

WJG 20th Anniversary Special Issues (14): Pancreatic cancer

Personalising pancreas cancer treatment: When tissue is the issue

Katrin M Sjoquist, Venessa T Chin, Lorraine A Chantrill, Chelsie O'Connor, Chris Hemmings, David K Chang, Angela Chou, Marina Pajic, Amber L Johns, Adnan M Nagrial, Andrew V Biankin, Desmond Yip

Katrin M Sjoquist, NHMRC Clinical Trials Centre, University of Sydney, Sydney NSW 1450, Australia

Katrin M Sjoquist, Cancer Care Centre, St George Hospital, Kogarah NSW 2217, Australia

Venessa T Chin, Lorraine A Chantrill, Chelsie O'Connor, David K Chang, Angela Chou, Marina Pajic, Amber L Johns, Adnan M Nagrial, Andrew V Biankin, The Kinghorn Cancer Centre, and the Cancer Research Program, Garvan Institute of Medical Research, Sydney NSW 2010, Australia

Lorraine A Chantrill, Macarthur Cancer Therapy Centre, Campbelltown Hospital, Campbelltown NSW 2560, Australia

Lorraine A Chantrill, David K Chang, Marina Pajic, St Vincents Hospital Clinical School, Sydney UNSW 2010, Australia
Chelsie O'Connor, Cancer Therapy Centre, Liverpool Hospital, Liverpool NSW 2170, Australia

Chris Hemmings, St John of God Pathology, Subiaco WA 6904, Australia

David K Chang, Andrew V Biankin, Department of Surgery, Bankstown Hospital, Eldridge Road, Bankstown, Sydney NSW 2200, Australia

David K Chang, Andrew V Biankin, Faculty of Medicine, South Western Sydney Clinical School, University of NSW, Liverpool NSW 2170, Australia

David K Chang, Andrew V Biankin, Wolfson Wohl Cancer Research Centre, Institute of Cancer Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G61 1BD, United Kingdom

Angela Chou, Department of Anatomical Pathology, St. Vincent's Hospital, Darlinghurst, Sydney NSW 2010, Australia

Andrew V Biankin, West of Scotland Pancreatic Unit, Glasgow Royal Infirmary, Glasgow G4 0SF, United Kingdom

Desmond Yip, Department of Medical Oncology, The Canberra Hospital, Garran ACT 2605, Australia

Desmond Yip, ANU Medical School, Australian National University, Acton ACT 2601, Australia

Author contributions: Sjoquist KM, Chantrill LA and Yip D contributed to Conception and design; all authors contributed to drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and final approval of the version to be published.

Supported by NHMRC, Pancare Australia, Sydney Catalyst, Royal Australasian College of Physicians to Chin VT; and NHMRC Programme Grant to Sjoquist KM

Correspondence to: Desmond Yip, Associate Professor, Clinical Director, Department of Medical Oncology, The Can-

berra Hospital, Yamba Drive, Garran ACT 2605, Australia. desmond.yip@anu.edu.au

Telephone: +612-6244-2220 Fax: +612-6244-4266

Received: November 28, 2013 Revised: February 15, 2014

Accepted: March 19, 2014

Published online: June 28, 2014

Abstract

The treatment of advanced pancreatic cancer has not moved much beyond single agent gemcitabine until recently when protocols such as FOLFIRINOX (fluorouracil, leucovorin, irinotecan and oxaliplatin) and nab-paclitaxel-gemcitabine have demonstrated some improved outcomes. Advances in technology especially in massively parallel genome sequencing has progressed our understanding of the biology of pancreatic cancer especially the candidate signalling pathways that are involved in tumorigenesis and disease course. This has allowed identification of potentially actionable mutations that may be targeted by new biological agents. The heterogeneity of pancreatic cancer makes tumour tissue collection important with the aim of being able to personalise therapies for the individual as opposed to a one size fits all approach to treatment of the condition. This paper reviews the developments in this area of translational research and the ongoing clinical studies that will attempt to move this into the everyday oncology practice.

© 2014 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Key words: Pancreatic neoplasms; Molecular targeted therapy; Genomics; Tissue banks; Chemotherapy

Core tip: State of art review of genomic developments in pancreatic cancer that will hopefully lead to a new treatment paradigm of recognising that pancreatic cancer is a heterogenous disease. Adequate tissue col-

lection is important to allow biomarker testing and molecular sequencing to allow determination of actionable mutations so that personalised therapies can be used in a rational manner.

Sjoquist KM, Chin VT, Chantrill LA, O'Connor C, Hemmings C, Chang DK, Chou A, Pajic M, Johns AL, Nagrial AM, Biankin AV, Yip D. Personalising pancreas cancer treatment: When tissue is the issue. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014; 20(24): 7849-7863 Available from: URL: <http://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v20/i24/7849.htm> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v20.i24.7849>

INTRODUCTION

Until recently, progress in understanding of pancreas cancer has been frustratingly slow. Prognosis remains exceedingly poor, with the majority of patients presenting with rapidly lethal advanced disease^[1,2]. Distinct phenotypes, while clinically recognised, have been difficult to capture using common diagnostic tests. In addition, the value of doing so for directing therapy has been minimal, with limited treatment options and a lack of alternatives to gemcitabine which has remained the standard of care for advanced disease until recently.

Advances in technology have recently accelerated our understanding of the biology of pancreatic cancer and tumour-host interactions. Recent initiatives such as Australian Pancreatic Cancer Genome Initiative (APGI, <http://www.pancreaticcancer.net.au/apgi>) and International Cancer Genome Consortium (ICGC, <http://icgc.org>) have seen major progress in the acquisition of high quality biospecimens for molecular studies in comprehensive cancer cohorts. Whole genome sequencing has facilitated identification of potentially actionable mutations with greater sensitivity and specificity. As tissue requirements and costs for genome sequencing decrease, the potential to select treatments in a “personalised” manner based on tumour biology moves closer to the clinic^[3].

The move towards “personalised” treatment of pancreatic cancer is not without challenges. The anatomical location of the pancreas and clinical presentation of the majority of cancers in advanced stages present particular barriers to diagnostic and exploratory tissue sampling. The relative inaccessibility of the pancreas, compared to many other tumour types, limits the ability to collect adequate μ -tissue (for example core biopsies) from primary lesions. Recent trials have demonstrated that core biopsies are currently feasible in some settings; the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) trial required core biopsy for trial participation and were able to do this prior to enrolment in 367 participants with metastatic disease^[4]. Patients presenting *de novo* with advanced disease can rapidly deteriorate and any additional diagnostic tests need to demonstrate therapeutic value and provide useful information with minimal delay to be useful in routine practice.

Tumour and patient profiling are critical in understanding the disease, developing new treatments, and better selecting patients for existing treatments. The timely, accurate and appropriate collection of tissue and blood samples are fundamental to driving future research and evolving patient care in the era of personalised and precision medicine. Future strategies, including profiling of circulating tumour DNA^[5], may minimise the invasiveness of testing but at present access to tumour tissue remains important in developing new treatment strategies and understanding their failures.

This review highlights recent advances in understanding of pancreas cancer at a molecular level including key signalling pathways and markers of treatment sensitivity. The current evidence base for a personalised approach is summarised, together with relevant ongoing trials.

RECENT ADVANCES IN SYSTEMIC THERAPY FOR ADVANCED PANCREATIC CANCER

Very little progress has been made in the systemic treatment of advanced pancreatic cancer until recent years. Gemcitabine a nucleoside analogue became established as the standard therapy following the demonstration of improved survival and clinical benefit (pain, performance status and weight) against 5-fluorouracil^[6]. This led to the subsequent focus on combining other drugs with gemcitabine to test doublets against gemcitabine monotherapy. For a time no doublet was clearly superior to monotherapy. A number of meta-analysis of gemcitabine combination studies have been carried out^[7-9]. These have shown an improvement in survival with platinum based combinations as well as fluorouracil based combinations^[10]. There was a suggestion of more benefit from combination therapy in good performance status patients and a worse prognosis in poor performance patients with combination therapy^[8]. The most recent meta-analysis of 26 studies with a total of 8808 patients has found that the relative risk of 1 year survival was lower for monotherapy when compared to combinations with platinum, fluoropyrimidine and targeted agents respectively but no statistical differences were found^[9]. When median progression free survival and overall survival were assessed only fluoropyrimidine was statistically superior. The combination therapies were associated with more toxicity.

A non-gemcitabine based intensive chemotherapy schedule FOLFIRINOX (fluorouracil, leucovorin, irinotecan and oxaliplatin) in good performance status patients under 76 years of age has shown clear superiority to gemcitabine monotherapy (response rate 31.6% *vs* 9.4% ($P < 0.001$), median survival 11.1 mo *vs* 6.8 mo ($P < 0.01$) and one year survival 48.4% *vs* 20.6% at a cost of increased toxicity^[11]. Quality of life was assessed in the study and it was found that the FOLFIRINOX arm improved global health status and the time until definitive

deterioration was significantly longer than gemcitabine^[12].

A recently reported phase III trial demonstrated for the first time an overall survival benefit with gemcitabine based doublet therapy. The MPACT trial randomised gemcitabine *vs* gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel (Abraxane) found an improvement in median survival from 6.7 to 8.5 mo with 1 year survivals of 22% and 35% respectively ($P < 0.001$)^[13]. The response rate also increased in the combination arm (7% *vs* 23%, $P > 0.001$), although this was at the expense of higher rates of myelosuppression and peripheral neuropathy with the doublet.

The role of biological agents has been studied in pancreatic cancer. They have generally been tested in combination with the traditional chemotherapy backbone of gemcitabine. One positive trial was the combination of gemcitabine with the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) tyrosine kinase inhibitor erlotinib *vs* gemcitabine alone^[14]. This NCIC phase III study found no difference in response rates or quality of life between the arms but did find an improvement of median overall survival from 5.91 to 6.24 mo ($P = 0.038$) with the addition of erlotinib and the one year survival improved from 17% to 23% ($P = 0.023$)^[14]. The very modest benefit in median survival (2 wk) raises the question as to whether this is clinically relevant although there is a tail of increased survivors at one year. Tumour tissue was collected in this study from 184 patients out of 569 patients with only 162 with sufficient tumour for immunohistochemistry, limiting the power to detect whether EGFR expression had any effect on outcome. Although a positive relationship between the development of rash and survival was observed in this study suggesting that this may be a identify a favourable prognostic subgroup, a subsequent study that explored dose escalation of erlotinib until development of rash found no added benefit to standard fixed dose erlotinib when combined with gemcitabine^[15]. Also of note, a subsequent SWOG phase III trial using the monoclonal antibody cetuximab as an anti-EGFR strategy in advanced pancreatic cancer found no additional benefit when added to gemcitabine^[16].

Antiangiogenics have been tested in a number of phase III trials in combination with gemcitabine. These include the anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (anti-VEGF) monoclonal antibodies bevacizumab^[17,18] and aflibercept^[19] as well as the oral small molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitor axitinib^[20,21]. These trials have been uniformly negative and suggest that targeting VEGF is an ineffective strategy in pancreatic cancer. Similarly, trials of the matrix metalloproteinase inhibitors marimastat^[22] and BAY 12-9566^[23] have also been negative. A phase III trial of the multikinase inhibitor sorafenib in combination with gemcitabine was also negative^[24], as was a study of enzastaurin a PKCbeta and PI3K/AKT signalling inhibitor^[25].

