

Molecular analysis of EGFR gene mutation and PD-L1 expression in a Brazilian cervical cancer cohort



Torres, ML¹; Abreu T^{1,2}; Fonseca R¹; Inada HP³; Rodrigues EM¹; Ferreira CG²; Melo AC^{1,2}, Thuler, LCS¹ 1 Instituto Nacional de Cancer 2 Grupo Oncologia D'Or 3 Hemorio

INTRODUCTION

RESULTS

Cervical cancer (CC) represents the third most commonly diagnosed cancer and the fourth cause of cancer death in women worldwide^{1,2}. There are two main types of CC: squamous cell carcinoma (SCC), that accounts for 80-90% of the cases and adenocarcinoma (ACA), which represents 10-20% of CC histology. Although preventive strategies are cardinal, early diagnosis and an effective treatment are primordial for the reduction of morbidity and mortality. EGFR receptors are expressed by CC cells and when autofosforilated activation of cancer signaling pathways is promoted, but data from mutational status of EGFR during cervical carcinogenesis differ in the literature. EGFR receptor could be a target therapy in CC as it is in lung cancer^{3,4,5}.

184 CC patients stage IA to IV with age between 18-80 years from 2011 were included. Table 1 demonstrates the clinical and epidemiological variables by cancer type. SCC and ACA are similar with the exception of age at sexual initiation, number of sexual partner, FIGO classification, tumor size and surgical treatment. Table 2 demonstrates pathological characteristics by cancer type, SCC and ACA are not similar in many variables: cancer and stromal percentage, necrosis, mitosis, inflammation type and site, pleomorphism and PD-L1 expression. Regarding PD-L1 expression, within ACA (61 cases), 8 had insufficient material, 58.5% were negative, 10 (18.9%) presented minimal PD-L1 expression of <5%, 4 (7.5%) presented PD-L1expression between 5-25%, 3 (5.7%) between 25-50%, 2 (3.8%) between 50-75% and 3 (5.7%) between 75-100% of positivity. Three cases had heterogeneity expression. Within SCC, (123 cases), 20 had insufficient material, 42/103 (40.8%) were negative, 11 (10.7%) presented minimal PD-L1 expression of <5%, 19 (18.4%) presented PD-L1expression between 5-25%, 18 (17.5%) between 25-50%, 6 (5.8%) between 50-75% and 7 (6.8%) between 75-100% of positivity. Heterogeneity of PD-L1 expression was seen in 11 cases. Overall, 41.5% of ACA and 59.2% of SCC had positive PD-L1 expression. EGFR exon 18, 19, 20 and 21 were investigated and mutation was found in 1 (0.9%) of 112 SCC. None ACA presented EGFR mutation. The mutation occurred at exon 18 by a replacement of the amino acid Glutamate with Glutamine at position 711 (E711Q ou c.2131G>C).

Also, the programmed death-1/programmed death-ligand-1 (PD-1/PD-L1) immune regulatory axis has emerged as a promising new target for cancer therapeutics, with lasting responses seen in the treatment of metastatic renal, lung cancer and melanomas. Tumor surface expression of PD-L1 has been found to correlate with objective responses to anti-PD-L1 immunotherapies.

Due to the high mortality of the advanced CC, the identification of a specific population that would benefit from target therapy is of the utmost importance.

AIM

To investigate the EGFR mutations and PD-L1 expression in CC and evaluate their prognostic significance in those patients.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

A cohort of CC from 2011 INCA were evaluated for EGFR mutation and PD-L1 expression. DNA samples were isolated from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded samples of CC patients. Direct sequence analysis of the PCR products of EGFR gene was used in order to evaluate activating mutations. PD-L1 expression were evaluated through immunohistochemistry of tissue microarrays (TMA) of the same CC cases. Epidemiologic data were collected. 123 SCC and 61 ACA matched our selection criteria for DNA extraction and TMA preparation.

