



Short communication

Monitoring *KRAS* mutations in circulating DNA and tumor cells using digital droplet PCR during treatment of *KRAS*-mutated lung adenocarcinoma



Nicolas Guibert^{a,b,d}, Anne Pradines^{b,c}, Magali Farella^{b,c}, Anne Casanova^{b,c},
Sandrine Gouin^a, Laura Keller^{b,c,d}, Gilles Favre^{b,c,d}, Julien Mazieres^{a,b,d,*}

^a Thoracic Oncology Department, Larrey Hospital, University Hospital of Toulouse, France

^b Inserm, Centre de Recherche en Cancérologie de Toulouse, CRCT UMR-1037, Toulouse, France

^c Institut Claudius Regaud, IUCT-Oncopole, Laboratoire de Biologie Médicale Oncologique, Toulouse, France

^d University of Toulouse III (Paul Sabatier), Toulouse, France

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 28 June 2016

Received in revised form 18 July 2016

Accepted 21 July 2016

Keywords:

Non-small-cell lung cancer

KRAS mutation

Circulating tumor cells

Circulating tumor DNA

Monitoring of response

ABSTRACT

Liquid biopsies are a new non-invasive strategy to detect and monitor the biology of non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in the era of personalized medicine. *KRAS* is an oncogenic driver that is mutated in 30% of NSCLCs and is associated with a poor prognosis. 62 samples from 32 patients, treated for metastatic *KRAS*-mutated lung adenocarcinoma, had DNA extracted from plasma and circulating tumor cells (CTCs) prospectively tested for the presence of *KRAS* mutations using droplet digital PCR. A *KRAS* mutation was detected in 82% of patients. Sensitivity was 78% for circulating free DNA (cfDNA) and 34% for CTCs. The presence of a *KRAS* mutation in cfDNA was correlated with a poor response to chemotherapy or targeted therapy. When a *KRAS*-mutated-DNA was detected and then monitored in cfDNA, its variation during targeted or conventional therapy was correlated with response, according to RECIST criteria, in 87.5% of cases ($n = 14/16$), whereas this correlation was observed in 37.5% of cases for CTCs ($n = 3/8$). We report the usefulness of using digital droplet PCR on liquid biopsies to predict and monitor responses to treatment of *KRAS*-mutated lung adenocarcinoma. ctDNA was much more sensitive than CTCs in this context.

© 2016 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Amongst all the theranostic biomarkers for NSCLC, *KRAS* mutations are characterized by their high frequency (nearly 30% of adenocarcinomas), their negative prognostic value, and a lack of an effective targeted therapy. Nevertheless, recent preclinical findings and early phase trials indicate potentially effective strategies using lethal synthetic interactions [1] or by directly targeting *KRAS*-mutant proteins [2]. These encouraging results suggest the need for new tools that provide non-invasive and iterative information on these tumors. Liquid biopsies, circulating tumor cells (CTCs), and circulating-free DNA (cfDNA) isolated from the blood of patients have been widely studied in this field, but have not yet been adopted into routine clinical practice [3]. Beside their prognos-

tic value and the possibility of cytomorphological analysis, CTCs isolated by ISET (isolation by size of epithelial tumor cells) can detect some molecular alterations in NSCLC, such as *EGFR* mutations (assessed by PCR) [4] or *ALK* rearrangement (assessed by FISH and immunocytochemistry) [5].

cfDNA level is increased in lung-cancer patients and changes during treatment could help monitor tumor burden [6]. Identifying mutated tumor-specific DNA can circumvent the obstacle of its low specificity [7]. Thus, detection of several genomic alterations in cfDNA is possible with good diagnostic accuracy, including *EGFR* [8], *KRAS* [9–13], or *BRAF* mutations [14]. Another potential application for liquid biopsies is the early detection of mechanisms of resistance or their use to dynamically follow-up a mutated clone during targeted therapy [8,14].

KRAS-mutated cfDNA has been detected using many procedures that have variable sensitivities: 76.7% using restriction fragment-length polymorphism [15], 90% using ARMS-qPCR [14], and 97% with a multiplex PCR sequencing system [16]. A study recently compared the diagnostic accuracy of CTCs to cfDNA to detect *KRAS* mutations in blood samples ($n = 26$), and found cfDNA was more

* Corresponding author at: Thoracic Oncology Unit, Respiratory Disease Department, Hôpital Larrey, CHU Toulouse, Chemin de Pouvoirville, 31059 Toulouse Cedex, France.

E-mail addresses: nicolas.guibert@hotmail.fr (N. Guibert), mazieres.j@chu-toulouse.fr (J. Mazieres).

Table 1
Diagnostic accuracy of ddPCR on blood-derived DNA compared to tissue samples.

cfDNA	Results	DCR (RECIST)
Positive	26/32	34.6%
Negative	6/32	100%
Sensitivity	78%	
Specificity	100%	
CTCs		
Positive	11/32	
Negative	21/32	
Sensitivity	34.3%	
Specificity	100%	
Total liquid biopsy		
Positive	27/32	
Negative	5/32	
Sensitivity	81%	
Specificity	100%	

cfDNA = circulating free DNA; CTCs = circulating tumor cells; DCR = disease-control rate; RECIST = Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors.

sensitive than using CTCs (95% vs. 78% sensitivity, respectively) [17]. Variations in *EGFR*-mutated DNA level seem to be correlated with radiographic response to *EGFR*-TKI [8]. Nevertheless, although the use of plasma digital droplet PCR (ddPCR) for cfDNA has been recently used to detect *KRAS* mutations, and thus determine resistance in patients who have progressed under *EGFR*-TKI [18], the level of *KRAS* mutation has never been monitored during chemotherapy or targeted therapies using CTCs or cfDNA.