These trials have all taken a “one size fits all” approach to treatment of advanced pancreatic cancer in enrolling unselected patients. With the recognition that pancreatic cancer is a biologically heterogenous disease, a person-

alised approach would mean selecting out patients into enriched groups with biomarker or genomic profiles of activated pathways that are more likely to respond to targeted agents being tested therapeutically^[26]. This approach has been taken with the randomised phase II RECAP trial (NCT01423604) of capecitabine in combination with placebo or ruxolitinib a JAK1 and JAK2 inhibitor in which patients with recurrent or treatment refractory pancreatic cancer has analysed a prespecified subgroup of patients identified prospectively as likely to benefit from JAK inhibition. Within this subgroup which is half of the randomized population the hazard ratio for survival was 0.47 with ruzolitinib with 6 mo survival being 42% and 11% for placebo^[27]. This trial is yet to be formally reported but a phase III study is expected to be launched soon.

Current understanding of core signalling pathways in pancreatic cancer

Detailed molecular analysis of pancreatic cancer began at the beginning of the 21st century, with *CDKN2A*, *SMAD4*, *TP53* and *KRAS* the first candidate genes identified^[28-32]. In late 2008 Jones *et al*^[33] published a seminal paper in *Science* detailing global genomic analysis of 24 pancreatic cancers. In this paper, the authors made the case for 12 core signalling pathways that are genetically altered in the majority of pancreas cancers.

One pathway they highlighted was Wnt/Notch and Hedgehog signalling. Four years later, thanks to the international genome sequencing efforts described above, Biankin *et al*^[34] published genomic data from 142 early stage pancreatic cancers. Although substantial heterogeneity was identified, 16 genes were significantly mutated. Reassuringly, some of these were common to those identified by Jones *et al*^[33] but additional novel mutated genes were identified. Of these, the strongest signal was obtained from the SLIT/ROBO pathway of axon guidance that was identified previously in 2003^[35,36]. Further work on this pathway to establish its role in tumorigenesis of pancreatic cancer is ongoing. Clearly the ongoing challenge for biologists in this field is to determine drivers of pancreas cancer, understanding that there may be different drivers in different cases. Using this method of separating pancreatic cancers into subgroups by driver has led us to test targeted, personalised treatment in animal models and also in human subjects.

Potential “actionable mutations” based on molecular profiling of pancreatic cancers

Several actionable changes have been identified in pancreas cancer; those with greatest potential clinical significance are summarised in Table 1.

Some of these were able to be verified with accredited, confirmatory genomic tests that are available commercially, such as *KRAS* mutation testing, *BRCAl* and *BRCAl2* mutation testing and *ATM* mutation testing. It is envisaged that the future will see targeted sequencing panels for pancreas cancer being commercially available, accredited and clinically applicable with short timelines

Table 1 Potentially 'actionable' phenotypes and supporting evidence

Actionable phenotype	Therapeutic	Rationale	Molecular characterization
Gemcitabine responsive	Gemcitabine	In PC, Phase III trials showed benefit in adjuvant (DFS 13.4 mo <i>vs</i> 6.9 mo) and palliative setting (MS 5.65 <i>vs</i> 4.41) ^[6,87]	High hENT1, hCNT1, hCNT3 Phase III data suggested that hENT1 correlated with response to Gemcitabine in adjuvant setting in PC ^[65,88] , however this was not shown in the metastatic population ^[89]
Anti-EGFR responsive	Erlotinib, Cetuximab	A Phase III trial showed that Erlotinib plus Gemcitabine had an overall survival benefit (HR = 0.82) compared with Gemcitabine alone in PC ^[14] Phase III data did not show a difference in OS when Cetuximab was added to Gemcitabine in an unselected population with PC ^[16]	Classical subtype PC cell lines with a "classical" subtype were shown to be more sensitive to Erlotinib ^[90] EGFR expression did not correlate with response to Cetuximab in patients with PC ^[16]
Taxane responsive	<i>nab</i> -Paclitaxel	Phase III data showed that the addition of <i>nab</i> -Paclitaxel to Gemcitabine increased PFS (HR = 0.69) and OS (HR = 0.72) in the metastatic PC population ^[13]	SPARC expression (stromal) A phase I / II study showed that SPARC expression in the stroma correlated with survival ^[71]
5-FU responsive	5-Fluorouracil	Small phase III trials showed activity of 5-FU containing regimens in the metastatic population in PC ^[91,92] 5-FU was shown to prolong survival when used in the adjuvant setting in PC (HR = 0.7) ^[93]	Thymidylate Synthase High intra-tumoural expression was shown to correlate with an increased benefit from 5-FU based chemotherapy in pre-clinical ^[94] and retrospective patient populations ^[95]
Irinotecan responsive	Irinotecan	In PC, a small effect as monotherapy has been shown in the second-line setting ^[96] , and a significant effect on OS was shown when used as part of FOLFIRINOX (HR = 0.57) ^[11]	Topoisomerase 1 expression High topo 1 expression was associated with a larger benefit from Irinotecan containing regimens in metastatic colorectal cancer ^[97]
HER2 amplified	Trastuzumab	Has shown activity in HER-2 overexpressing breast and gastric cancers ^[39,98,99] Phase II trials do not show a benefit of adding Trastuzumab to Gemcitabine in PC (OS = 7 mo), however, no standardised approach to FISH testing was used ^[41,70]	<i>HER2</i> amplification Pre-clinical studies suggested that <i>HER2</i> overexpression predicts a response to Trastuzumab in PC ^[100]
m-TOR responsive	Everolimus, Temozolimus	A phase III trial of Everolimus in renal cell cancer shows prolongation in PFS (PFS 4 mo <i>vs</i> 1.9 mo) ^[101] Phase II data showed minimal activity (OS = 4.5 mo) of Everolimus for second line treatment in an unselected population of patients with metastatic PC ^[102] A case study in a patient with PC and Peutz-Jeghers syndrome (SK11 deficient) responds to Everolimus ^[103]	P-TEN Deficient, High p-mTOR/p70S6, AKT amplified, STK11/LKB1 deficiency, PI3K mutation Pre clinical studies showed that p-TEN deficient cell lines are sensitive to m-TOR inhibitors ^[104] Retrospective studies suggested that SK11, p-MTOR, p-70S6, PI3K and AKT can select tumours that will respond to m-TOR inhibitors ^[103,104-110]
VEGF inhibitor responsive	Sunitinib, Bevacizumab	Phase III trial showed no benefit with adding Bevacizumab to Gemcitabine in an unselected population of patients with PC ^[17] Phase II data showed that maintenance Sunitinib after primary chemotherapy improved 2 yr OS (22.9% <i>vs</i> 7%) in the metastatic PC population ^[109]	CSF1R up-regulation, High HIF- α expression <i>In vitro</i> studies showed CSF-1R up-regulation was associated with response to Sunitinib in AML ^[110] High HIF- α predicted response to Sunitinib in a retrospective cohort in renal cell cancer ^[111]
DNA damage repair deficient	Platinum; MMC; PARP inhibitor	<i>In vitro</i> work showed that cells with defects in BRCA2 are preferentially sensitive to PARP inhibitors ^[112] Case reports of PC patients with BRCA2 deficient tumours respond to PARP ^[113,114] Multiple clinical trials are on-going assessing the effects of PARP inhibition	DDR signature; mutation of DDR genes, <i>BRCA/ATM/PALB2</i> Loss of BRCA1 was associated with sensitivity to DNA damaging agents ^[115] BRCA2 mutations were associated with improved response to platinum agents ^[116] <i>In vivo</i> studies showed PALB2 inactivation was a determinant of response to DNA damaging agents in PC ^[114]
SMO inhibitor responsive	Saridegib, Vismodegib	A phase II trial found that Saridegib plus Gemcitabine was no better than Gemcitabine alone in an unselected population of metastatic PC patients (data not published) ^[117] <i>In vivo</i> studies show SMO inhibitors block metastasis formation in pancreatic cancer ^[118]	Gli1 and PTCH1 transcript levels GLI1 mRNA may predict response to SMO inhibitors in pancreatic cancer <i>in vivo</i> ^[119] High Gli1/PTCH1 transcript levels were correlated with response to SMO inhibitors in CLL ^[120]

PC: Pancreatic cancers; EGFR: Epidermal growth factor receptor; VEGF: Vascular endothelial growth factor; DFS: Disease-free survival; OS: Overall survival.

and low cost. Others, such as Her2 upregulation, can be tested for using immunohistochemistry and *in situ* hybridisation.

Her2 as an example of an "actionable" mutation

The *HER2* (human epidermal growth factor receptor)/*neu/ERBB2* gene is a member of a family of genes that

play a role in regulating cell growth. *HER2* signalling promotes cell proliferation through the RAS-MAPK pathway and inhibits cell death through the phosphatidylinositol 3'-kinase-AKT-mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR) pathway. Although *HER2* overexpression has been described in a variety of human malignant conditions, gene amplification is uncommon except in breast and gastric cancer^[37]. Anti-*HER2* therapy is clinically indicated and effective for both *HER2* amplified breast^[38] and gastric^[39] cancers. There is growing evidence that *HER2* is an important biomarker and key driver of tumorigenesis in pancreatic cancer.

Recent evidence suggests *HER2* amplification occurs in 2% of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, and may potentially respond to anti-*HER2* therapy^[37], similar to *HER2*-amplified breast cancer. On a molecular level, *HER2*-amplified pancreatic cancers demonstrated a mRNA expression profile which clustered with the *HER2*-amplified intrinsic subtype of breast cancer using the PAM50 classifier. Clinically, *HER2*-amplified pancreatic cancers showed an atypical metastatic pattern characterized by spread to the lungs and brain with avoidance of the liver, not unlike the pattern of spread seen in *HER2*-amplified breast cancer. These findings suggest that *HER2* is likely to be the main driver of tumorigenesis in this subgroup of pancreatic cancer, analogous to *HER2*-amplified breast cancer and may respond to anti-*HER2* therapy.

Three clinical trials have assessed anti-Her2 therapy in pancreatic cancer. All 3 were single arm phase II trials utilising anti-Her2 agents active in other cancers in conjunction with traditional cytotoxics. Only 2 of the trials selected patients based on Her2 status, and utilised immunohistochemistry alone to detect *HER2* overexpression^[40-42].

In Safran's first study patients with *HER2* overexpressing metastatic pancreatic cancers were recruited and showed a response rate of only 6% which was considered as not significantly different from historical controls of gemcitabine alone^[40]. The majority of the patients recruited however had *HER2* 2+ tumors. In Safran's second study lapatinib (a dual *HER1* and *HER2* inhibitor) and gemcitabine were given to an unselected population of patients with metastatic pancreatic cancer^[42]. The study was terminated after 6 mo due to poor response rate. Harder *et al*^[41] recruited 17 patients with *HER2* expressing metastatic pancreatic cancer for trastuzumab and capecitabine, and this study closed prematurely due to lower than expected prevalence of *HER2* 3+ tumours and therefore slow accrual.

The selection of patients was based on *HER2* expression using immunohistochemistry alone and these were not standardized assays performed in reference laboratories. As a result it is possible that the use of non-standardised assays performed outside accredited reference laboratories overestimated *HER2* positivity. The likely overestimation of *HER2* positivity underpowered the trials and makes a negative result difficult to interpret.

Identifying *HER2* overexpressing pancreatic cancers

(PC) by genomic profiling has the potential to identify a cohort more likely to benefit from anti-*HER2* therapy. This enrichment strategy is being utilised in the recently opened IMPaCT (Individualised Molecular Pancreatic Cancer Therapy) trial (Table 2) of which several authors are investigators.