TABLE 2: Pathologic variables by cancer type

	Squamous Cell	Adapasaminama		
Pathological review	cancinoma	Adenocarcinoma	Total (N=184)	p-value
	(N=123)	(N=01)		
Cancer percentage	77,30 (±11.85)	81.17 (±10,18)	78,57 (±11.45)	0,024
Stromal percentage	16.80 (±10.37)	11.17 (±10.37)	14,71 (±9.77)	<0,001
Mitosis	24.45 (±48.99)	12.76 (±15.38)	20,79 (±41.82)	0,020
Stromal type				0.008
Fibrous	54 (45.0%)	14 (23.3%)	68 (37.8%)	
Muscular	66 (55.0%)	45 (75.0%)	111 (61.7%)	
Necrosis				0.197
Withou necrosis	21 (17.5%)	13 (21.7%)	34 (18.9%)	
Mild	70 (58.3%)	25 (41.7%)	95 (52.8%)	
Moderate	20 (16.7%)	15 (25.0%)	35 (19.4%)	
High	9 (7.5%)	7 (11.7%)	16 (8.9%)	
Quantity of inflammation				0.635
Mild	55 (45.8%)	32 (53.3%)	87 (48.3%)	
Moderate	47 (39.2%)	18 (30.0%)	65 (36.1%)	
High	15 (12.5%)	9 (15.0%)	24 (13.3%)	
Inflammationtype				0.004
Lymphocyte	30 (25.0%)	6 (10.0%)	36 (20.0%)	
Polymorph	6 (5.0%)	5 (8.3%)	11 (6.1%)	
Both	17 (14.2%)	20 (33.3%)	37 (20.6%)	
Inflammationsite				0.005
Intratumoral	81 (71.1%)	34 (56.7%)	115 (66.1%)	
Peritumoral	14 (12.3%)	9 (15.0%)	23 (13.2%)	
Stromal	11 (9.6%)	16 (26.7%)	27 (15.5%)	
Intratumoral and	8 (7 0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.6%)	
Stromal	0 (1.070)	0 (0.070)		
Pleomorphism				< 0.001
Mild	2 (1.7%)	9 (15.0%)	11 (6.1%)	
Moderate	72 (60.0%)	40 (66.7%)	112 (62.2%)	
High	46 (38.3%)	11 (18.3%)	57 (31.7%)	
Differentiation				0.054
Mild	11 (9.6%)	13 (21.7%)	24 (13.7%)	
Moderate	77 (67.0%)	31 (51.7%)	108 (61.7%)	
Hight	27 (23.5%)	15 (25.0%)	42 (24.0%)	
PD-L1 expression				0.040
Without expression	42 (40.8%)	31 (58.5%)	73 (46.8%)	
Up to 5%	11 (10.7%)	10 (18.9%)	21 (13.5%)	
5-25%	19 (18.4%)	4 (7.5%)	23 (14.7%)	
25-50%	18 (17.5%)	3 (5.7%)	21 (13.5%)	
50-75%	6 (5.8%)	2 (3.8%)	8 (5.1%)	
75-100%	7 (6.8%)	3 (5.7%)	10 (6.4%)	
PD-L1 expression				0.251
neterogeneity	44.70.0073	9 / 4 00/ 1	44 /7 00/1	
res	11 (8.9%)	3 (4.9%)	14 (7.0%)	
NO DD I 4	92 (74.8%)	52 (85.2%)	144 (78.3%)	
PD-L1 expression				0.064
Intensity	10 (10 000)	24.752.520	70 / /0 00/1	
Without expression.	42 (40.8%)	31 (58.5%)	(3 (40.8%)	
Weak	30 (30.9%)	10 (30.2%)	04 (04.0%) 05 (40.0%)	
Woderate	21 (20.4%)	4 (7.5%)	25 (10.0%)	
High	2 (1.9%)	2 (3.8%)	4 (2.6%)	