Herein, we compare the sensitivity of *KRAS*-mutated ctDNA and *KRAS*-mutated DNA extracted from CTCs to detect responses to treatment of *KRAS*-mutated lung adenocarcinoma.

Table 2
KRAS-mutated and wild-type DNA in plasma and circulating tumor cells (CTCs) during treatment for non-small-cell lung cancer.

	Last treatment received (before the time of blood collection)	Mutant copies/mL in CTCs	Negative control (wild-type patients)	Mutant copies/mL in ctDNA	RECIST evaluation
Patient 1 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Carboplatin + Paclitaxel Cdk4/6 inhibitor Cdk4/6 inhibitor Cdk4/6 inhibitor	8 6 0 2.5	0 0 0 0	240 9 4.5 6.5	Partial response Stable disease Progressive disease
Patient 2 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	None Cisplatin + Pemetrexed Pemetrexed	9.5 1.5 1.5	0 0 0	16 2.5 2.5	Partial response Stable disease
Patient 3 <i>KRAS</i> G12V	Bevacizumab Erlotinib Erlotinib	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 6 6	Progressive disease Stable disease
Patient 4 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Cisplatin + Pemetrexed Docetaxel	2 2 NA	0 0 0	72 776 2960	Progressive disease Progressive disease
Patient 5 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Pemetrexed Carbo- platin + Gemcitabine	6.5 0	0 0	256 61	Partial response
Patient 6 <i>KRAS</i> G12C	Gemcitabine Erlotinib	0 0	0 0	1232 976	Progressive disease
Patient 7 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Erlotinib Vinorelbine	2 3.5	0 0	0 1.5	Progressive disease
Patient 8 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Pemetrexed Docetaxel + MEK inhibitor	0 1.5	0 0	1464 53	Stable disease
Patient 9 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Pemetrexed Docetaxel + MEK inhibitor	0 4	0 0	6.5 0	Partial response
Patient 10 <i>KRAS</i> G12V	Carboplatin + Paclitaxel	0 0	0 0	0 84	Progressive disease
Patient 11 <i>KRAS</i> G12C	Carboplatin + Vinorelbine	0 0	0 0	1132 1956	Progressive disease
Patient 12 <i>KRAS</i> G12V	Pemetrexed	0 0	0 0	0 5	Stable disease
Patient 13 <i>KRAS</i> G12V	Cdk4/6 inhibitor	0 0	0 0	5760 6860	Progressive disease
Patient 14 <i>KRAS</i> G12C	Carboplatin + Pemetrexed	0 0	0 0	3 2	Stable disease
Patient 15 <i>KRAS</i> G12D	Gemcitabine	3 0	0 0	6 0	Stable disease
Patient 16 <i>KRAS</i> G12C	Carboplatin + Vinorelbine	0 0	0 0	2 0	Partial response
Patient 17 <i>KRAS</i> G12C	Carboplatin + Pemetrexed	0 0	0 0	312 160	Partial response

CTCs: circulating tumor cells; cfDNA: circulating free DNA; WT: wild-type; RECIST: Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors; SD: stable disease; PD: progressive disease; PR: partial response. NA: not available. Negative control: cfDNA extracted from the plasma of patients with *BRAF*-mutated and *KRAS* WT lung adenocarcinomas.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Patients and samples

Thirty-two patients treated for a metastatic adenocarcinoma were prospectively included in this study between December 2014 and June 2015. All patients had a *KRAS* mutation previously detected in formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue samples, which had undergone high-resolution melting and the TaqMan assay when a variant was detected. The *KRAS* subtype substitutions were G12C ($n = 15$, 47%), G12D ($n = 8$, 25%), G12V ($n = 6$, 19%), and G12A ($n = 3$, 9%).

Patients were predominantly male (66%). Multiple samples were available from 22 patients, and included a total of 62 samples. All patients gave their informed consent to participate in this study. Initial samples were collected before conventional chemotherapy ($n = 23$, 72%), targeted therapy ($n = 8$, 25%: i.e., *EGFR*-TKI [$n = 3$], cdk4/6 inhibitor [$n = 2$], MEK inhibitor + docetaxel [$n = 3$]), or immunotherapy using anti-PD-1 ($n = 1$). Responses to systemic treatment was evaluated using RECIST 1.1 (Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors).

2.2. Isolation of DNA from circulating tumor cells and plasma, and analysis of *KRAS* mutations

For each patient, four 5-mL blood samples were analyzed within 4 h of collection. Two samples underwent ISET to isolate CTCs [5]. Three spots on the ISET filter were used to extract DNA using proteinase K lysing buffer. The two other blood samples were used to isolate cfDNA using the QI-Amp circulating nucleic-acid kit (Qiagen). DNA extracted from both cfDNA and CTCs was tested for the presence of the corresponding *KRAS* mutation using digital droplet PCR (QX200, Bio-Rad). The input DNA was emulsified into

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2140404>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2140404>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)