Preclinical trials of repurposed drugs in patient-derived xenografts

In order to maximize benefit to patients clinical trials should be conducted in populations based on molecular characteristics^[43]. This highlights the importance of biomarker driven therapeutic development. Such trials are expensive, labour intensive and pose significant logistical difficulties which in PC, are compounded by the rapidity of clinical deterioration and the small percentage of patients who are well enough to receive more than one line of chemotherapy. Using patient derived xenografts presents an attractive option to test potential biomarkers and partnered therapeutic interventions.

Xenograft models derived from established tumour cell lines may not fully recapitulate the complexities of human disease and therefore may not be the ideal medium with which to test novel therapeutics^[44-46]. In addition the vast majority of cell lines that have been used in the past do not have associated germline sequence data. As a consequence, the accuracy of genomic aberrations identified by comparing to a reference sequence is not sufficient for subsequent testing of genotype-guided treatment strategies. Genetically engineered mouse models (GEMM) will develop PC predictably and can be used to study pancreatic carcinogenesis^[47]. However, Singh *et al*^[48] showed that the PDAC *Pdx1-Cre LSL-Kras^{G12D}p16/p19^{fl/fl}* GEMM had a greater response to gemcitabine than typically observed in the patient population, suggesting these models too lack the heterogeneity and complexity of the human condition.

Primary xenografts are generated directly from engraftment of individual human tumour tissue into severely immunocompromised mice [nonobese diabetic /severe combined immunodeficiencies IL2rg -/- (NSG) mice] allowing efficient engraftment of the tumour^[49,50]. These have been shown to faithfully represent the histopathological, biological and genomic characteristics of the primary tumour^[51,52]. These models may represent valuable tools for testing novel therapies. Primary xenograft models have been used to test novel therapies in childhood leukaemia^[53-55] and neuroblastoma^[56,57]. More recently in PC, primary xenografts have been used to test the efficacy of sorafenib and everolimus alone and in combination^[58].

The generation of primary xenografts provides a renewable and valuable resource with which multiple treatments may be studied. Large pre-clinical trials may be designed where a specific tumour of interest may be examined for its sensitivity to numerous different therapies or efficacy of a single novel therapy may be examined in a range of tumours with different molecular profiles. The

Trial Identifier ¹	Name of study	Phase	Sponsor	Arms	Primary outcome	Biomarker
ACTRN1261200077897	The IMPACT trial: Individualised Molecular Pancreatic Cancer Therapy A randomised open label phase II study of standard first line treatment or personalised treatment in patients with recurrent or metastatic pancreatic cancer	II	The Australasian Gastro-Intestinal Trials Group Collaborating groups: Australian Pancreatic Cancer Genome Initiative Sydney Catalyst; the Translational Cancer Research Centre of Central Sydney and Regional NSW	Patients with actionable phenotypes randomised 1:1 to Standard -gemcitabine alone OR Personalised Treatment -allocated based on molecular phenotype: HER2 positive sub-group - gemcitabine plus trastuzumab Homologous recombinant defects sub-group: 5FU plus MMC antiEGFR responsive sub-group: gemcitabine plus erlotinib Gemcitabine and cisplatin	Progression free survival (initial pilot phase will assess feasibility of personalised approach)	Identification of actionable phenotypes based on molecular phenotype in tumour tissue in one of 3 subgroups: HER2 positive (HER2/neu amplification) subgroup Homologous recombination defects (BRCA1, BRCA2 or PALB2 mutation) AntiEGFR phenotype subgroup (KRAS wildtype or KRAS codon 13 mutation)
NCT01188109	Gemcitabine/cisplatin for resected pancreas cancer: Establishing the role of ERCC1 in treatment decision	II	Emory University	antiEGFR responsive sub-group: gemcitabine plus erlotinib Gemcitabine and cisplatin	Progression free survival and overall survival Complete response rate	Immunohistochemistry, rt-PCR, and single nucleotide polymorphism assessment to determine status of ERCC1 expression and gene
NCT01488552	A Phase II study of induction consolidation and maintenance approach for patients with advanced pancreatic cancer	I / II	Pancreatic Cancer Research Team	Gemcitabine + Nab-paclitaxel induction FOLFIRINOX consolidative Metformin + targeted agent selected by biomarkers for maintenance	Complete response rate	IHC Analysis will be performed on a fresh tissue biopsy of the tumor after chemotherapy has been administered. A targeted-based regimen will be determined from the results of the IHC analysis for the next therapy given to the patient in the maintenance phase of the study
NCT01524575	Gemcitabine and oxaliplatin in the management of metastatic pancreatic cancers with low expression of ERCC1	Phase II	University of Hawaii	Gemcitabine+oxaliplatin	6 mo overall survival	Low expression of ERCC1 protein and mRNA
NCT01888978	A Pilot Study of Molecularly Tailored Therapy for Patients With Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer	Phase II	Georgetown University	Gemcitabine+oxaliplatin Gemcitabine + 5FU Gemcitabine + docetaxel FOLFOX6 Oxaliplatin + docetaxel FOLFIRI Docetaxel-irinotecan Cisplatin+gemcitabine +/-veliparib	Timing of biopsy and treatment Number of days from study entry to biopsy to molecular results to first dose	Selection of doublet treatment on basis of molecular analysis of tumour
NCT01585805	Gemcitabine Hydrochloride and Cisplatin With or Without Veliparib or Veliparib Alone in Patients With Locally Advanced or Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer	Randomised phase II	National Cancer Institute	Docetaxel-irinotecan Cisplatin+gemcitabine +/-veliparib	Optimal dose of veliparib Response rate	BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation carrier
NCT01586611	Study of Gemcitabine vs FOLFOX in the First Line Setting for Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer Patients Using Human Equilibrative Nucleoside Transporter 1 (hENT1) Biomarker Testing	Phase III	AHS Cancer Control Alberta	FOLFOX Gemcitabine	PFS between arms in hENT1 high and hENT1 low patients	hENT1

NCT01454180	Study of Individualized Selection of Chemotherapy in Patients With Advanced Pancreatic Carcinoma According to Therapeutic Targets	Phase II	Centro Nacional de Investigaciones Oncológicas CARLOS III	Arm A: Physician discretion Arm B: Therapeutic target guided	Overall survival	Therapeutic targets expressed in tumour tissue
NCT01726582	Molecular Profiling to Guide Neoadjuvant Therapy for Resectable and Borderline Resectable Adenocarcinoma of the Pancreas	Phase II	Medical College of Wisconsin	Gemcitabine Gemcitabine + capecitabine Gemcitabine + erlotinib FOLFOXIRI FOLFOX FOLFIRI Targeted chemotherapy prior to surgery Standard FOLFIRINOX chemotherapy prior to surgery Gemcitabine after surgery No additional therapy after surgery Targeted chemotherapy after surgery Chemoradiotherapy (Targeted chemotherapy include the following schedules: FOLFIRINOX, FOLFIRI, gemcitabine+irinotecan, gemcitabine + oxaliplatin, gemcitabine + cisplatin, gemcitabine+nab-paclitaxel, capecitabine + nab-paclitaxel, gemcitabine, capecitabine, 5FU)	Resectability rate	Molecular profile of tumour will point to particular chemotherapy treatment

¹Trial number prefixes correspond to location of registry/portal. ANZCTR/N: Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry; 5FU: 5-fluorouracil; FOLFIRINOX: Fluorouracil, leucovorin, irinotecan and oxaliplatin; MMC: Mitomycin C; IHC: Immunohistochemistry; ERCC1: Excision repair cross complementation gene-1.

impact of this is two-fold, with the opportunity for a patient's tumour to undergo pre-clinical testing to determine the clinician's choice of therapy having obvious advantages to patient outcomes but also, that tumours bearing particular biomarkers of interest may be tested extensively against existing and novel therapies to guide the design of molecularly driven human clinical trials.

PREDICTING RESPONSE TO TREATMENT/IMPROVING TREATMENT DELIVERY

Another important facet of personalising therapy for pancreatic cancer is identifying patients who will derive net clinical benefit from existing treatments. Biomarkers of potential benefit or toxicity from existing systemic therapies as well as radiation therapy have been identified.

Identifying biomarkers for patients likely to benefit from radiotherapy treatment

Autopsy studies^[59,60] have shown that more than 80% of patients with pancreatic cancer develop distant metastases even in those who have undergone curative resection, suggesting the presence of occult metastases at time of surgery. Therefore, patients who would benefit from local radiotherapy treatment are those less likely to develop systemic disease. Futures areas of research should not only focus on identifying those patients with locally aggressive disease but also those with radiosensitive tumours more likely to respond from radiotherapy treatment.

An autopsy study^[61] found that positive staining for the intracellular protein DPC4 (or SMAD4) might indicate a patient that was more likely to harbour locally aggressive disease. Only twenty-two percent of patients with no metastatic disease at autopsy showed loss of expression of DPC4. Conversely, 73% of patients with extensive metastatic disease demonstrated loss of expression of this protein.

Identification of a biomarker of radiosensitivity has been explored in other tumour sites. The XRCC1 (X-ray repair cross-complementing group 1) protein is involved in base excision repair. A single nucleotide polymorphism known as Arg399Gln has been shown to affect radiosensitivity. The ECOG 1201 Phase II trial analysed patients to determine whether the presence of this allele affected complete response rates after neoadjuvant cisplatin based chemoradiotherapy in oesophageal adenocarcinoma^[62]. Fifty-two percent of patients had the Arg399Gln allele and only 6% of those had a complete response at time of surgery 5 wk after completion of their neoadjuvant treatment. The odds ratio for failing to undergo a complete pathological response in the presence of this allele was 5.37 ($P = 0.062$). This did not translate to a reduction in disease free or overall survival though it does suggest there are certain patients who are more likely to respond to radiotherapy.

Optimising drug delivery with predictive biomarkers

The co-development of novel chemotherapeutic and therapeutic strategy with companion diagnostics is the paradigm of modern clinical oncology. Outcomes from these efforts have been somewhat mixed to date, and the reasons are many and complex. For the purpose of this review, the authors will only concentrate on two drugs that have been approved for use in pancreatic cancer.