TABLE 1:Clinical and Epidemiologic variables by cancer type

Clinical and epidemiological	squamouscen	Adenocarcinoma	T-+-1(N-404)	
variables	carcinoma (N. 122)	(N=61)	iotal (N=184)	p-value
	(N=123)	FR (0 (+1 4 27)	50 70 (±14 00)	0.546
Age, years	52.33 (II5.3)	53.69 (114.27)	52.78 (±14.96)	0.546
Age, years	ac (ac and	4.4.4.6.654	77 (20 404)	0.783
18-30	26 (21.1%)	11 (18.0%)	37 (20.1%)	
30-50	66 (53.7%)	32 (52.6%)	98 (53.3%)	
>50	31 (25.2%)	18 (29.5%)	49 (26.6%)	
Age				0.467
≤70	104 (84.6%)	54 (88.5%)	158 (85,9%)	
>70	19 (15.4%)	7 (11.5%)	26 (14,1%)	
Menarch, year	13.07 (±1.80)	13.38(±1,79)	13.17 (± 1.80)	0.258
Menarch, years				0.925
≤14	92 (76.0%)	46 (76,7%)	138 (76.2%)	
>15	29 (24.0%)	14 (23, 3%)	43 (23, 8%)	
Sexual initiation, years	(0.004
<15	38 (31 9%)	5 (8,8%)	43 (24 4%)	
15-20	50 (52.5%) 52 (52.1%)	41 (71 9%)	103 (58 5%)	
> 20	19 (16 0%)	11 (19 2%)	20 (17.0)	
Sovual partners	15 (10.070)	11(13.379	56(17.6)	0.012
O ou 1	22 (27 484)	25 (A5 494)	EQ (33 EQ)	0.013
>2	95 (72 6%)	20 (52,6%)	115 (55.5%)	
E Z	05 (72.070)	0,0.00	115 (00.5%)	0.079
riegnancy	100 (00, 494)	57 (00, 40/)	477 (06.7%)	0.078
Yes	120 (98.4%)	57 (93.4%)	177 (96.7%)	
No	2 (1.6%)	4 (6.6%)	6 (3.3%)	
Menopause				0.143
Yes	60 (49,2%)	37 (60.7%)	86 (47.0%)	
No	62 (50.8%)	24 (39.3%)	37 (53.0%)	
Time between last cervical				
cytology and cervical cancer,	2.89 (±3.82)	2.96 (±4.02)	2.92 (±3.88)	0.923
year				
Time between last cervical cytology and cervical cancer				0.725
vear				
<1	11 (15 704)	5 (10 9%)	16 (12 004)	
1.3	43 (61 494)	31 (67 4%)	74 (62 994)	
52	16 (01.470)	10 (01.470)	25 (22,070) 25 (22,4%)	
Smoking	10 (22.5%)	10 (21.7%)	20 (22.470)	0.062
Ve-	EQ (47.004)	20 (22 284)	70 (42 444)	0.065
Tes No.	56 (47.2%)	20 (52.8%)	78 (42.4%)	
NO	65 (52.8%)	41 (67.2%)	106 (57.6%)	
Comorbidies				0.318
Yes	47 (38.2%)	28 (45.9%)	75 (40.8%)	
No	76 (61.8%)	33 (54.1%)	109 (59.2%)	
Contraceptive use				0.231
Yes	73 (60.3%)	41 (69.5%)	114 (63.3%)	
No	48 (39.7%)	18 (30.5%)	66 (36.7%)	
FIGO classification				0.073
la	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	
lb1	13 (10.6%)	15 (24.6%)	28 (15.2%)	
lb2	9 (7.3%)	9 (14.8%)	18 (9.8%)	
lla	5 (4.1%)	1 (1.6%)	6 (3.3%)	
ПЬ	35 (28.5%)	20 (32.8%)	55 (29.9%)	
IIIa	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	
ШЬ	50 (40 7%)	13 (21 3%)	63 (34 2%)	
IV-	5 (4 9%)	2 (2 3%)	8 (4 3%)	
IVb	2 (2, 494)	2 (5.5%)	4 (2, 2%)	
DCO ele estimation	5 (2.4%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (2.270)	0.011
FIGU classification	a a la a sad	45 (04 50)	00 (45 00))	0.021
la e lb1	14 (11.4%)	15 (24.6%)	29 (15.8%)	
Ib2-IVb	109 (88.6%)	46 (75.4%)	15 (84.2%)	
Visible tumor size, cm				0.003
≤4	39 (33.1%)	33 (55.9%)	72 (40.7%)	
>4	79 (66.9%)	26 (44.1%)	105 (59.3%)	
Positive lymphnodes in				0.792
surgical patients				0.762
Yes	4 (18.2%)	3 (15.0%)	7 (16.7%)	
No	18 (81.8%)	17 (85.0%)	35 (83.3%)	
Surgery				0.031
Yes	23 (18.75)	20 (32.8%)	43 (23.4%)	
No	100 (81.3%)	41 (67.2%)	141 (76.6%)	
Chemotherapy		a far merel	a contraction of	0.234
Yes	77 (64,2%)	33 (55.0%)	110 (61, 1%)	
No	43 (35.8%)	27 (45 0%)	70 (38.8%)	
Radiotherany	12 (22.070)	27 (13.079)	10 (00.074)	0.437
Yes	95 (78 5%)	44 (73 3%)	139 (76.8%)	
No	26 (21 594)	16 (26 7%)	42 (22.2%)	
Reachythorney	20 (22.370)	20 (20.770)	12 (23.270)	0.590
Vac	71 (50.004)	1/45 52) 95	109 (60.6%)	0.550
No	10 (40.000)	20 (25.20)	71 (20, 4%)	
NO	49 (40.8%)	22 (36.7%)	71 (39.4%)	
Radiochemotherapy alone				0.310
Yes	97 (81.5%)	45 (75.0%)	142 (79.3%)	
No	22 (18.5%)	15 (25.0%)	37 (20.7%)	
Progression or requirence				0.959
				0.000
Yes	63 (51.2%)	31 (50.8%)	94 (51.1%)	
No	60 (48.8%)	30 (49.2)	90 (48.9%)	
Death				0.228
Yes	65 (53.7%)	27 (44.3%)	92 (50.5%)	
No	56 (46.3%)	34 (55.7%)	90 (49.5%)	
Last visit status				0.301
With cancer	4 (7.0%)	4 (11.8%)	8 (8.8%)	
Without cancer	51 (89 5%)	30 (88 2%)	81 (89 0%)	
No information	2 (3 5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2 2%)	
	- (0 (0.0 M)	- 1	

