Review Article A perspective on anti-EGFR therapies targeting triple-negative breast cancer

Katsuya Nakai^{1,2}, Mien-Chie Hung^{1,3,4}, Hirohito Yamaguchi¹

1Department of Molecular and Cellular Oncology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, USA; 2Department of Breast Oncology, Juntendo University School of Medicine, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan; 3Center for Molecular Medicine and Graduate Institute of Cancer Biology, China Medical University and Hospital, Taichung 404, Taiwan; 4Department of Biotechnology, Asia University, Taichung 413, Taiwan

Received July 11, 2016; Accepted July 14, 2016; Epub August 1, 2016; Published August 15, 2016

Abstract: Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), which lacks estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), accounts for about 15-20% of breast cancers and is the most aggressive breast cancer subtype. There are currently no effective therapies against metastatic TNBC. Compared with other breast cancer subtypes, EGFR is frequently overexpressed in TNBC and a potential therapeutic target for this disease. There are two types of EGFR inhibitors, small molecular tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) and monoclonal antibody (mAb), for the treatment of cancers, such as non-small cell lung cancer and colorectal cancer. For breast cancer, however, the clinical trials of EGFR inhibitors have failed due to low response rates. Because a small portion of patients do demonstrate response to EGFR inhibitors, it may be necessary to stratify patients to enhance the efficacy of EGFR inhibitors in TNBC and to develop the effective combination therapy for this patient population. In this review, we describe some of the molecular mechanisms underlying EGFR inhibitor sensitivity and further discuss the possible therapeutic strategies to increase the efficacy of EGFR inhibitors in TNBC.

Keywords: TNBC, EGFR, EGFR inhibitors, drug resistance

Introduction

Breast cancer is the most common cancer type and the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths in women in the United States. The significant increase in the 5-year survival rate of breast cancer patients from 75 to 90% can be attributed to the advances in early detection and therapeutic approaches [1]. Although early-stage breast cancer is highly curable, the 5-year survival rate of patients with metastatic breast cancer is about 20%. Breast cancer is also a heterogeneous disease with multiple subtypes. About 15-20% of breast cancer patients are diagnosed with triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), which is defined by the lack of expression of estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR) and human epidermal growth factor receptor (HER2). TNBC is generally characterized by aggressive clinical course and poor prognosis compared with other breast cancer subtypes [2]. Moreover, due to the lack

of druggable targets, such as ER and HER2, chemotherapy is still a primary option for systemic treatment. While TNBC patients respond better to chemotherapy than do non-TNBC patients, TNBC patients who do not respond eventually develop the metastatic form of the disease, which is virtually incurable [3, 4]. Moreover, because the current treatment regimens are ineffective against a significant number of TNBC patients, new effective treatment strategies are urgently needed. In TNBC, the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) is frequently overexpressed, and anti-EGFR therapies, including small molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) and monoclonal antibodies (mAbs), have been developed and are currently used for treatment of some cancers such as non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) and colorectal cancer (CRC). Unfortunately, no EGFR therapies are currently approved for treatment of breast cancer. In this review, we briefly summa-

rize the results from clinical studies of EGFR therapies and potential resistant mechanisms against anti-EGFR therapies in various cancer types and discuss the perspective on anti-EGFR therapies in TNBC.

Breast cancer subtypes

Immunohistochemistry (IHC) classification by ER, PR, and HER2 is currently used as the standard assessment of this disease in clinic. However, breast cancer is a heterogeneous disease that exhibits distinct clinical behavior, and recent advances in new technologies for gene and protein expression profiling further revealed the complex features of breast cancer. On the basis of gene expression profiling, breast cancer can be classified into five different subtypes that include basal-like, HER2-enriched, luminal A and B, and normal-like [5, 6]. These subtypes, referred to as intrinsic subtypes, well match IHC classification [7], and among them, basal-like breast cancer (BLBC) is the most aggressive subtype with a high histologic grade, and accounts for about 15% of invasive breast cancer. About 80% of TNBC overlaps with BLBC, both of which are highly aggressive and exhibit poor clinical outcomes. Furthermore, TNBC harbors substantial genetic heterogeneity, and is further divided into six subtypes, including basal-like 1 (BL1), BL2, immunomodulatory (IM), mesenchymal (M), mesenchymal stem-like (M), MSL (mesenchymal-stem-like), and luminal androgen receptor (LAR) [8]. These TNBC subtypes have been reported to differ in drug sensitivity and require different therapeutic approaches based on their characteristics.

