

School of Medicine

32P ESMO Breast, Berlin Germany, 15-17 May 2024 **Genomic risk classification and whole transcriptome analysis of HR+/HER2- Postpartum breast cancers -**A FLEX sub study

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **ANSCHUTZ MEDICAL CAMPUS**

Virginia F. Borges¹, Elena Shagisultanova¹, Joyce O'Shaughnessy², Adam Brufsky³, Reshma L. Mahtani⁴, Kent Hoskins⁵, Hannah Linden⁶, Nina D'Abreo⁷, Sahra Uygun⁸, Lavanya Samraj⁸, William Audeh⁸ 1. University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora CO 2. Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, TX 3. University of Pittsburgh Medical Center Hillman Cancer Center, Pittsburgh, PA 4. Baptist Health South Florida, Plantation, FL 5. University of Illinois Cancer Center, Chicago, IL 6. Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, WA 7. New York University Langone's Perlmutter Cancer Center—Sunset Park, NY 8. Agendia Inc., Irvine, CA, USA

BACKGROUND

Women diagnosed with breast cancer before the age 45 and within 5-10 years of a childbirth have increased risk of metastasis. These high-risk cancers, defined as postpartum breast cancer (PPBC), have significantly worse prognosis independent of clinical-pathologic features and demonstrate treatment resistance. We hypothesized that PPBC exhibits high risk molecular profiles and sought to define the genomic patterns of PPBC.

METHODS

The prospective, observational FLEX Study (NCT03053193) includes stage I-III early BC patients who received MammaPrint[®] (MP) and/or BluePrint[®] (BP) testing and consented to full transcriptome and clinical data collection. We identified 377 HR positive and HER2-negative patients, age ≤50, grouped as PPBC 0-5 years (n=33); PPBC 6-10 years (n=51), PPBC beyond 10 years (n= 175). Nulliparous (n=118) was used as the comparison group (p-values in Table 1). Median age, clinical characteristics, metabolic factors, and genomic test results (MP and BP) were compared between PPBC groups and nulliparous. Limma R package was used for differential gene expression analysis in age-matched cohorts. Using the genes with 2-fold change (FC) difference, pathway analysis was conducted using Metascape [1] and Reactome [2].

RESULTS

Table 1 shows patient tumor characteristics. Median age for PPBC in the first 5 years is 38
 compared to 43 for nulliparous (p<0.001). No other clinical factors were significantly associated with any subgroup.

Figure 1A shows PPBC 0-5 had a significantly higher percentage of MP High 2 and lower percentage of MP Low Risk compared to nulliparous women (p < 0.05). Age matched cohorts showed similar trend in MP distribution.

Figure 1B shows that PPBC 0-5 had higher percentage of BluePrint Luminal B and Basal compared to nulliparous (not significant, p > 0.05).

Figure 2 shows the volcano plot of whole transcriptome comparison of age-matched PPBC 0-5 and nulliparous. PPBC 0-5 cohort had 25 genes with 2-fold higher expression compared to nulliparous. Elevated expression of MUCL1 and CLEC3A is of particular interest (Figure 3):

- MUCL1 is associated with promoting the invasion and metastasis of breast cancer cells via promoting epithelial-mesenchymal transition [3].
- High CLEC3A expression was shown to correlate with metastatic potential and indicated a poor prognosis in breast cancer, particularly in ductal carcinoma [4].

Figure 4 depicts the Reactome pathway analysis indicating enrichment of genes related to adaptive immune responses, humoral responses, and signal transduction in the PPBC 0-5 years group. Metascape analysis similarly showed enrichment of adaptive immune responses and immunoglobulin-mediated immune responses (not shown).

