ARTICLE IN PRESS EUROPEAN UROLOGY FOCUS XXX (2016) XXX-XXX

available at www.sciencedirect.com journal homepage: www.europeanurology.com/eufocus





Platinum Priority – Brief Correspondence Editorial by XXX on pp. x–y of this issue

Molecular Characterization of Bladder Cancer in Smokers versus Nonsmokers

Monika Joshi^{*a*,*}, Sherri Z. Millis^{*b*}, David Arguello^{*b*}, Sheldon L. Holder^{*a*}, Donald Lamm^{*c*}, Sandeep Reddy^{*b*}, Chandra Belani^{*a*}, Joseph J. Drabick^{*a*}, Nicholas J. Vogelzang^{*d*}

^a Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Medicine, Penn State Hershey Cancer Institute, Hershey, PA, USA; ^b Caris Life Sciences, Phoenix, AZ, USA; ^c BCG Oncology, Phoenix, AZ, USA; ^d Department of Oncology, Comprehensive Cancer Centers of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV, USA

Article info

Article history: Accepted June 11, 2016

Associate Editor: James Catto

Keywords:

Bladder cancer Molecular characterization Nonsmokers

Abstract

Smoking is considered an important risk factor for bladder cancer (BC), yet molecular characterization of BC in nonsmokers has not been extensively studied. Here, we compare molecular differences between smokers and nonsmokers with BC. BC specimens (676) profiled at a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments-certified laboratory from 2006 to 2014 were retrospectively evaluated for molecular differences between smokers and nonsmokers. Protein expression was determined with immuno-histochemistry. In situ hybridization was used for *ERBB2 (HER2/neu)* and *EGFR* evaluation. Genes were evaluated using Sanger or next-generation sequencing. Thirty patients were confirmed lifetime nonsmokers (NS) and 39 were reformed or current smokers (RCS). There was a trend for increased *PIK3CA* mutations in NS versus RCS (43% vs 11%, p = 0.1760), whereas *TP53* alterations were higher in RCS versus NS (63% vs 53%, p = 0.6699). *EGFR* amplification was observed more in NS versus RCS (22% vs 11%, p = 0.5815), while *HER2* was amplified only in RCS (23% vs 0%, p = 0.05). The molecular differences between RCS and NS with BC suggest a different oncogenesis with potentially different treatment options.

Patient summary: Bladder cancer patients with no history of smoking have different molecular characteristics than those with smoking history. We found that smokers tend to have higher incidence of *HER2* amplification, whereas nonsmokers seemed to have higher *PIK3CA* mutation. This knowledge provides essential information, which can bear relevance to treatment options.

© 2016 European Association of Urology. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

* Corresponding author. Penn State Hershey Cancer Institute, Division of Hematology and Oncology, 500 University Drive, Hershey, PA 17033, USA. Tel. +1-717-531-8678; Fax: +1-717-531-5076. E-mail address: mjoshi@hmc.psu.edu (M. Joshi).

Bladder cancer (BC), one of the most common malignancies of the urinary tract [1], accounted for 16 000 cancer-related deaths in 2015 [1]. Smoking is an important risk factor [2], causing half of BC cases. Other risk factors include exposure to aromatic amines, schistosomiasis, and genetic syndromes (eg, germline *Rb1* gene mutation, Cowden, Lynch syndromes, etc.) [3]. Cigarette smoke contains >60 carcinogens that can cause direct DNA damage leading to unique mutational changes in smokers with lung cancer [4]. Studies have shown that smokers with BC have worse cancer specific mortality than nonsmokers [5] and that that smoking exposure negatively affects disease recurrence,

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2016.06.011

2405-4569/© 2016 European Association of Urology. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Please cite this article in press as: Joshi M, et al. Molecular Characterization of Bladder Cancer in Smokers versus Nonsmokers. Eur Urol Focus (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2016.06.011

