Prognostic role of epidermal growth factor receptor in localized breast cancer: 15 years of follow-up
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ABSTRACT

Background: The expression of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGF-R) in breast cancer (BC) is generally considered as an unfavorable event during tumor progression. Its predictive role has been fairly well defined: EGF-R expression predicts tamoxifen un-responsiveness. EGF-R role in autocrine growth regulation was confirmed. However, reported results on its prognostic role in BC patients were conflicting. The prognostic role of EGF-R after 15 years of follow-up is analyzed in a group of 70 localized BC patients, presented at diagnosis in clinical stages I-III.

Methods: BC patients newly diagnosed from December 1990 until March 1991, treated in accordance to the National Protocol, were selected for EGF-R analysis. Steroid receptors and EGF-R were determined at diagnosis in same frozen tissue samples, using biochemical methods. Except 6 patients who were lost from follow-up in the interval shorter than 60 months, the remaining patients were followed-up from 60-188 months. The total number of events was 32 relapses (46%), and 27 deaths (38.5%).

Results: EGF-R expression was found in 28/70 patients (40%), and the EGF-R content higher than 26 fmol - in 15/70 patients (21%). Neither the expression, nor the high content of EGF-R showed any influence on disease-free or overall survival. Levels of EGF-R were similar in relapsing and relapse-free patients. Nodal status had the strongest influence on prognosis.

Conclusion: Our results suggest that the controversial findings, regarding the EGF-R prognostic role, might be the consequence of a genuine weak influence of EGF-R expression on disease outcome.
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INTRODUCTION

Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGF-R), a member of large type I receptor family, is a membrane protein, which binds ligands, such as EGF or transforming growth factor-α (TGF-α), with the extra cellular region, containing ligand binding domain. This binding leads to the formation of monomers and heterodimers mostly with cErbB2 (HER2), activating intrinsic tyrosine kinase region of the receptor, which leads to the stimulation of signaling pathways, including the downstream kinases, and triggers the gene transcription, cell proliferation and survival. Various growth factor signal pathways were found to be interactive (1). The so called cross-talk between estrogen receptor (ER) and growth factor (GF) signaling pathways was described, which can promote the escape from the growth inhibition by hormonal treatment, and consecutive resistance to the treatment. Tamoxifen resistant cells may retain ER and remain sensitive to estrogen deprivation with either ovarian ablation (2) or aromatase inhibitors (3). Increased components of EGF-R/HER2 signaling pathways, such as over-stimulation with ligands, increased receptor expression/amplification, increased heterodimerization, or increased downstream pathway elements, were found in acquired and de novo tamoxifen resistant BC cells (4), and cell lines (5). Increased GF signaling may also reduce the ER expression (6), which may lead to the insensitivity to all endocrine manipulations (7).

The expression of EGF-R in breast cancer is generally assumed to represent the unfavorable event during the process called “tumor progression”. On clinical material, its predictive role has been fairly well defined. Patients whose tumors expressed the EGF-R responded less frequently to endocrine treatment, as compared to those tumors that did not express it (8-9). In these studies, as well as in our own study (10), levels of EGF-R were significantly higher in non-responders, than in responders to endocrine treatment. Interestingly, we found that the EGF-R values mostly were overlapped between responders and non-responders, but did never exceed 26 fmol/mg in those tumors that had regressed on endocrine therapy. Later, it was reported that the EGF-R (and/or HER2) expressing tumors seemed to be less responsive to tamoxifen, but not to aromatase inhibitors (11), which suggested the role of EGF-R in clinical resistance to tamoxifen.

EGF-R is also assumed as a marker of autocrine regulation of tumor growth. TGF-α is one of its ligands, which could be expressed by same tumor cells, forming the autocrine loop. It was found that co-expression of EGF-R and TGF-α in early BC had the most significant effect on Disease-free interval (DFI) and overall survival (OS), higher than nodal status (12).

