with Primary and Metastatic Breast Cancer



© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Prognostic and Predictive Factors

Prognostic and Predictive Factors

- **Versions 2002–2017:**
**Costa / Fersis / Friedrichs / Gerber / Göhring / Harbeck /
Janni / Liedtke / Loibl / Mundhenke / Nitz / Rody / Schaller /
Schmidt / Schmutzler / Schneeweiss / Simon / Solomayer /
Thomssen / Witzel/ Harbeck/ Rody**
- **Version 2018:**
Fasching / Wöckel

Definition

A **Prognostic Factor*** is any parameter available at the time of interest (e.g. primary diagnosis) that correlates with disease-free or overall survival, in the absence of any therapy and, as a result, is able to correlate with the natural history of the disease.

A **Predictive Factor** is any parameter associated with response to a given therapy.

“Low absolute risk implies low absolute benefit”

Quality Criteria

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

- **Biological hypothesis**
- **Simple and standardized assessment method, quality assurance (QA) of the test**
- **Prospectively planned statistical evaluation (primary goal)**
- **Validation of clinical significance according to**
 - „Oxford Level of Evidence (LoEOx2001)“ criteria and „Grades of Recommendation (GR)“
 - „Grades of Recommendation (GR)“ as well as modified LoE criteria for the use in archived specimen (LoE2009) and category of tumor marker study (CTS)
- **Clinical relevance for treatment decisions**

- ¹ Simon et al, J Natl Cancer Inst 101: 1446-1452, 2009
- ² Febbo et al, J Natl Compr Canc Netw 9 Suppl 5: S1-32, 2011
- ³ McShane, Hayes, J Clin Oncol 30: 4223 – 4232, 2012

Elements of Tumor Marker Studies that Constitute Levels of Evidence Determination

©AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Category Element	A Prospective	B Prospective using archived samples	C Prospective/ observational	D Retrospective/ observational
Clinical trial	Prospective controlled trial (PCT) designed to address tumor marker	Prospective trial not designed to address tumor marker, but design accommodates tumor marker utility Accommodation of predictive marker requires Prospective randomized controlled trial (PRCT)	Prospective observational registry, treatment and follow-up not dictated	No prospective aspect to study
Patients and patient data	Prospectively enrolled, treated, and followed in PCT	Prospectively enrolled, treated, and followed in clinical trial and, especially if a predictive utility is considered, a PRCT addressing the treatment of interest	Prospectively enrolled in registry, but treatment and follow-up standard of care	No prospective stipulation of treatment or follow-up; patient data collected by retrospective chart review
Specimen collection, processing, and archival	Specimens collected, processed, and assayed for specific marker in real time	Specimens collected, processed, and archived prospectively using generic SOPs. Assayed after trial completion	Specimens collected, processed, and archived prospectively using generic SOPs. Assayed after trial completion	Specimens collected, processed and archived with no prospective SOPs
Statistical design and analysis	Study powered to address tumor marker question	Study powered to address therapeutic question and underpowered to address tumor marker question Focused analysis plan for marker question developed before doing assays	Study not prospectively powered at all. Retrospective study design confounded by selection of specimens for study Focused analysis plan for marker question developed before doing assays	Study not prospectively powered at all. Retrospective study design confounded by selection of specimens for study No focused analysis plan for marker question developed before doing assays
Validation	Result unlikely to be play of chance Although preferred, validation not required	Result more likely to be play of chance than A but less likely than C Requires one or more validation studies	Result very likely to be play of chance Requires subsequent validation studies	Result very likely to be play of chance Requires subsequent validation studies

Revised Determination of Levels of Evidence Using Elements of Tumor Marker Studies

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Level of Evidence	Category	Validation studies available
I	A	None required
I	B	One or more with consistent results
II	B	None or inconsistent results
II	C	2 or more with consistent results
III	C	None or 1 with consistent results or inconsistent results
IV–V	D	Not applicable because LOE IV and V studies will never be satisfactory for determination of medical utility