TNBC and BLBC are also closely associated with hereditary breast and ovarian cancer syndrome caused by germline mutations in the *BRCA1*/*2* genes [9, 10]. *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* are involved in double-stranded DNA damage repair and play an essential role in DNA integrity. The incidence of breast cancer in individuals with *BRCA1*/*2* germline mutations is 20-30 times higher than those without the mutations, and 75% of breast cancer patients with *BRCA1* mutation turned out to have TNBC [11]. Recently, inhibitors against poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) have been shown to induce synthetic lethality in *BRCA-*deficient ovarian and breast cancers. One PARP inhibitor, olaparib, is approved for the treatment of *BRCA* mutated advanced ovarian cancer. Several other PARP inhibitors are being tested in clinical trials and are expected to receive approval for treatment for patients with TNBC and BLBC.

EGFR in human cancers

EGFR is a receptor tyrosine kinase (RTK) that belongs to the ErbB family, and a transmembrane protein comprising an extracellular ligand binding domain, transmembrane domain, and cytoplasmic tyrosine kinase domain [12-14]. When a ligand binds to the extracellular region of EGFR, the receptor forms a dimer, turning on its kinase activity, followed by autophosphorylation at multiple tyrosine residues in the intracellular region to recruit various substrates. The receptor activation promotes cell proliferation, motility, and survival via activation of various downstream signaling pathways, such as Ras-Raf-MEK-ERK, PI3K-AKT-mTOR, and Src-STAT3 [15]. Ligand-activated EGFR molecules are then ubiquitinated, internalized, and isolated in endosomes. There are two major pathways of internalized EGFR, lysosome-mediated degradation pathway, which transports EGFR to the lysosomes for degradation, and receptor recycling pathway, which sorts EGFR to cell surface again [14, 15]. EGFR is also known to translocate into the nucleus, where it is involved in transcriptional regulation, DNA replication, and DNA repair [16]. The *EGFR* gene is frequently mutated or overexpressed lung, colon, head and neck, brain, pancreatic, and breast cancers and promotes tumor progression and drug resistance in these cancers [17-20]. Therefore, EGFR is an attractive drug target, and the inhibitors of EGFR, including TKIs and mAbs, have been developed and some are currently used in the clinic.

Overexpression of EGFR in cancer is partly due to gene amplification [21], but the underlying mechanisms are not yet fully understood. It has been reported that EGFR degradation through endocytosis is critical for upregulation of EGFR protein in some types of cancer cells, including breast cancer cells [22, 23]. Moreover, inhibition of BRCA1 has been shown to induce upregulation of EGFR mRNA and protein in breast and ovarian cancer cells [24, 25] although the molecular mechanisms are still uncertain. Because TNBC is closely associated with *BRCA*mutant breast cancer, the BRCA1-mediated

Year	Authors	Country	Patient Number	Methods	Results
2007	Rakha et al. [29]	UK	282	IHC (Novocastra)	Positive: 37%
2008	Tan et al. [30]	China	31	IHC (Zymed)	Positive: 52%
2008	Toyama et al. [44]	Japan	110	IHC (PhamaDx) qPCR (TaqMan)	Positive: 31% No activating mutations
2009	Viale et al. [28]	Italy	284	IHC (Zymed)	Positive: 13%
2010	Gumuskaya et al. [35]	Turkey	62	IHC (Zymed, Novocastra) FISH (Abbot)	Positive: 61% (Zymed), 78% (Novocastra) Gene amplification: 2%
2011	Jacot et al. [41]	France	229	Direct sequencing	No activating mutations
2011	Shao et al. [38]	China	59	FISH (GP medical)	Gene amplification: 12%
2011	Teng et al. [42]	China	70	Direct sequencing	Exon 19 deletions and L858R mutation: 11%
2012	Choi et al. [27]	Korea	122	IHC (Novocastra)	Positive: 13%
2012	Liu et al. [33]	China	287	IHC (Dako)	Positive: 36%
2012	Meseure et al. [32]	France	18	IHC (PharmDx)	Positive: 72%
2012	Grob et al. [36]	Germany	65	FISH (Abbott)	Gene amplification: 2%
				Direct sequencing	No activating mutations
2012	Martin et al. [31]	Switzerland	38	IHC (PharmDx) FISH (Abbot) Direct sequencing	Positive: 76% Gene amplification: 24% No activating mutations
2012	Lv et al. [43]	China	13	qPCR (TaqMan)	L858R mutation: 7.7%
2012	Santarpia et al. [39]	USA	267 %	Sequenom technology	L858R mutation: 2.6%
2014	Nakajima et al. [45]	Japan	84	IHC (Ventana) DISH (Ventana) PCR (DNAFORM)	Positive: 33% No gene amplifications No activating mutations
2014	Park et al. [34]	Korea	151	IHC (PharmDx) FISH (Abbot)	High EGFR copy number: 64% Gene amplification: 2% High polysomy: 31%
				Direct sequencing	L858R mutation: 2%
2014	Tilch et al. [40]	Australia	107	OncoCarta Assay Panel	No activating mutations
2015	Cao et al. [46]	China	50	ARMS assay	No activating mutations
2015	Bemanian et al. [48]	Norway	17	Direct sequencing	T790M mutation: 12%

