PREDICTIVE VALUE OF TOPOISOMERASE 1 BY IMMUNOHISTOCHEMISTRY (TOP1 IHC) IN PATIENTS WITH **METASTATIC BREAST CANCER RECEIVING IRINOTECAN-BASED THERAPY.**

¹Virginia Cancer Specialists/ US Oncology, Fairfax, VA; ²Evergreen Hematology-Oncology, Spokane, WA; ³Caris Life Sciences, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale Healthcare, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale Healthcare, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale Healthcare, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale Healthcare, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale Healthcare, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale Healthcare, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁵Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ; ⁴TGen Clinical Research Services at Scottsdale, Scottsd ⁶UM Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center, Deerfield Beach, FL; ⁷George Mason University, Manassas, VA; ⁸The Side-Out Foundation, Fairfax, VA; ⁹Paradigm Diagnostics, Phoenix, AZ.

Background

There is an unmet need for rapid assays predictive of efficacy for specific chemotherapy agents. In particular, for those patients with metastatic disease that have progressed on prior therapies. Newer multi-omic analysis can be performed on a single biopsy specimen and with rapid turn-around-time allowing greater clinical utility (1).

Methods

- \checkmark 49 patients with measurable metastatic breast cancer (MBC) and with a treatments were enrolled in a prospective phase II study.
- Real-time biopsies were evaluated with a multi-omic platform which include antibody) measured by IHC.
- ✓ 23 of 49 tumors were TOP1 positive (positive if intensity \ge 2+ in at least 30% tur

Figure 1: H&E (A) and positive staining for TOP1 (B) and H&E (C) negative staining for TOP1 (D)



Each of the 23 patients received an irinotecan based regimen as follows: 11 irino irinotecan+capecitabine or irinotecan+fluorouracil/leucovorin; 2 irinotecan+trastu irinotecan+exemestane. Twenty-two patients were evaluable for analysis.

To determine therapeutics benefit, a predetermined endpoint was used: progression free survival (PFS) of the new regimen divided by the PFS of t (GMI) with a ratio of 1.3 or greater indicating improved therapeutic benefit from the new regimen (2).

. Jameson GS et al. A pilot study utilizing multi-omic molecular profiling to find potential targets and select individualized treatments for patients with previously treated metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2014;147(3):579-88. 2. Von Hoff DD et al. Pilot study using molecular profiling of patients' tumors to find potential targets and select treatments for their refractory cancers. JCO 2010:4877-4883.

Robert N.J.¹, Anthony S.P.², Arguello D.³, Jameson G.S.⁴, Northfelt D.W.⁵, Jahanzeb M.⁶, Petricoin E.⁷, Pierobon M.⁷, Dunetz B.⁸, Liotta L.A.⁷, Loesch D.M.⁹

✓ In this prospective phase II study in patients with advanced MBC, measurement of TOP1 predicted clinical benefit as measured by GMI, in 61% of all patients receiving irinotecan based therapy and in 6/11 (55%) patients receiving irinotecan alone. \checkmark 73% of patients had a clinical benefit (PR and stable). ✓ These findings warrant further evaluation of TOP1 IHC in predicting the utility of irinotecan in the treatment of breast cancer.

history of prior	Table 1: Patient characteristic	
nistory of phot	Characteristic	n
	Gender	
ded TOP1 (1D6	Male	1
	Female	21
	Age, Years	
$\sim \sim r$	Median	66
nor).	Range	44-
and	Ethnicity	
anu	Not of Hispanic/Latin Origin	19
	Hispanic/Latin Origin	3
	Race	
	White	22
	Number of Prior Treatment Regimens	
Card Card Card Card Street	3	3
ALC: NOT	4	2
	5	3
	6	5
	9	4
	10	3
and the state of the second	12	2
	Tumor Characteristics	
otecan alone; 9	ER	
uzumab; 1	Positive	20
·	Negative	2
	PR	
The ratio of the	Positive	14
he prior therapy	Negative	8
	Her2	

Positive

Negative

Unknown

D)

References

Conclusions

Table 2: Treatment. GMI and Response	GMI distrib
% Ireatment Actual Patient Overall Best	based rea
Subject ID Received GMI Response	based reg
5 01-01-101 Irinotecan 1.977 SD	TOP1 pos
95 01-02-105 Irinotecan 0.319 PD	A 11
01-02-107 Folfiri 1.303 SD	All re
6 -74 Irinotecan + 7.156 SD	G
01-02-110 Folfiri 6.873 SD	
86 01-02-112 Folfiri 0.046 PD	
14 Irinotecan + 2.260* SD	
100 01-02-115 Fluorouracil 1.684 SD	
14 01-01-117 Irinotecan 3.408 SD	
9 01-02-118 Folfiri 2.527 PR	
14 02-04-007 Irinotecan 0.851 PD	Single ege
23 02-03-010 Irinotecan 3.843 SD	Single age
18 02-03-011Irinotecan + Capecitabine8.539PR	
9 02-03-012 Capecitabine 0.366 PD	
02-04-014 Irinotecan 1.373 SD	
91 902-02-023Irinotecan + Capecitabine1.370SD	
02-03-027 Irinotecan 0.429 PD	
64 02-02-029 Irinotecan 3.512 SD	
36 02-03-037 Irinotecan 1.145 PD	
02-02-036 Irinotecan 2.139 SD	
9 02-03-039Irinotecan + Trastuzumab1.429SD	* Patient did not window and the
5 02-02-041 Irinotecan 1.166 SD	responder.

bution after irinotecangimen in patients with sitive staining by IHC. egimens (n=23) MI < 1.3 GMI ≥ 1.3 (61%)

ent Irinotecan (n=11)

GMI < 1.3 (45%) GMI ≥ 1.3 (55%)

nave scan completed within GM refore is not considered a GM