In accordance with the EGF-R role in endocrine- (tamoxifen-) resistance and autocrine tumor growth regulation, it was expected that the prognosis would be much poorer in patients with EGF-R expressing tumors. However, early results on its prognostic role in breast cancer remained conflicting. Harris and co-workers (13) found that the EGF-R-expressing operable breast cancer patients had shorter DFI and OS. EGF-R-positive tumors progressed more rapidly than EGF-R-negative ones, under the primary endocrine treatment (8). This suggested...
that the EGF-R expression was a sign of more aggressive tumor behavior, or in other words, the unfavorable event. However, some authors found the prognostic value only in ER-negative (14-17), or only in node-negative operable breast carcinoma (15,16,18), while others did not find any prognostic significance of EGF-R (19-22). The reason for such controversial findings might be the use of too small patients’ groups, too short follow-up, retrospective analysis of the patients’ material, and the use of different methods for the EGF-R determination.

On the contrary, the genuine weak influence of EGF-R expression on disease outcome could attribute to the inconsistency of the findings. Moreover, within studies that used the biochemical method for EGF-R determination, the lack of the commonly accepted cut-off value for EGF-R positivity could be the major cause of confusion.

In 1996, in a sample of 106 unselected BC patients, we found that the EGF-R binding in individual breast carcinomas was independent of ER/PR, classic prognostic factors (nodal status, tumor size and grade, age and menopausal status) and clinical stage of the disease. It has been concluded that the differences in EGF-R quantitative content represented the true biological difference between tumors (23). This was in contrast to other findings, but not all: some authors found the correlation between EGF-R expression and nodal status (24), or histology grade and even menopausal status (25), or age (26), but others mostly did not find such correlation. In the analysis of OS in metastatic disease, we found a trend towards longer survival in patients whose EGF-R content was low, compared to those with the high EGF-R content (27). In the whole group of 106 unselected BC patients, when gradually increased the cut-off value by 5 fM/mg, from 0 to 60 fM/mg, the prognostic significance became borderline at the level of 20 fM/mg, and significant at the level of 25, and especially 26 fM/mg (28). These published data referred to the group of patients unselected according to clinical stage and to the follow-up of 5-years. However, neither low nor high cut-off values of EGF-R had any significant prognostic influence in a subgroup of operable BC patients. Some more recently published studies with large number of patients showed significant influence of EGF-R on both DFS and OS (29,30), while others did not show any prognostic value of EGF-R (26).

In the present paper, the prognostic role of EGF-R content is re-analyzed after 15 years of follow-up, in a subgroup of localized BC patients.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients

Seventy patients with localized breast cancer have been included in present analysis, as the part of a larger sample of unselected consecutive breast cancer patients, newly diagnosed between December 1990 and March 1991 in the Institute of Oncology and Radiology of Serbia, Belgrade (27).

The group consists of operable stage I-II BC patients (N=58), having been subjected to surgery as the primary treatment, and stage III patients (N=12), having been subjected to delayed radical mastectomy with axillary dissection, after primary (preoperative) radiotherapy. They were presented at diagnosis as borderline operable, but became operable due to the response to radiotherapy. Details of patients’ characteristics are presented in Table 1. Patients were considered as premenopausal if they had regular menstrual cycles at the time of diagnosis; postmenopausal - if the last regular cycle occurred 5 or more years earlier; and perimenopause was defined as the interval between pre- and postmenopause.