Table 1. EGFR protein expression, gene mutations, and copy number in TNBC

Abbreviations: TNBC, triple-negative breast cancer; IHC, Immunohistochemistry; FISH, fluorescence in situ hybridization; DISH, dual-color in situ hybridization; ※ primary breast cancer patients.

upregulation of EGFR mRNA and protein may partially explain the overexpression of EGFR in TNBC.

EGFR expression and mutation in human TNBC tissues

Compared to other subtypes of breast cancer, EGFR is more frequently overexpressed in TNBC [11], and EGFR expression has been recognized as a factor of poor prognosis for TNBC [26]. EGFR expression, gene amplification, and mutation status have been broadly studied in TNBC. IHC-based interrogation of the frequency of EGFR protein expression in TNBC indicated a range between 13-76%, largely depending on the methods of the evaluation and antibodies (Table 1) [27-34]. For example, Choi *et. al.* [27] and Rakha *et al.* [29] reported a frequency of 13% and 37% of EGFR overexpression, respectively, in TNBC using an antibody from Novocastra (2+ to 3+ membranous staining in ≥ 10% tumor cells for evaluation). Tan *et al.* reported a rate of 52% of EGFR overexpression in TNBC using an antibody from Zymed (2+ to $3+$ membranous staining in $\geq 10\%$ tumor cells) [30]. Using EGFR PharmDx Kit (Dako), which is widely used to assess EGFR expression in CRC, Martin *et al.* have indicated a frequency of 76% of EGFR overexpression in TNBC [31]. EGFR protein overexpression has been detected in 72% of TNBC by EGFR PhrmDx, but a frequency of 11% and 47%, respectively, of EGFR mRNA overexpression and normal expression was also observed in the same study [32], suggesting that EGFR protein overexpression in TNBC

is partly due to post-transcriptional regulation, such as protein stabilization or enhanced recycling. Amplification of *EGFR* gene was observed in 2-24% of TNBC patient tumor tissue samples whereas high polysomy of *EGFR* gene was reported to be between 8-27% (Table 1) [31, 35-38]. Therefore, gene amplification only partly accounts for expression of EGFR protein.

Many studies have been conducted to investigate the activating mutations in *EGFR* genes, but the results are controversial (Table 1). Santarpia *et al.* have documented that the EGFR-activating mutation (L858R) exists in 3.4% of TNBC (4 out of 116) [39]. However, several reports from Europe and Australia indicated that no activating mutations were identified in TNBC patient samples [31, 40, 41]. In contrast with the European and Australian studies, report from Asia by Teng *et al.* indicated the presence of activating mutations (4 of exon 19 deletion and 1 of L858R out of 70 TNBC samples) in a patient cohort in Singapore [42]. Furthermore, Lv *et al.* reported that two activating mutations, exon 19 deletion and L858R mutation, were detected in all tumor samples from a breast cancer patient cohort (N=143) in China [43] while several studies did not find any activating mutations in EGFR in Japanese and Chinese cohorts [44-46]. It is well known that the incidence of EGFR activating mutations in NSCLC is significantly higher in Asian population [47]. Although some studies have indicated that the incidence of EGFR mutations in TNBC may be related to ethnicity, it is clear that more studies will be required to demonstrate the significance of ethnicity in EGFR-activating mutation(s) in TNBC. A recent Norwegian breast cancer study revealed a 12% frequency (2 out of 17) of the T790M mutation in the tumors of TNBC patients [48], but because these tumors do not have primary activating mutations, there may not be any clinical significance.