Gemcitabine: The putative biomarkers of gemcitabine responsiveness include nucleoside transporters such as hENT1, hCNT1/3 and kinases involved in gemcitabine metabolism such as deoxycytidine kinase^[63,64]. The most studied biomarker of therapeutic responsiveness to date in PC is hENT1, a membranous equilibrative nucleoside transporter encoded by the *SLC29A1* gene. There is promising evidence to support the role of hENT1 in gemcitabine responsiveness in PC cells both *in vitro* and *In vivo*, but its precise role as a predictive biomarker in the clinic has not been well established, with conflicting results reported. Small cohort studies and retrospective analysis of large Phase III randomised-controlled trials (RCT), such as RTOG 9704 and ESPAC 1/3 have supported its role as a predictive biomarker of adjuvant gemcitabine responsiveness, where patients with hENT1 positive tumour had significant survival benefit from adjuvant gemcitabine as compared to patients with low hENT1 tumours^[65,66]. However, a recent Phase II RCT stratified by hENT1 expression (LEAP: Low hENT1 and Adenocarcinoma of the Pancreas) comparing gemcitabine *vs* CO-101 (lipophilic gemcitabine) in metastatic PC failed to demonstrate this in metastatic disease^[4]. Though the reasons for this are still unclear, the discrepancy may be due to the use of different hENT1 antibodies for immunohistochemistry, and/or perhaps the significance of hENT1 as a predictive biomarker is different in the metastatic as compared to the adjuvant setting. LEAP was the first purposely designed biomarker stratified trial in PC with prospec-

tive tissue acquisition, further analysis of the available tissue samples may offer more insight into gemcitabine responsiveness biomarkers.

nab-Paclitaxel (Abraxane®): Secreted Protein Acid and Rich in Cysteine (SPARC, also known as osteonectin) regulates extracellular matrix modeling and deposition and may act as a tumour suppressor or an oncogenic driver depending on its differential expression in epithelial and stromal compartments in different cancer types^[67]. High stromal and low epithelial expression of SPARC has been shown to be a poor prognostic biomarker in PC^[68,69] and based on its hypothesised function as an albumin “sticker”, it was developed as a therapeutic target for nab-paclitaxel to enable “stromal depletion” and in turn, to improve drug delivery. A positive phase I / II study of gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel demonstrated in a biological sub-study that SPARC expression in the stroma, but not in the epithelium, co-segregated with improved survival in PC, and hence a candidate predictive biomarker for nab-paclitaxel responsiveness^[70]. This led to the recently reported Phase III MPACT (Metastatic Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma Clinical Trial) RCT comparing gemcitabine *vs* gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel which demonstrated the significant addition survival benefit of nab-paclitaxel in patients with metastatic PC^[71]. However, data concerning SPARC as a predictive biomarker of nab-paclitaxel responsiveness are not currently available. Although the relationship between SPARC expression and nab-paclitaxel responsiveness is still evolving, these proof-of-concept data suggest it warrants further exploration.

Improving treatment delivery: Targeting stroma

There is mounting evidence that stromal factors may be crucially important not only in determining the development and behaviour of carcinoma, but in influencing treatment response and, ultimately, prognosis. Stromal and epithelial cells may interact through direct cell-cell contact, or *via* paracrine signaling, and various non-cellular components in the stroma may influence either or both cell types. Many of these factors may contribute to cancer progression and metastasis through altered cell adhesion, epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), matrix remodeling (facilitating tumour cell migration), and neovascularisation. These concepts have been examined in more detail elsewhere^[72].

Individual differences in gene expression have been demonstrated within the stromal component of breast tumours, and these different phenotypes correlated with clinical outcome^[73,74]. Differential expression of some of these same genes at the protein level appears to correlate with tumour regression in irradiated rectal carcinoma (Hemmings, unpublished data). One such protein is SPARC (Secreted Protein Acidic and Rich in Cysteine), a matricellular protein which modulates cell-cell and cell-matrix interactions, as described previously. Treatment with SPARC can block fibroblast activation and may

serve to inhibit angiogenesis^[75]. There is some evidence that SPARC may act as a chemosensitiser by potentiating apoptosis^[76]. SPARC may be upregulated in pancreatic cancer, and suppressing its expression may inhibit cancer cell migration, offering a potential therapeutic target^[77]. Modulation of other matricellular proteins has also been shown (at least in a murine model) to alter chemotherapy response, without directly altering drug delivery^[78], and the addition of agents which modify the tumour stroma may enhance chemotherapy response in clinical cases of operable pancreatic cancer^[79].

Another important stromal variable is the host immune response to invading tumour cells. Whilst generally thought to be part of the host's armamentarium against cancer, it has become clear that inflammatory cells may promote the formation and progression of some tumours, and the balance of pro- and anti-tumour effects varies between individuals as well as between different tumour types. In pancreatic cancer, tumour-infiltrating TH17 (lymphoid) cells may act on stroma to induce angiogenesis, as well as activating other tumour-promoting transcription factors^[80]. In one model, tumours which were resistant to VEGF inhibitors were rendered sensitive by inhibition of TH17 effector function, suggesting that immunomodulation may improve the efficacy of antiangiogenic treatments^[81]. Similarly, tumour-associated macrophages (TAMs) may produce various growth factors as well as proteases which degrade the extracellular matrix, facilitating tumour invasion and angiogenesis^[73], and may promote EMT in pancreatic cancer cells^[82]. Transition of normal macrophages to tumour-promoting TAMs may be induced by IL-4 produced by pancreatic carcinoma cells^[83], again offering a possible therapeutic target, and other inflammatory mediators may serve as biomarkers of prognosis in patients with advanced pancreatic carcinoma^[84].

DEVELOPING THE EVIDENCE BASE FOR A "PERSONALISED APPROACH"

Many challenges exist in developing the evidence base for a "personalised approach" to PC treatment. These include: appropriate design of clinical trials; development, interpretation and accreditation of standardised tests; matching appropriate patients to suitable trials; and minimising turn around time of new molecular based diagnostic tests required for trial eligibility and ultimately treatment selection^[26,85,86]. A number of clinical trials examining different aspects of personalised treatment for pancreatic cancer are ongoing (Table 2). Biobanking of tissue samples linked to clinical outcomes data is possible within clinical trials and community cohorts. Such resources hold significant potential for true translational research.

Molecular profiling of tumours and the role of biobanks

Next generation sequencing is providing unprecedented opportunities to uncover the underlying genetic pathways driving cancer and is accelerating the drive towards per-

sonalized medicine. Human specimens that are analyzed using these technology platforms are a critical resource for basic and translational research in cancer because they are a direct source of molecular data from which targets for therapy, detection, and prevention are identified. The recent Federal Drug Administration approval of next generation sequencing platforms for diagnostic use (<http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/ucm375742.htm>) and the rapidly falling costs of whole genome sequencing will bring this technology into the clinic in the near future.

Biobanking has the potential to be a powerful platform for health innovation and knowledge generation, as biospecimens represent essential materials that fuel the advance of technology, scientific and medical research. This has stimulated a growing demand for appropriately qualified, well annotated biospecimens world-wide.

However, establishing a biobank of value, presents unique ethical, logistical, scientific, informational, and financial challenges in tissue acquisition and resource development. To be of maximum value tissue samples and analytical methods must be "fit for purpose" and reproducible.

Controlling pre-analytical variables is critical to ensure that the results of multidimensional high-throughput profiling are accurate and reproducible. The Australian Pancreatic Cancer Genome Initiative, an Australian led, international effort to characterise the genome of pancreatic cancer, has led international efforts to harmonise and standardize biospecimen collection, processing and downstream application. Factors critical to the success of this initiative include using best practice to guide processes, collection of multiple aliquots of specimens, ensuring all samples have a reference germline sample and expanding the repertoire to include the development of patient derived xenografts and cell lines. It is crucial to set appropriate standards from the projects initiation, and the human aspects of this complex enterprise cannot be underestimated to ensure quality samples that accurately represent the spectrum of cancer.

Meeting the challenges of biospecimen quality and interoperability requires a more modern approach to biobanking. Modern biobanking sees a new type of biospecimen emerge: where biospecimens are collected at distinct time points, and in a pre-specified clinical context. These samples are comprehensively annotated with clinico-pathological and treatment data, and linked to genomic and molecular data sets. Procurement of these types of samples requires a new organisational structure that includes specific clinical disciplines such as interventional radiology and molecular pathology.

CONCLUSION

Recent advances in the treatment of pancreatic cancer have evolved through greater understanding of clinical tumour biology. None of this would be possible without access to tumour tissues. Biospecimen collection for

future research is becoming an integral part of trials and increasingly part of practice. Appropriate methods for collection, analysis and annotation of specimens are critical for maximising benefit from this valuable resource and ensuring reliability and reproducibility of results.

There is still much progress to be made in improving outcomes for patients with pancreatic cancer. Oncologists are increasingly recognising the importance of bio-specimen collection to facilitate precision medicine. To make this a reality in practice, engagement of patients and other related clinicians (gastroenterologists, radiologists and pathologists) is vital. Acceptability to patients in routine practice is a crucial step in moving not just from bench to bedside but from trial to clinic.

The contribution of patients in allowing their specimens to be accessed for research cannot be undervalued. At both global and individual levels, for contribution to research and for personalisation of treatment, tissue is -and will continue to be- an important issue.

