# oncodesign Tumor-specific molecular changes in luminal B breast cancer patient-derived xenografts (PDXs)

Marc Hillairet de Boisferon<sup>1</sup>, Ismahene Benzaid<sup>1</sup>, Elodie Marie Dit Chatel<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Hoffmann<sup>1</sup>, and Bruce A. Littlefield<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>OncoDesign Biotechnology, Dijon, France; <sup>2</sup>Global Oncology, Eisai Inc., Cambridge, MA, USA

## Introduction

human health care

Breast cancer (BC) is the most common cancer and the leading cause of cancer related death among women in the world [1]. At least 70% of breast cancers are classified as estrogen recentor positive (EB+) and/or progesterone recentor positive (PB+) and HEB2 negative tumors commonly called luminal A breast cancers [2] Interfering with the EB pathway with antiestrogens (e.g., tamoxifen or fulvestrant) or estrogen deprivation (e.g. aromatase inhibitors or ovariectomy), decreases mortality from ER+ breast cancer. However, development of hormonal therapy resistance (HTR) in patients remains a major clinical issue [3]. The main mechanisms of resistance to these therapies are lack of ER expression. deregulation of ER-associated transcription factors, coactivators, activation of receptor tyrosine kinase signaling, and aberrant expression of cell-cycle regulators [4]. A huge research effort has over the years deciphered key biological mechanisms of HTR. Unfortunately, results obtained in biology-based clinical studies showed only very small and short-term clinical benefits, underlining the need for more in-depth molecular understanding of HTR and adequately predictive preclinical investigations. Consequently, there is a need for new experimental models that better replicate the diversity of human tumor biology in a preclinical setting. Utilization of patient-derived xenograft (PDX) models in preclinical breast cancer research has been recognized as a more realistic solution to recapitulate human molecular tumor changes associated with acquisition of resistance and predict patient drug response [5] by directly comparing drug responses in patients and their corresponding xenografts. To extend such observations to a greater number of human cancers. OncoDesign and Eisai have collaboratively developed an extensive collection of breast cancer PDXs. Starting with luminal A hormone dependent breast cancer PDX models, we generated PDX sublines with acquired resistance to fulvestrant or the ability to grow in the complete absence of estrogen (ovariectomy or without estrogen supplementation), thus corresponding to acquisition of resistance following hormonotherapy in the clinical setting. To understand phenotypic changes associated with resistance acquisition, each generated PDX subline was then analyzed by IHC (for ER/PR expression), whole exome sequencing, RNA sequencing and DNA methylation analyses and compared to the parental tumor.

Similar to what is observed in the clinic, 60% of our breast PDX panel is classified as estrogen receptor (ER) positive. Immunohistochemical analyses showed that all derived resistant PDXs had complete loss of PR expression regardless of selection method, whereas ER expression was only decreased in resistant PDXs that had been selected by fulvestrant treatment. Response to hormone therapy showed different sensitivities, thus exhibiting heterogeneity similar to what is observed in the clinic. Genetic analyses showed that resistant PDX tumors fell into two different transcriptomic signatures, depending on whether resistance was driven by estrogen deprivation or fulvestrant administration. Compared to the naïve parental tumor the cluster corresponding to fully estrant-selected PDX showed up-regulated and down-regulated pathways associated with genomic alterations related to endocrine therapy pathways. Interestingly, the other cluster in which PDX were selected without fulvestrant showed only a partial genomic alterations. Furthermore, whole exome sequencing of the PDX revealed similar driver genes mutations existed in both derived resistant and sensitive parental PDX. Finally, we confirmed pharmacological resistance to fulvestrant in the resistant PDX. New experiments investigating drug combinations in the context of endocrine resistance are ongoing.

# References

[1]- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018; 68:394–424.

[2] Kohler BA, Sherman PL, Howlader N, Jemal A, Pyreson AB, Henry KA, Boscoe FP, Cronin KA, Lake A, Noone AM, Henley SJ, Eheman CR, Anderson RN, Penberthy L. Annual report to the nation on the status of cancer, 1975–2011, featuring incidence of breast cancer subtypes by race/ethnicity, poverty, and state. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2015; 10:73():048

[3]- Ma CX, Reinert T, Chmielewska I, Ellis MJ. Mechanisms of aromatase inhibitor resistance. Nat Rev Cancer. 2015;15:261–75.

