VANDERBILT VERSITY

Identification of racial disparities across MammaPrint[®] and **BluePrint[®] subtypes in HR+HER2- breast cancer**

MEDICAL CENTER

Sonya Reid, M.D.¹; Jennifer G. Whisenant, Ph.D.¹; Jennifer Wei, M.D., Ph.D.²; Harshini Ramaswamy, M.Sc.²; Nicole Stivers, Ph.D.²; Andrea Menicucci, Ph.D.²; William Audeh, M.D.²; Tuya Pal, M.D.¹ | ¹Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN; ²Agendia Inc, Irvine, CA

Background

- Black women in the United States diagnosed with breast cancer have a 30% higher mortality rate than White women, even after adjusting for socioeconomic factors.¹
- Racial disparities in outcomes are observed even among patients receiving comparable systemic treatments, suggesting, in part, a biological basis for racial survival disparities observed in patients diagnosed with hormone receptor positive (HR+) breast cancer.²
- Higher incidences of genomically high risk tumors have been observed in Black participants in studies utilizing MammaPrint risk of distant recurrence and BluePrint molecular subtyping.^{3,4}
- In this study, we utilized MammaPrint and BluePrint to examine whether tumor genomic differences contribute to racial survival disparities among women with HR+, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-negative (HER2-) early-stage breast cancer.

Methods

- This study included 1,018 participants with HR+HER2- early breast cancer with 3-year follow-up data. A reference cohort of 509 black females was used to propensity score match 509 White patients enrolled in FLEX by age and menopausal status.
- MammaPrint and BluePrint Genomic Test Results:

MammaPrint	Low Risk	High 1 Risk	High 2 Risk	
	1.000 to 0.000	0.000 to -0.569	-0.570 to -1.000	
BluePrint	Luminal A-Type	Luminal B-Type		Basal-Type

- Recurrence-free survival (RFS) was compared between race and molecular subtype using Kaplan-Meier estimates and logrank tests.
- A Cox proportional hazards model was used to analyze the association of MammaPrint, BluePrint, race, and clinicopathologic features with RFS.

al	able 1. Clinical Characteristics					
		Black (N=509)	White (N=509)	All (N=1018)	P-value	
	Age (Years)					
	Mean (SD)	54 (± 13)	54 (± 13)	54 (± 13)	0.983	
	Menopausal Status					
	Post-	250 (51.9%)	251 (52.1%)	501 (52.0%)	1	
	Pre-/Peri-	232 (48.1%)	231 (47.9%)	463 (48.0%)		
	Tumor Stage					
	T1	203 (56.7%)	202 (63.9%)	405 (60.1%)	0.645	
	T2	124 (34.6%)	94 (29.7%)	218 (32.3%)		
	Т3	24 (6.7%)	17 (5.4%)	41 (6.1%)		
	Τ4	7 (2.0%)	3 (0.9%)	10 (1.5%)		
	Lymph Node Status					
	LN-	241 (70.1%)	240 (82.5%)	481 (75.7%)	0.002	
	LN+	103 (29.9%)	51 (17.5%)	154 (24.3%)		
	Grade					
	G1	113 (23.5%)	143 (30.0%)	256 (26.8%)	<0.001	
	G2	225 (46.8%)	259 (54.4%)	484 (50.6%)		
	G3	143 (29.7%)	74 (15.5%)	217 (22.7%)		
	ER Staining					
	>10%	469 (95.9%)	492 (97.8%)	961 (96.9%)	0.257	
	1-10%	20 (4 1%)	11 (2 2%)	31(31%)		

Data presented N (%) unless indicated otherwise: Unknown values excluded: N. sample size: standard deviation: ER, estrogen receptor





Figure 1. MammaPrint and BluePrint distribution by race with HR+HER2- tumors



All participants were included in MammaPrint comparisons. Participants with unknown B excluded from BluePrint comparisons (N=492 and N=475 for Black and White participan

Figure 2B. 3-year RFS by MammaPrint



Table 2. Multivariate Cox proportional hazards model

Variable	HR (multivariate)	Variable	HR (multiva
MP/BP Group		Tumor Stage	
Low Risk/Luminal A	-	T1	-
High Risk/Luminal B	3.50 (1.26-9.76, p=0.017)	T2	1.37 (0.65-2.90,
High Risk/Basal	5.84 (1.59-21.37, p=0.008)	Т3	2.78 (1.08-7.13,
Menopausal Status		Lymph Node Status	
Pre-/Peri-	-	LN-	-
Post-	2.45 (1.23-4.88, p=0.011)	LN+	2.94 (1.50-5.79,
Race		Grade	
White	-	G1	-
Black	1.14 (0.54-2.41, p=0.731)	G2	1.20 (0.38-3.79,
		G3	1.60 (0.47-5.50,

Data presented as HR (95% CI, p-value). T4 not included due to small sample size N=10. HR, hazard ratio: MP. MammaPrint: BP. BluePrint





ESMO Congress 2024 | Barcelona Monday, September 16th | Presentation # 310P

in participants	Results
<u>t</u> K	 Black participants were significantly more likely to have nodal involvement, higher grade (Table 1), and were more likely to be treated with chemotherapy, compared to White participants (73.6% vs. 47.1%, respectively; p<0.001)
	 Genomically High Risk tumors were more common among Black compared to White females (Figure 1):
	 High 2: p<0.001; Luminal B-Type: p=0.002; Basal-Type: p<0.001
А-Туре З-Туре	 No significant difference in 3-yr RFS was observed for Black females, compared to White females (p=0.55; Figure 2A)
pe luePrint results were ts, respectively)	 3-year RFS by MammaPrint and BluePrint (Figures 2B-C):
	 Low Risk: 96.7%, High 1: 94.1%, High 2: 86.4%; p<0.0001
	 Luminal A-Type: 96.5%; Luminal B-Type: 93.7%; Basal-Type: 83.7%; p<0.0001
95% CI) 98.5)	 In the multivariate model, High Risk Luminal B- and Basal-Type tumors had significantly worse 3-year outcomes compared to Luminal A-Type tumors. Post-menopausal status, T3 tumor size, and lymph node involvement were also associated with 3-year outcomes (Table 2)
96.5) 89.2) 3	 Race and tumor grade were not significantly associated with 3-year outcomes when adjusted for other covariates (Table 2)
R (multivariate)	Conclusions
- 0.65-2.90, p=0.412) 1.08-7.13, p=0.033)	 MammaPrint and BluePrint classification identified higher incidence of High 2, Luminal B, and Basal molecular subtypes among Black females, compared to White, with HR+HER2- early breast cancer.
- 1.50-5.79, p=0.002) -	 Notably, 3-yr RFS was driven by MammaPrint + BluePrint, independent of race, after adjusting for other covariates.
0.38-3.79, p=0.754) 0.47-5.50, p=0.453)	These data highlight the importance of tumor genomic testing to inform treatment decisions as we strive to reduce racial survival

This presentation is the intellectual property of the author/presenter. Contact them (sonya.reid@vumc.org) for permission to reprint and/or distribute

disparities among Black females with breast cancer.