Continuous variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation; categorical variables as frequency (percentage). A p-value in bold font indicates a significant difference between group PD-L1, programmed death-ligand.



Continuous variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation; categorical variables as frequency (percentage). A p-value in bold font indicates a significant difference between groups The presented results indicate that EGFR mutations is uncommon in CC and it is unlikely to be useful for cancer treatment. PD-L1 expression could be considered as a potential biomarker for CC and a potential target for immunotherapy.

REFERENCES

(1) Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2013. Available from: http://globocan.iarc.fr, accessed on day/month/year.
(2) (<u>http://globocan.iarc.fr/Pages/bar_sex_pop_prev_sel.aspx</u>)

(3) Longatto-Filho A, Pinheiro C, Martinho O, Moreira MA, Ribeiro LF, Queiroz GS, Schmitt FC, Baltazar F, Reis RM. Molecular characterization of EGFR, PDGFRA and VEGFR2 in cervical adenosquamous carcinoma. BMC Cancer. 2009 Jun 29;9:212

(4) da Cunha Santos G., Shepherd F.A., Tsao M.S. Egfr mutations and lung cancer. Annu. Rev. Pathol. 2011;6:49–69.

(5) Arias-Pulido H, Joste N, Chavez A, Muller CY, Dai D, Smith HO, Verschraegen CF. Absence of epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in cervical cancer. Int J Gynecol Cancer. 2008;18:749–754.

(6) <u>Heeren AM</u>, <u>Punt S</u>, <u>Bleeker MC</u>, <u>Gaarenstroom KN</u>, <u>van der Velden J</u>, <u>Kenter GG</u>, <u>de Gruijl TD</u>, <u>Jordanova ES</u>. Prognostic effect of different PD-L1 expression patterns in squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma of the cervix. <u>Mod Pathol</u>. 2016 Jul;29(7):753-63.

Projeto Gráfico: Setor de Edição e Informação Técnico-Científica / INCA