REFERENCES

- 1 Siegel R, Naishadham D, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2013. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2013; **63**: 11-30 [PMID: 23335087]
- 2 Malvezzi M, Bertuccio P, Levi F, La Vecchia C, Negri E. European cancer mortality predictions for the year 2013. *Ann Oncol* 2013; **24**: 792-800 [PMID: 23402763]
- 3 American Society of Clinical Oncology. Clinical Cancer Advances 2012. In: Roth BJ, Vogelzang NJ, editors. ASCO's Annual Report on Progress Against Cancer. Alexandria, VA: American Society of Clinical Oncology, 2012
- 4 Poplin E, Wasan H, Rolfe L, Raponi M, Ikdahl T, Bondarenko I, Davidenko I, Bondar V, Garin A, Boeck S, Ormanns S, Heinemann V, Bassi C, Evans TR, Andersson R, Hahn H, Picozzi V, Dicker A, Mann E, Voong C, Kaur P, Isaacson J, Allen A. Randomized, multicenter, phase II study of CO-101 versus gemcitabine in patients with metastatic pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: including a prospective evaluation of the role of hENT1 in gemcitabine or CO-101 sensitivity. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; **31**: 4453-4461 [PMID: 24220555]
- 5 Alix-Panabières C, Schwarzenbach H, Pantel K. Circulating tumor cells and circulating tumor DNA. *Annu Rev Med* 2012; **63**: 199-215 [PMID: 22053740]
- 6 Burris HA, Moore MJ, Andersen J, Green MR, Rothenberg ML, Modiano MR, Cripps MC, Portenoy RK, Storniolo AM, Tarassoff P, Nelson R, Dorr FA, Stephens CD, Von Hoff DD. Improvements in survival and clinical benefit with gemcitabine as first-line therapy for patients with advanced pancreas cancer: a randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 1997; **15**: 2403-2413 [PMID: 9196156]
- 7 Sultana A, Smith CT, Cunningham D, Starling N, Neoptolemos JP, Ghaneh P. Meta-analyses of chemotherapy for locally advanced and metastatic pancreatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; **25**: 2607-2615 [PMID: 17577041 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2006.09.2551]
- 8 Xie DR, Yang Q, Chen DL, Jiang ZM, Bi ZF, Ma W, Zhang YD. Gemcitabine-based cytotoxic doublets chemotherapy for advanced pancreatic cancer: updated subgroup meta-analyses of overall survival. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2010; **40**: 432-441 [PMID: 20147334 DOI: 10.1093/jjco/hyp198]
- 9 Sun C, Ansari D, Andersson R, Wu DQ. Does gemcitabine-based combination therapy improve the prognosis of unresectable pancreatic cancer? *World J Gastroenterol* 2012; **18**: 4944-4958 [PMID: 23002368 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v18.i35.4944]
- 10 Heinemann V, Boeck S, Hinke A, Labianca R, Louvet C. Meta-analysis of randomized trials: evaluation of benefit from gemcitabine-based combination chemotherapy applied in advanced pancreatic cancer. *BMC Cancer* 2008; **8**: 82 [PMID: 18373843]
- 11 Conroy T, Desseigne F, Ychou M, Bouché O, Guimbaud R, Bécouarn Y, Adenis A, Raoul JL, Gourgou-Bourgade S, de la Fouchardière C, Bennouna J, Bachtet JB, Khemissa-Akouz F, Péré-Vergé D, Delbaldo C, Assenat E, Chauffert B, Michel P, Montoto-Grillot C, Ducreux M. FOLFIRINOX versus gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2011; **364**: 1817-1825 [PMID: 21561347 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1011923]
- 12 Gourgou-Bourgade S, Bascoul-Mollevi C, Desseigne F, Ychou M, Bouché O, Guimbaud R, Bécouarn Y, Adenis A, Raoul JL, Boige V, Bérille J, Conroy T. Impact of FOLFIRINOX compared with gemcitabine on quality of life in patients with metastatic pancreatic cancer: results from the PRODIGE 4/ACCORD 11 randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; **31**: 23-29 [PMID: 23213101 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2012.44.4869]
- 13 Von Hoff DD, Ervin T, Arena FP, Chiorean EG, Infante J, Moore M, Seay T, Tjulandin SA, Ma WW, Saleh MN, Harris M, Reni M, Dowden S, Laheru D, Bahary N, Ramanathan RK, Tabernero J, Hidalgo M, Goldstein D, Van Cutsem E, Wei X, Iglesias J, Renschler MF. Increased survival in pancreatic cancer with nab-paclitaxel plus gemcitabine. *N Engl J Med* 2013; **369**: 1691-1703 [PMID: 24131140 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1304369]
- 14 Moore MJ, Goldstein D, Hamm J, Figer A, Hecht JR, Gallinger S, Au HJ, Murawa P, Walde D, Wolff RA, Campos D, Lim R, Ding K, Clark G, Voskoglou-Nomikos T, Ptasynski M, Parulekar W. Erlotinib plus gemcitabine compared with gemcitabine alone in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: a phase III trial of the National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; **25**: 1960-1966 [PMID: 17452677 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2006.07.9525]
- 15 Tang P, Gill S, Au H, Chen E, Hedley D, Leroux M, Wang L, Moore M. Phase II trial of erlotinib in advanced pancreatic cancer (PC). *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27** (15 Suppl): 4609
- 16 Philip PA, Benedetti J, Corless CL, Wong R, O'Reilly EM, Flynn PJ, Rowland KM, Atkins JN, Mirtsching BC, Rivkin SE, Khorana AA, Goldman B, Fenoglio-Preiser CM, Abbruzzese JL, Blanke CD. Phase III study comparing gemcitabine plus cetuximab versus gemcitabine in patients with advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma: Southwest Oncology Group-directed intergroup trial S0205. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; **28**: 3605-3610 [PMID: 20606093]
- 17 Kindler HL, Niedzwiecki D, Hollis D, Sutherland S, Schrag D, Hurwitz H, Innocenti F, Mulcahy MF, O'Reilly E, Wozniak TF, Picus J, Bhargava P, Mayer RJ, Schilsky RL, Goldberg RM. Gemcitabine plus bevacizumab compared with gemcitabine plus placebo in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: phase III trial of the Cancer and Leukemia Group B (CALGB 80303). *J Clin Oncol* 2010; **28**: 3617-3622 [PMID: 20606091 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2010.28.1386]
- 18 Van Cutsem E, Vervenne WL, Bennouna J, Humblet Y, Gill S, Van Laethem JL, Verslype C, Scheithauer W, Shang A, Cosaert J, Moore MJ. Phase III trial of bevacizumab in combination with gemcitabine and erlotinib in patients with metastatic pancreatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 2231-2237 [PMID: 19307500 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2008.20.0238]
- 19 Rougier P, Riess H, Manges R, Karasek P, Humblet Y, Barone C, Santoro A, Assadourian S, Hatteville L, Philip PA. Randomised, placebo-controlled, double-blind, parallel-group phase III study evaluating aflibercept in patients receiving first-line treatment with gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2013; **49**: 2633-2642 [PMID: 23642329 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2013.04.002]
- 20 Kindler HL, Ioka T, Richel DJ, Bennouna J, Létourneau R, Okusaka T, Funakoshi A, Furuse J, Park YS, Ohkawa S, Springett GM, Wasan HS, Trask PC, Bycott P, Ricart AD,

- Kim S, Van Cutsem E. Axitinib plus gemcitabine versus placebo plus gemcitabine in patients with advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a double-blind randomised phase 3 study. *Lancet Oncol* 2011; **12**: 256-262 [PMID: 21306953 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(11)70004-3]
- 21 **Spano JP**, Chodkiewicz C, Maurel J, Wong R, Wasan H, Barone C, Létourneau R, Bajetta E, Pithavala Y, Bycott P, Trask P, Liau K, Ricart AD, Kim S, Rixe O. Efficacy of gemcitabine plus axitinib compared with gemcitabine alone in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: an open-label randomised phase II study. *Lancet* 2008; **371**: 2101-2108 [PMID: 18514303 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60661-3]
 - 22 **Bramhall SR**, Schulz J, Nemunaitis J, Brown PD, Baillet M, Buckels JA. A double-blind placebo-controlled, randomised study comparing gemcitabine and marimastat with gemcitabine and placebo as first line therapy in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2002; **87**: 161-167 [PMID: 12107836 DOI: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6600446]
 - 23 **Moore MJ**, Hamm J, Dancey J, Eisenberg PD, Dagenais M, Fields A, Hagan K, Greenberg B, Colwell B, Zee B, Tu D, Ottaway J, Humphrey R, Seymour L. Comparison of gemcitabine versus the matrix metalloproteinase inhibitor BAY 12-9566 in patients with advanced or metastatic adenocarcinoma of the pancreas: a phase III trial of the National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2003; **21**: 3296-3302 [PMID: 12947065 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2003.02.098]
 - 24 **Gonçalves A**, Gilibert M, François E, Dahan L, Perrier H, Lamy R, Re D, Largillier R, Gasmi M, Tchiknavorian X, Esterni B, Genre D, Moureau-Zabotto L, Giovannini M, Seitz JF, Delpero JR, Turrini O, Viens P, Raoul JL. BAYPAN study: a double-blind phase III randomized trial comparing gemcitabine plus sorafenib and gemcitabine plus placebo in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2012; **23**: 2799-2805 [PMID: 22771827 DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mds135]
 - 25 **Richards DA**, Kuefler PR, Becerra C, Wilfong LS, Gersh RH, Boehm KA, Zhan F, Asmar L, Myrand SP, Hozak RR, Zhao L, Gill JF, Mullaney BP, Obasaju CK, Nicol SJ. Gemcitabine plus enzastaurin or single-agent gemcitabine in locally advanced or metastatic pancreatic cancer: results of a phase II, randomized, noncomparative study. *Invest New Drugs* 2011; **29**: 144-153 [PMID: 19714296 DOI: 10.1007/s10637-009-9307-8]
 - 26 **Roychowdhury S**. Cancer genomics meets clinical trials: the challenge ahead. *J Pers Med* 2012; **9**: 459-461 [DOI: 10.2217/pme.12.50]
 - 27 **Murphy PM**. Incyte Announces Positive Top-Line Results from COMFORT-1 Pivotal Phase III Trial. Available from: <http://www.mpdvoice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Top-Line-Results-PR-12.20.10.pdf>
 - 28 **Efthimiou E**, Crnogorac-Jurcevic T, Lemoine NR. Pancreatic cancer genetics. *Pancreatology* 2001; **1**: 571-575 [PMID: 12120238 DOI: 10.1159/000055865]
 - 29 **Mimeault M**, Brand RE, Sasson AA, Batra SK. Recent advances on the molecular mechanisms involved in pancreatic cancer progression and therapies. *Pancreas* 2005; **31**: 301-316 [PMID: 16258363]
 - 30 **Tuveson DA**, Hingorani SR. Ductal pancreatic cancer in humans and mice. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* 2005; **70**: 65-72 [PMID: 16869739]
 - 31 **Jaffee EM**, Hruban RH, Canto M, Kern SE. Focus on pancreas cancer. *Cancer Cell* 2002; **2**: 25-28 [PMID: 12150822]
 - 32 **Maitra A**, Hruban RH. Pancreatic cancer. *Annu Rev Pathol* 2008; **3**: 157-188 [PMID: 18039136]
 - 33 **Jones S**, Zhang X, Parsons DW, Lin JC, Leary RJ, Angenendt P, Mankoo P, Carter H, Kamiyama H, Jimeno A, Hong SM, Fu B, Lin MT, Calhoun ES, Kamiyama M, Walter K, Nikolskaya T, Nikolsky Y, Hartigan J, Smith DR, Hidalgo M, Leach SD, Klein AP, Jaffee EM, Goggins M, Maitra A, Iacobuzio-Donahue C, Eshleman JR, Kern SE, Hruban RH, Karchin R, Papadopoulos N, Parmigiani G, Vogelstein B, Velculescu VE, Kinzler KW. Core signaling pathways in human pancreatic cancers revealed by global genomic analyses. *Science* 2008; **321**: 1801-1806 [PMID: 18772397 DOI: 10.1126/science.1164368]
 - 34 **Biankin AV**, Waddell N, Kassahn KS, Gingras M-C, Muthuswamy LB, Johns AL, Miller DK, Wilson PJ, Patch A-M, Wu J, Chang DK, Cowley MJ, Gardiner BB, Song S, Harliwong I, Idrisoglu S, Nourse C, Nourbakhsh E, Manning S, Wani S, Gongora M, Pajic M, Scarlett CJ, Gill AJ, Pinho AV, Rooman I, Anderson M, Holmes O, Leonard C, Taylor D, Wood S, Xu Q, Nones K, Lynn Fink J, Christ A, Bruxner T, Cloonan N, Kolle G, Newell F, Pinese M, Scott Mead R, Humphris JL, Kaplan W, Jones MD, Colvin EK, Nagrial AM, Humphrey ES, Chou A, Chin VT, Chantrill LA, Mawson A, Samra JS, Kench JG, Lovell JA, Daly RJ, Merrett ND, Toon C, Epari K, Nguyen NQ, Barbour A, Zeps N, Kakkar N, Zhao F, Qing Wu Y, Wang M, Muzny DM, Fisher WE, Charles Brunicaudi F, Hodges SE, Reid JG, Drummond J, Chang K, Han Y, Lewis LR, Dinh H, Buhay CJ, Beck T, Timms L, Sam M, Begley K, Brown A, Pai D, Panchal A, Buchner N, De Borja R, Denroche RE, Yung CK, Serra S, Onetto N, Mukhopadhyay D, Tsao M-S, Shaw PA, Petersen GM, Gallinger S, Hruban RH, Maitra A, Iacobuzio-Donahue CA, Schulick RD, Wolfgang CL, Morgan RA, Lawlor RT, Capelli P, Corbo V, Scardoni M, Tortora G, Tempero MA, Mann KM, Jenkins NA, Perez-Mancera PA, Adams DJ, Largaespada DA, Wessels LFA, Rust AG, Stein LD, Tuveson DA, Copeland NG, Musgrove EA, Scarpa A, Eshleman JR, Hudson TJ, Sutherland RL, Wheeler DA, Pearson JV, McPherson JD, Gibbs RA, Grimmond SM. Pancreatic cancer genomes reveal aberrations in axon guidance pathway genes. *Nature* 2012; **491**: 399-405 [PMID: 23103869]
 - 35 **Liu ZJ**, Herlyn M. Slit-Robo: neuronal guides signal in tumor angiogenesis. *Cancer Cell* 2003; **4**: 1-2 [PMID: 12892705 DOI: 10.1016/S1535-6108(03)00166-1]
 - 36 **Wang B**, Xiao Y, Ding BB, Zhang N, Yuan Xb, Gui L, Qian KX, Duan S, Chen Z, Rao Y, Geng JG. Induction of tumor angiogenesis by Slit-Robo signaling and inhibition of cancer growth by blocking Robo activity. *Cancer Cell* 2003; **4**: 19-29 [PMID: 12892710 DOI: 10.1016/S1535-6108(03)00164-8]
 - 37 **Chou A**, Waddell N, Cowley MJ, Gill AJ, Chang DK, Patch AM, Nones K, Wu J, Pinese M, Johns AL, Miller DK, Kassahn KS, Nagrial AM, Wasan H, Goldstein D, Toon CW, Chin V, Chantrill L, Humphris J, Mead RS, Rooman I, Samra JS, Pajic M, Musgrove EA, Pearson JV, Morey AL, Grimmond SM, Biankin AV. Clinical and molecular characterization of HER2 amplified-pancreatic cancer. *Genome Med* 2013; **5**: 78 [PMID: 24004612 DOI: 10.1186/gm482]
 - 38 **Arteaga CL**, Sliwkowski MX, Osborne CK, Perez EA, Puglisi F, Gianni L. Treatment of HER2-positive breast cancer: current status and future perspectives. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 2012; **9**: 16-32 [PMID: 22124364]
 - 39 **Bang YJ**, Van Cutsem E, Feyereislova A, Chung HC, Shen L, Sawaki A, Lordick F, Ohtsu A, Omuro Y, Satoh T, Aprile G, Kulikov E, Hill J, Lehle M, Rüschoff J, Kang YK. Trastuzumab in combination with chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for treatment of HER2-positive advanced gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction cancer (ToGA): a phase 3, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2010; **376**: 687-697 [PMID: 20728210 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61121-X]
 - 40 **Safran H**, Iannitti D, Ramanathan R, Schwartz JD, Steinhoff M, Nauman C, Hesketh P, Rathore R, Wolff R, Tantravahi U, Hughes TM, Maia C, Pasquariello T, Goldstein L, King T, Tsai JY, Kennedy T. Herceptin and gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancers that overexpress HER-2/neu. *Cancer Invest* 2004; **22**: 706-712 [PMID: 15581051]
 - 41 **Harder J**, Ihorst G, Heinemann V, Hofheinz R, Moehler M, Buechler P, Kloepfel G, Röcken C, Bitzer M, Boeck S, Endlicher E, Reinacher-Schick A, Schmoor C, Geissler M. Multicentre phase II trial of trastuzumab and capecitabine