Requirements for a Marker-Based Test to Reach Level IB Evidence

©AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

- **1. Adequate amounts of archived specimen must be available from enough patients from a prospective trial ... for analyses to have adequate statistical power and for the patients included in the evaluation to be clearly representative of the patients in the trial.**
- **2. The marker-based test should be analytically and preanalytically validated for use with archived specimens.**
- **3. The plan for marker evaluation should be completely specified in writing before the performance of marker assays on archived specimens and should be focused on evaluation of a single completely defined marker-based test.**
- **4. The results from archived specimens should be validated using specimens from one or more similar, but separate, studies.**

Prognostic Factors I in Early Breast Cancer

Oxford

Factor	LoE _{Ox2001}	GR	AGO
■ Tumor size	1a	A	++
■ Nodal status	1a	A	++
■ Distant metastasis	1a	B	++
■ Histological tumor type (colloid, mucinous, tubular etc.)	2b	B	++
■ Grade (Elston & Ellis)	2a	B	++
■ Age	2a	B	++
■ Peritumoral lymphatic vessel and vascular invasion (L1 V1)	2b	B	+
■ pCR after NACT* in (HR+/G3, HER2+, TN)	1a	A	++
■ Obesity (BMI >30 kg/m ²)	1b	B	+
■ Margins (Resection status)	1a	A	+

* NACT = Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy

Reproducibility

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

- **ER/PR: concordance central vs local is high (97%; Plan B, SABCS 2014)**
- **Grading: concordance central vs local is 68% (PlanB, JCO 2016)**
- **HER2: frequency of false-positive test results 6% (ASCO /CAP JCO 2013)**
- **Impact of routine pathologic review in N0 BC: 20% changes : grading 40%, LVI 26%, N 15%, margin 12% (JCO 2012)**
- **pN0 from MIRROR study: pN0 was upstaged in 22%, in central pathology review (Ann Oncol 2012)**
- **Inter- and intraobserver variability in measurement of ki-67 is high (J Nat. Cancer Institute 2011)**

Critical Issues Regarding LoEs for Biomarkers

©AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

It needs to be emphasized that the *levels of evidence* obtained by Oxford-criteria and CTS-criteria cannot be directly compared.

The prospectively-planned retrospective validation of a biomarker (CTS level 1) may be biased by an insufficient number of clinical trial samples used for the biomarker analysis.

This sample collection may not represent the reported outcome of the clinical trial. An optimal percentage of sample needed from clinical trials needed for optimal biomarker validation has not yet been established *

Prognostic Factors II in Early Breast Cancer

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor	Oxford		
	LoE _{Ox2001}	GR	AGO
▪ ER / PgR	2a	B	+
▪ HER2 (IHC, FISH)	2b	B	+
▪ ER / PgR / HER2/ Ki-67 as surrogate markers for molecular subtypes	2b	B	+
▪ uPA / PAI (Femtelle [®] ELISA) _§ in N0	1a	A	+
▪ Proliferation markers			
▪ Ki-67 before, during or after treatment	1a	B	+

Commercially Available Molecular Tests

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

	70 gene signature (MammaPrint®) †	21 gene Recurrence score (Oncotype DX®) †	8 gene signature (Endopredict®) †	PAM 50 (Prosigna®) †
Provider	Agendia	Genomic Health	Sividon	NanoString
Type of assay	70-gene assay	21-gene recurrence score	11-gene assay	50-gene assay
Type of tissue	fresh frozen (technical validation for FFPE available)	FFPE	FFPE	FFPE
Technique	Microarrays for RNA	qRT-PCR	q-RT-PCR	Direct hybridization
Central lab	yes	yes	no	no
Indication and population studied	prognostic N-/+, < 70 Jahre	prognostic N-/+, ER+ endocrine treated	prognostic (pre-) postmenopausal N-/+, ER+ HER2- endocrine treated	prognostic postmenopausal N-/+, ER+ HER2- endocrine treated
Clinical Validation	yes	yes	yes	yes
Registration	FDA clearance as "In Vitro Diagnostic Multivariate Index Assay (IVDMIA)« CE-Mark (fresh tissue and FFPE)	Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) + College of American Pathologists (CAP)- accredited ref lab	CE-Mark	<u>CE-Mark</u> FDA 510(k) Clearance