[4]- Ring, A. & Dowsett, M. Mechanisms of tamoxifen resistance. Endocr Relat Cancer. 2004; 11:643-58.

[5]- Hidalgo, M. et al. Patient-derived xenograft models: an emerging platform for translational cancer research. Cancer Discov. 2014; 4, 998–1013.

# Figure 2: Phenotypic stability between the original patient tumor and its corresponding acronging. Immunoisochemistry analyses of ER, PR and HER2 markers in parental breast tumor from patient and corresponding derived xenografts in Swiss Nude mice. In vivo tumor growth of OD-BRE-0438 xenografts and response to endocrine therapies In vivo tumor growth of OD-BRE-0438 xenografts and response to endocrine therapies In the parental breast tumor from patient and once parental breast tumor from patient and treast tumor from pat

Patient and Cancer Details

51-year-old female natient with luminal F

Patient tumor phenotype is reproduced in its patient derived xenograft

ive lobular breast carcinoma

HER 2



Results

Breast patient derived xenograft model

EB / PB /Her2 Status

ED./DD./UED2

DR.

OD BBE 0429

ER.

Figure 1: In vivo effect of estrogen deprivation (ovariectomy or without estrogen supplementation) and/or fulvestrant treatment on OD-BRE-0438 PDX models. Intact or ovariectomized Swiss Nude mice bearing OD-BRE-438 tumors were randomized into 5 groups and treated +/- estrogen supplementation and +/- fulvestrant as shown. Two groups of animals received fulvestrant treatment at 2.5 mg/mouse. The data show individual tumor volumes for each animal, with Day 0 defined as the day of initiation of the resistance-inducing protocols. Individual tumors with light colors were chosen for biomarkers analyses.

### Hormone receptor expression is affected by endocrine therapy



Figure 3: Immunohistochemistry analysis of ER, PR and HER2 from PDX tumor tissues generated from the 5 different treatment groups. The graph represents the individual value for each tumor and the mean t SEM for each group for HER2, ER, and PR. Tumors treated with endocrine therapy (tulvestrant; G3, G5) or estrogen deprivation (without estrogen supplementation and/or ovariectomy; G2, G3, G4) showed changes in hormone receptor expression levels compared to the untreated tumor from group 1 (G1).

## Estrogen independence and/or acquired resistance to endocrine treatment is associated with tumor-specific molecular changes



Figure 4: Characterization of molecular features of tumors generated from the 5 groups treated or not with fulvestrant, A) Differential gene expression of PDX tumors generated from the 5 different groups (G1, G2, G3, G4, G6) treated or not with fulvestrant compared to the control PDX (G1). The categorized subtype information is illustrated as a heat map with hierarchical clustering into 3 clusters (C1, C2, C3) according to gene expression patterns. B) Heat map representing up-regulated and downregulated pathways associated with genomic alterations in individual PDX tumors from groups in clusters 1 and 3 compared to G1.



Figure 5: Characterization of PDX estrogen independence issued from G3 and G4 to test their sensitivity of resistance to fulvestrant treatment. A). Swiss Nude Mice bearing OD-BRE-438 PDX received fulvestrant at 2.5 mg/mouse (original growth condition of PDX derived from G3; see Figure 1) and were then randomized into 4 groups and treated ± estrogen and ± fulvestrant 5 mg/mouse (maximum tolerated dose). The graph in the red box represents the growth condition of the tumor issued from G3. B). Intact or ovariectomized Swiss nude mice were randomized into 6 groups and treated ± estrogen and ± fulvestrant 5 mg/mouse (maximum tolerated dose). The graph in the red box represents the growth condition of the tumor issued from G3.

## **Comments and Conclusions**

40 60 80 100 120 Times (day)

✓ We established OD-BRE-438 subline-based PDX preclinical tumor models which show resistance to hormone therapy treatment (fulvestrant) in presence or absence of estrogen supplementation.

- Characterization of molecular features revealed differences between transcriptomic profiles of PDX models treated with fulvestrant versus untreated PDX, as compared to the original parental PDX tumor.
- The PDX tumor model treated with fulvestrant displays differential gene expression indicative of activation of many pathways, thus providing relevant models to test targeted agents and new treatment combinations.
- ✓ We confirmed the resistance of PDX to fulvestrant treatment generated from group 3 which already shows resistance to hormone therapy treatment.
- ✓ New experiments are ongoing using this PDX model resistance to fulvestrant with combinations therapy.

Abstract #1399