- in patients with HER2 overexpressing metastatic pancreatic cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2012; **106**: 1033-1038 [PMID: 22374460 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2012.18]
- 42 **Safran H**, Miner T, Bahary N, Whiting S, Lopez CD, Sun W, Charpentier K, Shipley J, Anderson E, McNulty B, Schumacher A, Clark A, Vakharia J, Kennedy T, Sio T. Lapatinib and gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancer. A phase II study. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2011; **34**: 50-52 [PMID: 24757739 DOI: 10.1097/COC.0b013e3181d26b01]
- 43 **Kris M**, Meropol N, Winer E. Accelerating Progress Against Cancer ASCO's Blueprint for Transforming Clinical and Translational Cancer Research. Virginia: Oncology ASoc, 2011
- 44 **Johnson JI**, Decker S, Zaharevitz D, Rubinstein LV, Venditti JM, Schepartz S, Kalyandrug S, Christian M, Arbuck S, Hollingshead M, Sausville EA. Relationships between drug activity in NCI preclinical in vitro and in vivo models and early clinical trials. *Br J Cancer* 2001; **84**: 1424-1431 [PMID: 11355958 DOI: 10.1054/bjoc.2001.1796]
- 45 **Katz MH**, Takimoto S, Spivack D, Moossa AR, Hoffman RM, Bouvet M. An imageable highly metastatic orthotopic red fluorescent protein model of pancreatic cancer. *Clin Exp Metastasis* 2004; **21**: 7-12 [PMID: 15065597]
- 46 **Larbouret C**, Robert B, Bascoul-Mollevi C, Penault-Llorca F, Ho-Pun-Cheung A, Morisseau S, Navarro-Teulon I, Mach JP, Pèlerin A, Azria D. Combined cetuximab and trastuzumab are superior to gemcitabine in the treatment of human pancreatic carcinoma xenografts. *Ann Oncol* 2010; **21**: 98-103 [PMID: 19889608 DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdp496]
- 47 **Olive KP**, Jacobetz MA, Davidson CJ, Gopinathan A, McIntyre D, Honess D, Madhu B, Goldgraben MA, Caldwell ME, Allard D, Frese KK, Denicola G, Feig C, Combs C, Winter SP, Ireland-Zecchini H, Reichelt S, Howat WJ, Chang A, Dhara M, Wang L, Rückert F, Grützmann R, Pilarsky C, Izeradjene K, Hingorani SR, Huang P, Davies SE, Plunkett W, Egorin M, Hruban RH, Whitebread N, McGovern K, Adams J, Iacobuzio-Donahue C, Griffiths J, Tuzeson DA. Inhibition of Hedgehog signaling enhances delivery of chemotherapy in a mouse model of pancreatic cancer. *Science* 2009; **324**: 1457-1461 [PMID: 19460966 DOI: 10.1126/science.1171362]
- 48 **Singh M**, Johnson L. Using genetically engineered mouse models of cancer to aid drug development: an industry perspective. *Clin Cancer Res* 2006; **12**: 5312-5328 [PMID: 17000664 DOI: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-0437]
- 49 **Ito M**, Hiramatsu H, Kobayashi K, Suzue K, Kawahata M, Hioki K, Ueyama Y, Koyanagi Y, Sugamura K, Tsuji K, Heike T, Nakahata T. NOD/SCID/gamma(c)(null) mouse: an excellent recipient mouse model for engraftment of human cells. *Blood* 2002; **100**: 3175-3182 [PMID: 12384415 DOI: 10.1182/blood-2001-12-0207]
- 50 **Quintana E**, Shackleton M, Sabel MS, Fullen DR, Johnson TM, Morrison SJ. Efficient tumour formation by single human melanoma cells. *Nature* 2008; **456**: 593-598 [PMID: 19052619 DOI: 10.1038/nature07567]
- 51 **Julien S**, Merino-Trigo A, Lacroix L, Pocard M, Goéré D, Mariani P, Landron S, Bigot L, Nemati F, Dartigues P, Weiswald LB, Lantuas D, Morgand L, Pham E, Gonin P, Dangles-Marie V, Job B, Dessen P, Bruno A, Pierré A, De Thé H, Soliman H, Nunes M, Lardier G, Calvet L, Demers B, Prévost G, Vrignaud P, Roman-Roman S, Duchamp O, Berthet C. Characterization of a large panel of patient-derived tumor xenografts representing the clinical heterogeneity of human colorectal cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2012; **18**: 5314-5328 [PMID: 22825584 DOI: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-12-0372]
- 52 **Petrillo LA**, Wolf DM, Kapoun AM, Wang NJ, Barczak A, Xiao Y, Korkaya H, Baehner F, Lewicki J, Wicha M, Park JW, Spellman PT, Gray JW, van't Veer L, Esserman LJ. Xenografts faithfully recapitulate breast cancer-specific gene expression patterns of parent primary breast tumors. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2012; **135**: 913-922 [PMID: 22941572 DOI: 10.1007/s10549-012-2226-y]
- 53 **Kang MH**, Kang YH, Szlymska B, Wilczynska-Kalak U, Sheard MA, Harned TM, Lock RB, Reynolds CP. Activity of vincristine, L-ASP, and dexamethasone against acute lymphoblastic leukemia is enhanced by the BH3-mimetic ABT-737 in vitro and in vivo. *Blood* 2007; **110**: 2057-2066 [PMID: 17536015 DOI: 10.1182/blood-2007-03-080325]
- 54 **Lee EM**, Bachmann PS, Lock RB. Xenograft models for the preclinical evaluation of new therapies in acute leukemia. *Leuk Lymphoma* 2007; **48**: 659-668 [PMID: 17454623 DOI: 10.1080/10428190601113584]
- 55 **Carol H**, Houghton PJ, Morton CL, Kolb EA, Gorlick R, Reynolds CP, Kang MH, Maris JM, Keir ST, Watkins A, Smith MA, Lock RB. Initial testing of topotecan by the pediatric preclinical testing program. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2010; **54**: 707-715 [PMID: 20017204 DOI: 10.1002/pbc.22352]
- 56 **Zamboni WC**, Stewart CF, Thompson J, Santana VM, Cheshire PJ, Richmond LB, Luo X, Poquette C, Houghton JA, Houghton PJ. Relationship between topotecan systemic exposure and tumor response in human neuroblastoma xenografts. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1998; **90**: 505-511 [PMID: 9539245]
- 57 **Furman WL**, Stewart CF, Poquette CA, Pratt CB, Santana VM, Zamboni WC, Bowman LC, Ma MK, Hoffer FA, Meyer WH, Pappo AS, Walter AW, Houghton PJ. Direct translation of a protracted irinotecan schedule from a xenograft model to a phase I trial in children. *J Clin Oncol* 1999; **17**: 1815-1824 [PMID: 10561220]
- 58 **Pawaskar DK**, Straubinger RM, Fetterly GJ, Hylander BH, Repasky EA, Ma WW, Jusko WJ. Synergistic interactions between sorafenib and everolimus in pancreatic cancer xenografts in mice. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2013; **71**: 1231-1240 [PMID: 23455452 DOI: 10.1007/s00280-013-2117-x]
- 59 **Barugola G**, Falconi M, Bettini R, Boninsegna L, Casarotto A, Salvia R, Bassi C, Pederzoli P. The determinant factors of recurrence following resection for ductal pancreatic cancer. *JOP* 2007; **8**: 132-140 [PMID: 17228145]
- 60 **Hishinuma S**, Ogata Y, Tomikawa M, Ozawa I, Hirabayashi K, Igarashi S. Patterns of recurrence after curative resection of pancreatic cancer, based on autopsy findings. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2006; **10**: 511-518 [PMID: 16627216]
- 61 **Iacobuzio-Donahue CA**, Fu B, Yachida S, Luo M, Abe H, Henderson CM, Vilardeell F, Wang Z, Keller JW, Banerjee P, Herman JM, Cameron JL, Yeo CJ, Halushka MK, Lahsleman JR, Raben M, Klein AP, Hruban RH, Hidalgo M, Lameru D. DPC4 gene status of the primary carcinoma correlates with patterns of failure in patients with pancreatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 1806-1813 [PMID: 19273710]
- 62 **Yoon HH**, Catalano PJ, Murphy KM, Skaar TC, Philips S, Powell M, Montgomery EA, Hafez MJ, Offer SM, Liu G, Meltzer SJ, Wu X, Forastiere AA, Benson AB, Kleinberg LR, Gibson MK. Genetic variation in DNA-repair pathways and response to radiochemotherapy in esophageal adenocarcinoma: a retrospective cohort study of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *BMC Cancer* 2011; **11**: 176 [PMID: 21586140 DOI: 10.1186/1471-2407-11-176]
- 63 **Young JD**, Yao SY, Baldwin JM, Cass CE, Baldwin SA. The human concentrative and equilibrative nucleoside transporter families, SLC28 and SLC29. *Mol Aspects Med* 2013; **34**: 529-547 [PMID: 23506887 DOI: 10.1016/j.mam.2012.05.007]
- 64 **Maréchal R**, Bachet JB, Mackey JR, Dalban C, Demetter P, Graham K, Couvelard A, Svrcek M, Bardier-Dupas A, Hamel P, Sauvanet A, Louvet C, Paye F, Rougier P, Penna C, André T, Dumontet C, Cass CE, Jordheim LP, Matera EL, Closset J, Salmon I, Devière J, Emile JF, Van Laethem JL. Levels of gemcitabine transport and metabolism proteins predict survival times of patients treated with gemcitabine for pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2012; **143**: 664-74. e1-6 [PMID: 22705007 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2012.06.006]
- 65 **Farrell JJ**, Elsaleh H, Garcia M, Lai R, Ammar A, Regine WF, Abrams R, Benson AB, Macdonald J, Cass CE, Dicker