† Validated clinical data only available for this assay

Commercially Available Molecular Tests

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

	70 gene signature (MammaPrint®) §	21 gene Recurrence score (Oncotype DX®) §	8 gene signature (Endopredict®) §	PAM 50 (Prosigna®) §
Prognosis after 5 yrs (late recurrences)	not separately shown	no	yes	yes
Predictive impact (chemotherapy benefit)	poorly validated	yes *	not shown	not shown
Prospective- retrospective evidence (% of recruited patients)	Multicenter validation	NSABP B-14 (14%) NSABP B-20 (28%) ECOG 9127 SWOG 8814 (40%) ATAC (30%)	ABCSG 6 (19%) ABCSG 8 (36%) GEICAM-9906 (45%) ATAC (10%)	MA.12 (59%) MA.5 (66%) ABCSG 8 (44%) ATAC (16%)
Prospective evidence (5-year DFS, OS)	MINDACT (N0, N1)	TAILOR _x (N0, low-risk, RS<11) PlanB (N0, highrisk/N+)	–	–

Prospective Randomized Trials

(Oncotype DX [TailorX, PlanB], MammaPrint [MINDACT])

Prognosis in the low-risk group is for both tests favorable
(94% 5-Jahres DFS with adjuvant endocrine therapy only)

	TailorX	PlanB	MINDACT
Follow-up period	Median 69 mo	5-yr-DFS	Median 60 mo
Proportion of low risk patients (study population suitable for chemotherapy)	16%	15.3%	23.2% (high clinical and low genomic risk)
Test failure rate	n.r.	2.9%	26% (fresh frozen tissue)
Proportion of intermediate risk patients (applies only to OncotypeDX)	67.3%	60.4%	n.a.
10-yr-follow up	---	---	---

Prognostic Factors III in Early Breast Cancer

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Faktor	LoE ₂₀₀₉	CTS	AGO
■ Disseminated tumor cells (DTC, in bone marrow)	I	B	+/-
■ Circulating tumor cells (CTC, in blood, Cell Search®) \$	I	A	+/-
■ CTC before NACT (regarding OS, DDFS, LRFI)	I ^a	B	+/-
■ Therapy decisions based on CTC phenotypes	III	C	-
■ Multigene assays			
■ EndoPredict® (N0-1, HR+, Her2 -)	I	B	+*
■ Prosigna® (N0-1, HR+, Her2 -)	I	B	+*
■ MammaPrint® (70 gene signature) (N0-1)	I	A	+*
■ Oncotype DX® (N0-1, HR+ HER2-, 5 years)	I	A	+*

* Should only be used in selected patients if all other criteria are inconclusive for therapeutic decision making

\$ Validated clinical data only available for this assay

Cuzick et al., J Clin Oncol 29: 4273-4278, 2011

Neoadjuvant Systemic Chemotherapy Response Prediction I

©AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor	CTS	LoE _{Ox2001}	GR	AGO
▪ Young age	B	1a	A	+
▪ cT1 / cT2 tumors o. N0 o. G3	B	1a	A	++
▪ Negative ER and PgR status	B	1a	A	++
▪ Triple negative breast cancer (TNBC)	B	1a	A	++
▪ Positive HER2 status	B	1a	A	++
▪ Non-lobular tumor type	B	1a	A	+
▪ Early clinical response	B	1b	A	+

Neoadjuvant Systemic Chemotherapy

Response Prediction II

©AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor	LoE ₂₀₀₉	CTS	AGO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multigene signature (Mammaprint, Endopredict Oncotyp Dx, PAM50 Prosigna[§]) 	II	C	+/-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ki-67 	I	B	+
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes* 	I	B	+
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>PIK3CA</i> mutation 	I	B	+/-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gBRCA in TNBC 	II	B	+

[§] validated clinical data only available for this assay

* defined as dense lymphocytic infiltration of inner peritumoral stroma outside of the invasion front (lymphocytes make up >50% of stroma area)