Treatment

The choice of primary and consecutive treatment was done in accordance to the National Breast Cancer Protocol. The preoperative and/or adjuvant treatment depended on clinical and pathological stage, tumor size, nodal involvement, histological grade, menstrual status and steroid receptor status: patients in early clinical stages (I-II) were routinely treated by surgery (modified radical mastectomy with axillary dissection in 53, and quadrantectomy without axillary dissection in 5 patients). Node-negative patients with histology grade I-II tumors were followed-up without any adjuvant treatment. The adjuvant treatment of high-risk node-negative (N-) patients, defined with tumor grade III, consisted of CMF chemotherapy (cyclophosphamide, methotrexate, 5-fluorouracil) in PR-negative (PR-), and endocrine therapy in PR-positive (PR+) patients (castration by irradiation in premenopausal, tamoxifen in postmenopausal). Node-positive (N+) operable breast cancer patients were treated with adjuvant CMF chemotherapy if they were PR-, and with CMF chemotherapy + endocrine therapy, if PR+. All postmenopausal N+ patients have been irradiated postoperatively. Those patients who were clinically classified at stage IIIa (T1-3, N2) and IIIb (T4b, N1-2) according to TNM classification, were subjected to biopsy only and irradiated preoperatively with tumor dose (TD) 45 Gy to the whole breast, and 45 Gy to regional lymphatics, in 15 fractions both, every second day during 6 weeks. Two months later (if responded), they were subjected to radical mastectomy with axillary dissection. All stage III patients, presented here, responded to radiotherapy. The further adjuvant treatment depended on pre-irradiation tumor status, postoperative patho-histological nodal status, as well as on histological tumor grade and receptor status of primary tumor, on the same way as in patients primarily operated. EGF-R findings were not known at the time of adjuvant treatment making decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No pts.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histologically confirmed invasive BC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menopausal status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premenopausal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimenopausal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmenopausal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial clinical stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumor size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT4b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodal status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histology tumor type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histology tumor grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steroid receptors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR+</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER+ and/or PR+</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Patients’ and tumors’ characteristics

Abbreviations: IDC Invasive ductal carcinoma, ILC Invasive lobular carcinoma

The diagnosis of the first relapse has been routinely confirmed using X-ray, ultrasound, radionuclide and clinical examinations, as well as computed tomography (CT) and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) evaluation, when necessary.

The overall survival analysis was done after 15 years of follow-up. It was accepted that the breast cancer was the cause of death only in case when the patient had well documented progressive metastatic disease 1-3 months prior to death.

Receptor determination

Steroid receptors (SR) were determined at diagnosis, in tissue samples of breast cancer, using biochemical methods, which was previously described. An EGF-R content was determined in a membrane fraction of the same frozen tissue samples. Specific binding was calculated by subtracting non-specific from total binding. Data were calculated according to Scatchard analysis (31-34).
Statistics
In the analyses of parametric values, Chi-square and Fisher’s exact test were used. For comparison of the non-parametric values Man-Whitney-U test was used. Survival functions were presented by Kaplan-Meier method, and comparison of the groups was done by Log rank and Wilcoxon test.

RESULTS
In a whole group, 5 and 6 patients were lost from follow-up in the interval shorter than 60 months (median 54 and 55 months) for relapse and survival, respectively. Remaining patients were followed-up from 60 to 188 months (median 111.5 months for relapse and 128 months for survival, respectively).
The total number of events was 32 relapses (46%), and 27 deaths (38.5%). Only one patient died in the 42nd month of FU from the cause other than breast cancer. She died from the recurrent multiform glioblastoma, without signs of BC recurrence. Other deaths were caused by metastatic BC.

EGF-R values varied from 0-330 (median 0) fmoI/mg. Any measurable EGF-R expression (> 0 fmoI/mg) was found in 28/70 patients (40%), and the EGF-R content higher than 26 fmoI/mg - in 15/70 patients (21%). There was no correlation with either other prognostic factors, or age and menopausal status. However, the significant inverse relationship with both ER and PR was found.

We compared the DFS and OS in two groups of patients - those without the EGF-R expression in their tumors and the group with any measurable EGF-R expression (42 and 28 patients, respectively). There was no difference either in DFS or in OS between groups (Figure 1). When the higher cut-off level was used (>=26 fmoI/mg), again there was no difference either in the occurrence of relapse or survival (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Disease-free interval (DFS) and Overall Survival (OS) in BC patients without the EGF-R expression (EGF-R=0) and any measurable EGF-R (>0 fmoI/mg)

No difference in the outcome between ER-positive vs. ER-negative patients was found, as well as between PR-positive vs. PR-negative (30 vs. 40 pts both, respectively) (not presented). Moreover, there was no difference in EGF-R content between patients who relapsed and those who remained disease-free (Figure 3).