- AP, Mackey JR. Human equilibrative nucleoside transporter 1 levels predict response to gemcitabine in patients with pancreatic cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2009; **136**: 187-195 [PMID: 18992248 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2008.09.067]
- 66 **Greenhalf W**, Ghaneh P, Neoptolemos JP, Palmer DH, Cox TF, Lamb RF, Garner E, Campbell F, Mackey JR, Costello E, Moore MJ, Valle JW, McDonald AC, Carter R, Tebbutt NC, Goldstein D, Shannon J, Dervenis C, Glimelius B, Deakin M, Charnley RM, Lacaine F, Scarfe AG, Middleton MR, Anthony A, Halloran CM, Mayerle J, Oláh A, Jackson R, Rawcliffe CL, Scarpa A, Bassi C, Büchler MW. Pancreatic cancer hENT1 expression and survival from gemcitabine in patients from the ESPAC-3 trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2014; **106**: djt347 [PMID: 24301456]
- 67 **Neuzillet C**, Tijeras-Raballand A, Cros J, Faivre S, Hammel P, Raymond E. Stromal expression of SPARC in pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Cancer Metastasis Rev* 2013; **32**: 585-602 [PMID: 23690170 DOI: 10.1007/s10555-013-9439-3]
- 68 **Infante JR**, Matsubayashi H, Sato N, Tonascia J, Klein AP, Riall TA, Yeo C, Iacobuzio-Donahue C, Goggins M. Peritumoral fibroblast SPARC expression and patient outcome with resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; **25**: 319-325 [PMID: 17235047 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2006.07.8824]
- 69 **Mantoni TS**, Schendel RR, Rödel F, Niedobitek G, Al-Assar O, Masamune A, Brunner TB. Stromal SPARC expression and patient survival after chemoradiation for non-resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Cancer Biol Ther* 2008; **7**: 1806-1815 [PMID: 18787407]
- 70 **Von Hoff DD**, Ramanathan RK, Borad MJ, Laheru DA, Smith LS, Wood TE, Korn RL, Desai N, Trieu V, Iglesias JL, Zhang H, Soon-Shiong P, Shi T, Rajeshkumar NV, Maitra A, Hidalgo M. Gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel is an active regimen in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: a phase I/II trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2011; **29**: 4548-4554 [PMID: 21969517 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2011.36.5742]
- 71 **Von Hoff D**, Ervin T, Arena F, Chiorean E, Infante J, Moore M. Results of a randomized phase III trial (MPACT) of weekly nab-paclitaxel plus gemcitabine vs gemcitabine alone for patients with metastatic adenocarcinoma of the pancreas with PET and CA19-9 correlates. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; **31**: abstract4005
- 72 **Hemmings C**. Is carcinoma a mesenchymal disease? The role of the stromal microenvironment in carcinogenesis. *Pathology* 2013; **45**: 371-381 [PMID: 23594691]
- 73 **West RB**, Nuyten DS, Subramanian S, Nielsen TO, Corless CL, Rubin BP, Montgomery K, Zhu S, Patel R, Hernandez-Boussard T, Goldblum JR, Brown PO, van de Vijver M, van de Rijn M. Determination of stromal signatures in breast carcinoma. *PLoS Biol* 2005; **3**: e187 [PMID: 15869330]
- 74 **Beck AH**, Espinosa I, Gilks CB, van de Rijn M, West RB. The fibromatosis signature defines a robust stromal response in breast carcinoma. *Lab Invest* 2008; **88**: 591-601 [PMID: 18414401]
- 75 **Chlenski A**, Guerrero LJ, Yang Q, Tian Y, Peddinti R, Salwen HR, Cohn SL. SPARC enhances tumor stroma formation and prevents fibroblast activation. *Oncogene* 2007; **26**: 4513-4522 [PMID: 17260013 DOI: 10.1038/sj.onc.1210247]
- 76 **Tang MJ**, Tai IT. A novel interaction between procaspase 8 and SPARC enhances apoptosis and potentiates chemotherapy sensitivity in colorectal cancers. *J Biol Chem* 2007; **282**: 34457-34467 [PMID: 17897953 DOI: 10.1074/jbc.M704459200]
- 77 **Seux M**, Peugot S, Montero MP, Siret C, Rigot V, Clerc P, Gigoux V, Pellegrino E, Pouyet L, N'Guessan P, Garcia S, Dufresne M, Iovanna JL, Carrier A, André F, Dusetti NJ. TP53INP1 decreases pancreatic cancer cell migration by regulating SPARC expression. *Oncogene* 2011; **30**: 3049-3061 [PMID: 21339733 DOI: 10.1038/onc.2011.25]
- 78 **Neesse A**, Frese KK, Bapiro TE, Nakagawa T, Sternlicht MD, Seeley TW, Pilarsky C, Jodrell DI, Spong SM, Tuveson DA. CTGF antagonism with mAb FG-3019 enhances chemotherapy response without increasing drug delivery in murine ductal pancreas cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2013; **110**: 12325-12330 [PMID: 23836645 DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1300415110]
- 79 **Alvarez R**, Musteanu M, Garcia-Garcia E, Lopez-Casas PP, Megias D, Guerra C, Muñoz M, Quijano Y, Cubillo A, Rodriguez-Pascual J, Plaza C, de Vicente E, Prados S, Tabernero S, Barbad M, Lopez-Rios F, Hidalgo M. Stromal disrupting effects of nab-paclitaxel in pancreatic cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2013; **109**: 926-933 [PMID: 23907428 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2013.415]
- 80 **Maniati E**, Soper R, Hagemann T. Up for Mischief? IL-17/Th17 in the tumour microenvironment. *Oncogene* 2010; **29**: 5653-5662 [PMID: 20729908 DOI: 10.1038/onc.2010.367]
- 81 **Chung AS**, Wu X, Zhuang G, Ngu H, Kasman I, Zhang J, Vernes JM, Jiang Z, Meng YG, Peale FV, Ouyang W, Ferrara N. An interleukin-17-mediated paracrine network promotes tumor resistance to anti-angiogenic therapy. *Nat Med* 2013; **19**: 1114-1123 [PMID: 23913124 DOI: 10.1038/nm.3291]
- 82 **Liu CY**, Xu JY, Shi XY, Huang W, Ruan TY, Xie P, Ding JL. M2-polarized tumor-associated macrophages promoted epithelial-mesenchymal transition in pancreatic cancer cells, partially through TLR4/IL-10 signaling pathway. *Lab Invest* 2013; **93**: 844-854 [PMID: 23752129 DOI: 10.1038/labinvest.2013.69]
- 83 **Gocheva V**, Wang HW, Gadea BB, Shree T, Hunter KE, Garfall AL, Berman T, Joyce JA. IL-4 induces cathepsin protease activity in tumor-associated macrophages to promote cancer growth and invasion. *Genes Dev* 2010; **24**: 241-255 [PMID: 20080943 DOI: 10.1101/gad.1874010]
- 84 **Kondo S**, Ueno H, Hosoi H, Hashimoto J, Morizane C, Koizumi F, Tamura K, Okusaka T. Clinical impact of pentraxin family expression on prognosis of pancreatic carcinoma. *Br J Cancer* 2013; **109**: 739-746 [PMID: 23828517 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2013.348]
- 85 **Sharma MR**, Schilsky RL. Role of randomized phase III trials in an era of effective targeted therapies. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 2012; **9**: 208-214 [PMID: 22143142 DOI: 10.1038/nrclinonc.2011.190]
- 86 **Christine M**, Micheel S, Omenn GS. Evolution of translational omics: Lessons learned and the path forward 2012. Available from: URL: <http://www.iom.edu/Reports/2012/Evolution-of-Translational-Omics.aspx>
- 87 **Oettle H**, Post S, Neuhaus P, Gellert K, Langrehr J, Ridwelski K, Schramm H, Fahlke J, Zuelke C, Burkart C, Guterlet K, Kettner E, Schmalenberg H, Weigang-Koehler K, Bechstein WO, Niedergethmann M, Schmidt-Wolf I, Roll L, Doerken B, Riess H. Adjuvant chemotherapy with gemcitabine vs observation in patients undergoing curative-intent resection of pancreatic cancer: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2007; **297**: 267-277 [PMID: 17227978 DOI: 10.1001/jama.297.3.267]
- 88 **Neoptolemos JP**, Greenhalf W, Ghaneh P, Palmer DH, Cox TF, Garner E, Campbell F, Mackey GR, Moore MJ, Valle JW, McDonald A, Tebbutt NC, Dervenis C, Glimelius B, Charnley RM, Lacaine F, Mayerle J, Rawcliffe CL, Bassi C, Büchler MW. HENT1 tumor levels to predict survival of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients who received adjuvant gemcitabine and adjuvant 5FU on the ESPAC trials. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; **31**(suppl): abstr4006
- 89 **Poplin E**, Wasan H, Rolfe L, Raponi M, Ikdahl T, Bondarenko I, Davidenko I, Bondar V, Garin A, Boeck SH, Heinemann V, Bassi C, Jeffrey Evans TR, Voong C, Kaur P, Isaacson JD, Allen AR. Randomized multicenter, phase II study of CO-101 vs gemcitabine in patients with metastatic pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (mPDAC) and a prospective evaluation of the association between tumor hENT1 expression and clinical outcome with gemcitabine treatment. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; **31**(suppl): abstr4007
- 90 **Collisson EA**, Sadanandam A, Olson P, Gibb WJ, Truitt M, Gu S, Cooc J, Weinkle J, Kim GE, Jakkula L, Feiler HS, Ko AH, Olshen AB, Danenberg KL, Tempero MA, Spellman PT, Hanahan D, Gray JW. Subtypes of pancreatic ductal adeno-