Predictive Factors – Endocrine Therapy

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor	Oxford		
	LoE _{Ox2001}	GR	AGO
■ Endocrine therapy			
■ ER/PgR status	1a	A	++
■ IHC staining intensity (ER/PgR)	1a	A	+
■ Tamoxifen			
■ CYP2D6 polymorphism	2b	D	-
■ Ovarian ablation			
■ Menopausal status	1c	A	++
■ Aromatase inhibitors vs. Tamoxifen			
■ Menopausal status	1c	A	++
■ ER/PgR/HER2 as single markers	1c	A	-
■ Lobular subtype	2b	B	+
■ Ki-67 high (published cutoffs > 11% and >14%)	2b	B	+/-
■ Obesity (BMI >30 kg/m ²)	2b	B	+/-

Predictive Factors – HER2 Targeted Therapy / Adjuvant Chemotherapy

©AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor	LoE _{Ox2001} ([§] LoEO _{x2009})	GR ([§] CTS)	AGO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Anti-HER2-Therapy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ HER2 	1a	A	++
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Adjuvant Chemotherapy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ uPA / PAI1 (Femtelle®) ELISA [§] ■ 21 gene recurrence score (Oncotype DX®) [§] 	1a I [§]	A B [§]	+ +/-

[§] Validated clinical data only available for this assay

Prognostic Factors – Metastatic Breast Cancer

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor

LoE₂₀₀₉ CTS AGO

■ Circulating tumor cells (CTC in blood, Cell Search®)

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----|
| ■ Prognosis at baseline | I | A | + |
| ■ Early response assessment (3w) | I | B | + |
| ■ Therapy decision solely based on dynamics of CTC numbers over time or CTC phenotype | I | A | -* |

* Study participation recommended

Exome/whole Gene testing of Panel Genes or the whole Genome (Genomic Profile Tests)

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

	Local Pathology based*, **, ***	Foundation one*	Molecular Health Guide*	NeoSelect*	GPS Cancer*
Provider	Local Pathologist	Roche	Molecular Health	Siemens Healthineers	NantHealth
Number of Genes	Ca. 25- ca. 150	>300	>600	39	Whole genome
Central lab	No	yes	yes	Yes/no	yes
Indication and population studied	Not yet defined	Not yet defined	Not yet defined	Not yet defined	Not yet defined
Registration / QM	Local QC Standards, Analyse „CE konform“	FDA Approved	ISO13485	„CE-konform“	CLIA Certified CAP accredited
Implementation Status	Part of clinical routine care	External Service Providers			

- * Interpretation of genomic alterations with regard to resistance or efficacy of therapies, eligibility for clinical trials etc. by bioinformatic, automated, quality controlled algorithms (e.g. OncoKb.org)
- ** Implemented in molecular tumor boards as part of clinical routine
- *** some of which are professionalized like MSK-IMPACT (FDA authorized)

Actionable genomic alterations

© AGO e. V.
in der DGGG e.V.
sowie
in der DKG e.V.

Guidelines Breast
Version 2018.1

Factor*	Outcome	LoE ₂₀₀₉	CTS	AGO
Evidence from studies with breast cancer patients				
▪ sPI3K Mutation	Efficacy of anti-HER2 therapies	I	B	-**
▪ sESR1 Mutation	Efficacy of endocrine therapy	II	B	+/-**
▪ sHER2 Mutation	Efficacy of anti-HER2 therapies	II	B	+/-**
▪ sBRCA1/2 or gBRCA1/2	Efficacy of platinum chemotherapy	II	B	+/-**
▪ sBRCA1/2 or gBRCA1/2	Efficacy of chemotherapy	II	B	+/-**
▪ sBRCA1/2 or gBRCA1/2	Efficacy of PARP Inhibitors	I	A	+**
Evidence from studies with other cancer patients				
▪ Companion Diagnostics for therapies of other tumor entities (z.B. BRAF, FGFR1,)	Efficacy of diverse therapies	IV	D	+/-**
▪ Large Panel Gene Analysis (e.g. FoundationOne, GPS Cancer, NeoSelect, Molecular Health Guide, Lokale „hand selected,, Panels)	Efficacy of diverse therapies, Prognosis	III	C	+/-**

* Assessment method of somatic mutations is not taken into consideration for LOE

** Participation in clinical trials or structured registries recommended / s=somatic / g = germline