RESULTS

Table 1. Patie	ient Tumor Characteristics				p-values compared to nulliparous		
	PPBC 0-5 years (n=33)	PPBC 0-10 years (n=84)	PPBC >10 years (n=175)	Nulliparous (n=118)	PPBC 0-5	PPBC 0-10	PPBC >10
Age years							
Median	38	41	47	43	< 0.001	0.25	< 0.001
Range	28.00 - 47.00	28.00 - 50.00	33.00 - 50.00	27.00 - 50.00			
T stage							
T1	13 (48.1%)	36 (56.2%)	85 (66.4%)	43 (53.8%)	0.66	0.972	0.247
T2	13 (48.1%)	22 (34.4%)	36 (28.1%)	30 (37.5%)			
Т3	1 (3.7%)	4 (6.2%)	6 (4.7%)	5 (6.2%)			
T4	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.1%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (2.5%)			
Grade							
G1	5 (15.6%)	17 (20.7%)	52 (30.4%)	26 (22.8%)	0.236	0.772	0.353
G2	16 (50.0%)	45 (54.9%)	86 (50.3%)	65 (57.0%)			
G3	11 (34.4%)	20 (24.4%)	33 (19.3%)	23 (20.2%)			
N stage							
NO	21 (80.8%)	50 (82.0%)	101 (82.8%)	66 (84.6%)	0.76	0.819	0.846
N1	5 (19.2%)	11 (18.0%)	21 (17.2%)	12 (15.4%)			
Histology							
IDC	31 (93.9%)	71 (86.6%)	151 (87.8%)	106 (90.6%)	0.866	0.62	0.763
ILC	1 (3.0%)	8 (9.8%)	14 (8.1%)	8 (6.8%)			
MixedIDC&ILC	1 (3.0%)	3 (3.7%)	7 (4.1%)	3 (2.6%)			
Menopausal							
Pre-/Peri-	31 (93.9%)	77 (92.8%)	129 (75.9%)	96 (84.2%)	0.247	0.08	0.102
Post-	2 (6.1%)	6 (7.2%)	41 (24.1%)	18 (15.8%)			
ki67							
0-10	3 (12.0%)	16 (26.2%)	24 (22.2%)	25 (28.1%)	0.098	0.837	0.432
11-20	3 (12.0%)	11 (18.0%)	31 (28.7%)	19 (21.3%)			
>20	19 (76.0%)	34 (55.7%)	53 (49.1%)	45 (50.6%)			
Race/Ethnicity							
White	23 (79.3%)	4 (5.3%)	137 (87.3%)	93 (83.8%)	0.092	0.724	0.104
Black	6 (20.7%)	9 (12.0%)	17 (10.8%)	10 (9.0%)			
ΑΑΡΙ	0 (0.0%)	62 (82.7%)	3 (1.9%)	8 (7.2%)			

CONCLUSION

In this study, PPBC 0-5 years of childbirth is associated with significantly higher risk of recurrence (MP High 2) and increased immune gene expression, other unique genes/pathways related to PPBC biology compared to BC in nulliparous women.

These findings are consistent with the poor clinical outcomes previously reported for PPBC. Increased frequency of MP High 2 tumors and immune biology indicate that PPBC might benefit from adding immunotherapy, to be explored in future trials.



* Proportional z-test, p-value < 0.05

Figure 2. Volcano plot comparing age matched PPBC 0-5 and nulliparous







Hierarchical representation of reactome pathways showing coverage of pathways genes among genes FC >2



32/33 PPBC 0-5 years and 115/118 nulliparous patients also had BluePrint testing

Figure 3. Boxplots of MUCL1 and CLEC3A mRNA expression

MUCL1 ••• · .. · . , • • ••• ... nulliparous



p-values are from Mann-Whitney test

References

- 1. Zhou et al., Nature Communication (2019), 10(1):1523
- 2. Fabregat et al. BMC Bioinformatics (2017), 18(1):142
- 3. Li et al. Oncol Rep. (2020), 44(2):509-518
- 4. Ni et al. Onco Targets Ther. (2018), 11:3303-3312

Disclosures

Virginia F. Borges: Nothing to declare