- carcinoma and their differing responses to therapy. *Nat Med* 2011; **17**: 500-503 [PMID: 21460848 DOI: 10.1038/nm.2344]
- 91 **Palmer KR**, Kerr M, Knowles G, Cull A, Carter DC, Leonard RC. Chemotherapy prolongs survival in inoperable pancreatic carcinoma. *Br J Surg* 1994; **81**: 882-885 [PMID: 8044610]
 - 92 **Glimelius B**, Hoffman K, Sjöden PO, Jacobsson G, Sellström H, Enander LK, Linné T, Svensson C. Chemotherapy improves survival and quality of life in advanced pancreatic and biliary cancer. *Ann Oncol* 1996; **7**: 593-600 [PMID: 8879373]
 - 93 **Neoptolemos JP**, Stocken DD, Tudur Smith C, Bassi C, Ghaneh P, Owen E, Moore M, Padbury R, Doi R, Smith D, Büchler MW. Adjuvant 5-fluorouracil and folinic acid vs observation for pancreatic cancer: composite data from the ESPAC-1 and -3(v1) trials. *Br J Cancer* 2009; **100**: 246-250 [PMID: 19127260 DOI: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6604838]
 - 94 **Hu YC**, Komorowski RA, Graewin S, Hostetter G, Kallioniemi OP, Pitt HA, Ahrendt SA. Thymidylate synthase expression predicts the response to 5-fluorouracil-based adjuvant therapy in pancreatic cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2003; **9**: 4165-4171 [PMID: 14519641]
 - 95 **Takamura M**, Nio Y, Yamasawa K, Dong M, Yamaguchi K, Itakura M. Implication of thymidylate synthase in the outcome of patients with invasive ductal carcinoma of the pancreas and efficacy of adjuvant chemotherapy using 5-fluorouracil or its derivatives. *Anticancer Drugs* 2002; **13**: 75-85 [PMID: 11914644]
 - 96 **Yi SY**, Park YS, Kim HS, Jun HJ, Kim KH, Chang MH, Park MJ, Uhm JE, Lee J, Park SH, Park JO, Lee JK, Lee KT, Lim HY, Kang WK. Irinotecan monotherapy as second-line treatment in advanced pancreatic cancer. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2009; **63**: 1141-1145 [PMID: 18839175 DOI: 10.1007/s00280-008-0839-y]
 - 97 **Braun MS**, Richman SD, Quirke P, Daly C, Adlard JW, Elliott F, Barrett JH, Selby P, Meade AM, Stephens RJ, Parmar MK, Seymour MT. Predictive biomarkers of chemotherapy efficacy in colorectal cancer: results from the UK MRC FOCUS trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2008; **26**: 2690-2698 [PMID: 18509181 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2007.15.5580]
 - 98 **Baselga J**, Carbonell X, Castañeda-Soto NJ, Clemens M, Green M, Harvey V, Morales S, Barton C, Ghahramani P. Phase II study of efficacy, safety, and pharmacokinetics of trastuzumab monotherapy administered on a 3-weekly schedule. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**: 2162-2171 [PMID: 15800309 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2005.01.014]
 - 99 **Marty M**, Cognetti F, Maraninchi D, Snyder R, Mauriac L, Tubiana-Hulin M, Chan S, Grimes D, Antón A, Lluch A, Kennedy J, O'Byrne K, Conte P, Green M, Ward C, Mayne K, Extra JM. Randomized phase II trial of the efficacy and safety of trastuzumab combined with docetaxel in patients with human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive metastatic breast cancer administered as first-line treatment: the M77001 study group. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**: 4265-4274 [PMID: 15911866 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2005.04.173]
 - 100 **Kimura K**, Sawada T, Komatsu M, Inoue M, Muguruma K, Nishihara T, Yamashita Y, Yamada N, Ohira M, Hirakawa K. Antitumor effect of trastuzumab for pancreatic cancer with high HER-2 expression and enhancement of effect by combined therapy with gemcitabine. *Clin Cancer Res* 2006; **12**: 4925-4932 [PMID: 16914581]
 - 101 **Motzer RJ**, Escudier B, Oudard S, Hutson TE, Porta C, Braccarda S, Grünwald V, Thompson JA, Figlin RA, Hollaender N, Urbanowitz G, Berg WJ, Kay A, Lebwohl D, Ravaud A. Efficacy of everolimus in advanced renal cell carcinoma: a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *Lancet* 2008; **372**: 449-456 [PMID: 18653228 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61039-9]
 - 102 **Wolpin BM**, Hezel AF, Abrams T, Blaszczowsky LS, Meyerhardt JA, Chan JA, Enzinger PC, Allen B, Clark JW, Ryan DP, Fuchs CS. Oral mTOR inhibitor everolimus in patients with gemcitabine-refractory metastatic pancreatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 193-198 [PMID: 19047305 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2008.18.9514]
 - 103 **Klümper HJ**, Queiroz KC, Spek CA, van Noesel CJ, Brink HC, de Leng WW, de Wilde RF, Mathus-Vliegen EM, Offerhaus GJ, Alleman MA, Westermann AM, Richel DJ. mTOR inhibitor treatment of pancreatic cancer in a patient with Peutz-Jeghers syndrome. *J Clin Oncol* 2011; **29**: e150-e153 [PMID: 21189378 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2010.32.7825]
 - 104 **Ito D**, Fujimoto K, Mori T, Kami K, Koizumi M, Toyoda E, Kawaguchi Y, Doi R. In vivo antitumor effect of the mTOR inhibitor CCI-779 and gemcitabine in xenograft models of human pancreatic cancer. *Int J Cancer* 2006; **118**: 2337-2343 [PMID: 16331623 DOI: 10.1002/ijc.21532]
 - 105 **Duran I**, Kortmansky J, Singh D, Hirte H, Kocha W, Goss G, Le L, Oza A, Nicklee T, Ho J, Birlle D, Pond GR, Arboine D, Dancy J, Aviel-Ronen S, Tsao MS, Hedley D, Siu LL. A phase II clinical and pharmacodynamic study of temsirolimus in advanced neuroendocrine carcinomas. *Br J Cancer* 2006; **95**: 1148-1154 [PMID: 17031397 DOI: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6603419]
 - 106 **Galanis E**, Buckner JC, Maurer MJ, Kreisberg JL, Ballman K, Boni J, Peralba JM, Jenkins RB, Dakhil SR, Morton RF, Jaeckle KA, Scheithauer BW, Dancy J, Hidalgo M, Walsh DJ. Phase II trial of temsirolimus (CCI-779) in recurrent glioblastoma multiforme: a North Central Cancer Treatment Group Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**: 5294-5304 [PMID: 15998902 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2005.23.622]
 - 107 **Janku F**, Tsimberidou AM, Garrido-Laguna I, Wang X, Luthra R, Hong DS, Naing A, Falchook GS, Moroney JW, Piha-Paul SA, Wheeler JJ, Moulder SL, Fu S, Kurzrock R. PIK3CA mutations in patients with advanced cancers treated with PI3K/AKT/mTOR axis inhibitors. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2011; **10**: 558-565 [PMID: 21216929 DOI: 10.1158/1535-7163.MCT-10-0994]
 - 108 **Cho D**, Signoretti S, Dabora S, Regan M, Seeley A, Mariotti M, Youmans A, Polivy A, Mandato L, McDermott D, Stanbridge E, Atkins M. Potential histologic and molecular predictors of response to temsirolimus in patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma. *Clin Genitourin Cancer* 2007; **5**: 379-385 [PMID: 17956710 DOI: 10.3816/CGC.2007.n.020]
 - 109 **Renì M**, Cereda S, Milella M, Novarino A, Passardi A, Mambriani A, Di Lucca G, Aprile G, Belli C, Danova M, Bergamo F, Franceschi E, Fugazza C, Ceraulo D, Villa E. Maintenance sunitinib or observation in metastatic pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a phase II randomised trial. *Eur J Cancer* 2013; **49**: 3609-3615 [PMID: 23899530 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2013.06.041]
 - 110 **Kogan M**, Fischer-Smith T, Kaminsky R, Lehmicke G, Rappaport J. CSF-1R up-regulation is associated with response to pharmacotherapy targeting tyrosine kinase activity in AML cell lines. *Anticancer Res* 2012; **32**: 893-899 [PMID: 22399609]
 - 111 **Patel PH**, Chadalavada RS, Ishill NM, Patil S, Reuter VE, Motzer RJ. Hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF) 1a and 2a levels in cell lines and human tumor predicts response to Sunitinib in renal cell carcinoma (RCC). *J Clin Oncol* 2008; **26** (15 suppl): 5008
 - 112 **van der Heijden MS**, Brody JR, Dezentje DA, Gallmeier E, Cunningham SC, Swartz MJ, DeMarzo AM, Offerhaus GJ, Isacoff WH, Hruban RH, Kern SE. In vivo therapeutic responses contingent on Fanconi anemia/BRCA2 status of the tumor. *Clin Cancer Res* 2005; **11**: 7508-7515 [PMID: 16243825 DOI: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-05-1048]
 - 113 **Fogelman DR**, Wolff RA, Kopetz S, Javle M, Bradley C, Mok I, Cabanillas F, Abbruzzese JL. Evidence for the efficacy of Iniparib, a PARP-1 inhibitor, in BRCA2-associated pancreatic cancer. *Anticancer Res* 2011; **31**: 1417-1420 [PMID: 21508395]
 - 114 **Villarroel MC**, Rajeshkumar NV, Garrido-Laguna I, De Jesus-Acosta A, Jones S, Maitra A, Hruban RH, Eshleman JR, Klein A, Laheru D, Donehower R, Hidalgo M. Personalizing cancer treatment in the age of global genomic analyses: PALB2 gene mutations and the response to DNA damaging

- agents in pancreatic cancer. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2011; **10**: 3-8 [PMID: 21135251 DOI: 10.1158/1535-7163.MCT-10-0893]
- 115 **Kennedy RD**, Quinn JE, Mullan PB, Johnston PG, Harkin DP. The role of BRCA1 in the cellular response to chemotherapy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2004; **96**: 1659-1668 [PMID: 15547178 DOI: 10.1093/jnci/djh312]
- 116 **Yang D**, Khan S, Sun Y, Hess K, Shmulevich I, Sood AK, Zhang W. Association of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations with survival, chemotherapy sensitivity, and gene mutator phenotype in patients with ovarian cancer. *JAMA* 2011; **306**: 1557-1565 [PMID: 21990299 DOI: 10.1001/jama.2011.1456]
- 117 **Madden J**. Infinity Reports Update from Phase 2 Study of Saridegib Plus Gemcitabine in Patients with Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer. USA: Infinity Pharmaceuticals, 2012
- 118 **Feldmann G**, Fendrich V, McGovern K, Bedja D, Bisht S, Alvarez H, Koorstra JB, Habbe N, Karikari C, Mullendore M, Gabrielson KL, Sharma R, Matsui W, Maitra A. An orally bioavailable small-molecule inhibitor of Hedgehog signaling inhibits tumor initiation and metastasis in pancreatic cancer. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2008; **7**: 2725-2735 [PMID: 18790753 DOI: 10.1158/1535-7163.MCT-08-0573]
- 119 **Kogame A**, Tagawa Y, Shibata S, Tojo H, Miyamoto M, Tohyama K, Kondo T, Prakash S, Shyu WC, Asahi S. Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic modeling of hedgehog inhibitor TAK-441 for the inhibition of Gli1 messenger RNA expression and antitumor efficacy in xenografted tumor model mice. *Drug Metab Dispos* 2013; **41**: 727-734 [PMID: 23298863 DOI: 10.1124/dmd.112.049650]
- 120 **Decker S**, Zirlik K, Djebatchie L, Hartmann D, Ihorst G, Schmitt-Graeff A, Herchenbach D, Jumaa H, Warmuth M, Veelken H, Dierks C. Trisomy 12 and elevated GLI1 and PTCH1 transcript levels are biomarkers for Hedgehog-inhibitor responsiveness in CLL. *Blood* 2012; **119**: 997-1007 [PMID: 22130798 DOI: 10.1182/blood-2011-06-359075]

P- Reviewer: Miyagawa S **S- Editor:** Zhai HH
L- Editor: A **E- Editor:** Wang CH





Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

Help Desk: <http://www.wjgnet.com/esps/helpdesk.aspx>

<http://www.wjgnet.com>



ISSN 1007-9327