Among other prognostic parameters, nodal status (Figure 4) and clinical stage at diagnosis had the strongest influence on prognosis. All patients were divided by the involvement and the number of involved nodes in pN0, pN1-3, pN≥4, and those with clinical N2 category at diagnosis. Interestingly, both relapse-free and overall survival were similar in node-negative patients and those with 1-3 nodes, and significantly better than in both groups with advanced nodal involvement (N≥4 and those with clinically N2 nodal status). Similar result was found in regards to the clinical stage at diagnosis, concerning the DFI, but not the OS. Stage I and IIa patients had significantly better DFS, than stage IIb and III patients (not presented).
DISSUSSION

Although the expression of growth factor receptors is commonly thought to be the unfavorable prognostic event, our results, published earlier, showed that a prognostic role of EGF-R expression in early breast cancer patients was negligible (27). This was in accordance with the other findings of a weak, if any, influence of EGF-R on the outcome of operable breast cancer (16,26). After the follow-up of 15 years, neither the expression, nor the higher cut-offs, when used in a group of operable breast cancer patients, did not change our previous results: there was no difference in the outcome between EGF-R negative and EGF-R positive localized BC patients.

In addition, the EGF-R content, determined in relapsing patients, in comparison to those who were still relapse-free, showed no significant difference. The inverse relationship between EGF-R and ER, often reported in clinical studies (35) was confirmed, as reported earlier (23). The commonly used term “inverse” relationship obviously refers to the proportion of ER positive and EGF-R positive cells within a whole tumor. Therefore, it does not exclude the independence of their expression.

In our previous analysis, we found that patients, whose EGF-R content was below 26 fmol/mg, had significantly better prognosis than those with EGF-R content above this cut-off level (28). It seemed that the tumors with EGF-R content lower than this cut-off could be estrogen dependent (10). These results were obtained on the larger unselected BC patients’ group, but in the group of operable BC patients, at the point of 5 years follow-up, there was only a non-significant trend towards the influence of EGF-R on outcome. Similar results were published by Foekens (36) and Klijn (57) who found, in operable breast cancer patients, that the group with “intermediate” content (0.5-2.0 fmol/mg) had lower risk of recurrence than both groups with low EGF-R content (<0.5 fmol/mg) and those with high EGF-R content.

The offered explanation for this phenomenon implies the possibility that tumors with low EGF-R content do not secrete TGF-α, they do not display autocrine-regulated growth, and consequently they may be endocrine-responsive. The alternative explanation suggested that receptors for EGF could be saturated and masked by their ligand (38).

We have previously found that certain carcinomas were still endocrine regulated and endocrine sensitive as well, although contained EGF-R (10). Nicholson et al (39) found different levels of endocrine insensitivity between highly and moderately EGF-R-positive tumors, according to the level of immunostaining. Therefore, it could be concluded that the quantitative EGF-R content is associated with the level of the loss of endocrine sensitivity. In addition, Nicholson et al (8,9) found the lower levels of EGF-R in responders, than in non-responders to endocrine therapy. In our study, all patients with endocrine responsive tumors received adjuvant tamoxifen or ovarian ablation: their outcome must be changed (improved) in regards with the “natural” course of disease. Thus, it seems noteworthy to analyze the prognostic value of EGF-R in the subgroup of patients who did not receive any adjuvant treatment.

Obviously the expression of EGF-R, which is related to the increased EGF-R/HER2 signaling, leading to increased cell proliferation and survival, tamoxifen and probably endocrine insensitivity and much aggressive tumor behavior – represents the unfavorable event. However, our results, presented here, show that the weak prognostic influence of EGF-R level disappeared after 15 years of FU. Similar loss of prognostic influence was confirmed by Klijn et al. (37).

It is unusual that expression of EGF-R does not influence directly the outcome of early BC patients. Controversial reports still appear (40). Even in studies that confirm the prognostic value of EGF-R (30), the real clinical usefulness of this finding is questionable. EGF-R probably is one of the most important factors in the complex orchestra of growth regulation and endocrine sensitivity/resistance mechanisms. Thus, the further investigation of co-expression and co-operation of EGF-R with other factors, such as HER2, TGF-α and others, could probably be of clinical interest, as well as the investigation of the role of elevated multiple elements of signaling pathways in BC prognosis (41).
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Figure 4. Disease-free interval (DFS) and overall survival (OS) with respect to the nodal status (N) of BC patients.
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