2

ARTICLE IN PRESS

EUROPEAN UROLOGY FOCUS XXX (2016) XXX-XXX

| Patient Information | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Cohort | Lifetime NS | Current smoker | Reformed smoker | | | | | | |
| Total N | 30 | 8 | 31 | | | | | | |
| Median age (yr) | 66 | 65 | 69 | | | | | | |
| Specimens with staging | 14/30 | 3/8 | 15/31 | | | | | | |
| Ois (Tis) | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 (T2) | 4 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 3 (T3-4a) | 5 | 0 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 4 (T4b or N+/M+) | 4 | 3 | 7 | | | | | | |
| Specimen Information | | | | | | | | | |
| Histology (%) | Lifetime NS | | Reformed and current smokers | | | | | | |
| Urothelial | 24 (includes 2 wit | h sarcomatous | 33 (includes 1 micropapillary) | | | | | | |
| | differentiation) | | | | | | | | |
| Nonurothelial | 3 (2 adenocarcino | ma, 1 neuroendocrine) | 3 (1 adenocarcinoma, 2 squamous) | | | | | | |
| Not otherwise specified | 3 | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Location/Site | Lifetime NS | | Reformed and current smokers | | | | | | |
| Primary | 24 (includes 8 TUR cystectomy docum | RBT, 4 partial or radical nented) | 30 (includes 7 TURBT, 5 partial or radical cystectomy documented) | | | | | | |
| Metastatic | 5 (4 lymphatic, 1 i | renal) | 9 (4 lymphatic, 2 hepatic, 1 skin, 1 ileocecal, 1 pulmonary, 1 vaginal) | | | | | | |
| NS = nonsmoker bladder canc | ers; TURBT = transureth | ral resection of bladder tum | ог. | | | | | | |

Table 1 – Demographic details: the table shows the number of bladder cancer patients by age, smoking status, and specimen histology or patient diagnosis

progression, and survival in nonmuscle invasive BC patients [5]. The etiology behind such differences and behind the development of BC in nonsmokers is poorly understood. The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) recently published data detailing the molecular characterization of BC [6], identifying potential therapeutic targets in 69% of tumors, with roughly 42% aberrations identified in the phosphatidylinositol-4,5-bisphosphate 3-kinase, catalytic subunit alpha (PIK3CA)/AKT/mechanistic target of rapamycin pathway and 45% in the receptor tyrosine kinases/mitogenactivated protein kinases pathway [6]. The initial published dataset, comprised of 70% smokers/ex-smokers, identified no significant differences between smokers and never-smokers, although never-smokers had a slightly higher fraction of C>G mutations than smokers [6]. Differences in protein expression by immunohistochemistry (IHC) and gene amplification (in situ hybridization [ISH]) have never been well studied based on smoking status, although this is changing [7,8]. However, with the advent of newer technologies, molecular characterization of BC based on smoking status demands further exploration.

This study was Institutional Review Board exempt. Test results of IHC, ISH, and hot-spot sequencing from BC samples

(collected from 2006 to 2014) profiled at a commercial Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments-certified laboratory (Caris Life Sciences, Phoenix, AZ, USA) were reviewed. Test methodologies were previously described [7]. Smoking status (nonsmokers [NS]; reformed or current smokers [RCS]), age, and sex were available on a limited number of patients. Fisher's was utilized for statistical analysis.

Of 696 BC cases profiled, smoking history was available on 69 patients; 30 patients were lifetime NS; 39 patients were classified RCS. Reformed smokers were defined as patients who had stopped smoking for more than 5 yr at the time of diagnosis. Patients with detailed past or current smoking history (n = 9) averaged 57.8 pack yr (30–120 pack yr). All others had a *long* history of smoking. Table 1 delineates patient cohorts and BC specimens.

In our survey, the NS cohort had a higher rate of PDGFRA expression (30% vs 7.1%, p = 0.2721) and loss of PTEN expression versus RCS (50% vs 38.5%, p = 0.4629). The RCS cohort was twice as likely to be positive for HER2 expression versus NS (12.8% vs 6.7%, p = 0.6905). *EGFR* amplification was seen in 22% of NS versus 11% in RCS (p = 0.5815), whereas *HER2* was exclusively amplified in RCS (2.7% vs 0%,

Table 2 – Amplification or rearrangement by fluorescence or chromogenic in situ hybridization (*HER2* was exclusively amplified in thr RCS cohort, p = 0.05)

| | Overall | | | NS | | | RCS | | |
|--------------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|-------|---------|
| Biomarker | Amplified | Total | Percent | Amplified | Total | Percent | Amplified | Total | Percent |
| MET | 2 | 221 | 0.9 | 0 | 11 | 0.0 | 0 | 7 | 0.0 |
| EGFR | 47 | 217 | 21.7 | 2 | 9 | 22.2 | 2 | 18 | 11.1 |
| ERBB2 (HER2) | 44 | 444 | 10.3 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 5 | 22 | 22.7 |
| TOP2A | 3 | 56 | 5.4 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 4 | 0.0 |

EGFR = epidermal growth factor receptor; *HER2* = human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; *MET* = MET proto-oncogene; M = metastases; N = node; NS = nonsmoker bladder cancers; *TOP2A* = topoisomerase II alpha; T = tumor; RCS = reformed or current smokers.

Please cite this article in press as: Joshi M, et al. Molecular Characterization of Bladder Cancer in Smokers versus Nonsmokers. Eur Urol Focus (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2016.06.011

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8827875

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8827875

Daneshyari.com