Anti-EGFR therapies for treatment of various cancers

Specific anti-EGFR agents currently used in clinic include TKIs for NSCLC (gefitinib, erlotinib, afatinib, and osimertinib) and pancreatic cancer (erlotinib) as well as mAbs for CRC (cetuximab and panitumumab), head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC) (cetuximab),

and squamous cell lung cancer (necitumumab). EGFR TKIs bind to the ATP binding site of the EGFR tyrosine kinase to compete with ATP, thereby inhibiting EGFR kinase activity [49]. EGFR TKIs are currently approved for and highly effective against NSCLC with EGFR-activating mutations, e.g., exon 19 deletion and L858R mutation [50, 51]. Although some patients with NSCLC with wild type *EGFR* gene amplification and wild type *KRAS* also respond to EGFR TKIs, the TKIs have yet to receive approval for those patient [52, 53]. NSCLC patients with EGFR mutations dramatically respond to initial TKIs treatment but most patients eventually develop acquired resistance after long-term treatment. Consequently, understanding the mechanisms of EGFR TKI resistance in NSCLC is an important subject being studied extensively in preclinical and clinical studies. About half of acquired resistance to gefitinib and erlotinib is attributed to a secondary EGFR mutation in exon 20, T790M. A third-generation EGFR TKI, osimertinib, has demonstrated efficacy against EGFR with primary exon 19 deletion or L858R and secondary T790M mutations. Nonetheless, more recent studies have identified yet another mutation (C797S) contributing to the resistance of NSCLC to osimertinib [54]. A newer generation TKI was recently reported to inhibit EGFR with T790M and C797S mutations in NSCLC [55]. In addition to secondary mutations, there are many possible mechanisms of resistance that have been reported, including activation of alternative receptor kinases (c-Met, HER2, FGF and Axl overexpression), activation of downstream bypass signaling pathways (*BRAF* mutation, *PTEN* loss, NF-κB activation, etc.), and phenotypic changes (small-cell lung cancer transformation and epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition) [56-64]. Although these mechanisms partially explain TKI-resistance, the clinical significance of some of these mechanisms is not well established. Since activating mutation of EGFR in breast cancer is rare, it is uncertain whether some of the above-mentioned mechanisms in NSCLC are involved in the failure of clinical trials of TKI in TNBC.

EGFR mAbs bind to the ligand binding site on the cell surface EGFR in such a manner to compete with EGFR ligands, thereby inhibiting EGFR activation and dimerization [65]. Following antibody binding, cell surface EGFR undergoes

Table 2. Clinical studies of EGFR inhibitors in TNBC

Year	Author	Phase	Regimen	Outcome	Patient Number and Population
2012	Bernsdorf et al. [88]	\mathbf{I}	NAC: EC vs EC + Gefinitib	ORR: No significance	ER negative early BC (n=181)
2012	Schuler et al. [90]	\mathbf{I}	Afanitib alone	ORR: 0%	Metastatic TNBC (n=29)
2013	Layman et al. [87]		Bendamustine and erlotinib	ORR: 9%	Metastatic TNBC (n=11)
2012	Carey et al. [91]	\mathbf{I}	Carboplatin vs Carboplatin + Cetuximab	ORR: 6% (Carb), 16% (Carb + cetux), TTP - 2.1 month	Stage IV TNBC (n=102)
2013	Baselga et al. [92]	\mathbf{I}	Cisplatin vs Cisplatin + Cetuximab	ORR: 10% (cis), 20% (cis + cetux) P=0.032	Metastatic TNBC (n=115)
2014	Nabholtz et al. [95]	\mathbf{I}	NAC: EFC100 + DOC100 + Panitumumab	pCR rate 47%	Operable TNBC (n=60)
2015	Tredan et al. [93]	\mathbf{I}	Ixapepilone vs Ixabepilone + Cetuximab	ORR: No significance	Advanced/Metastatic TNBC (n=79)
2016	Nabholtz et al. [96]	II	NAC: Docetaxel + Cetuximab	pCR: 24%	Operable TNBC (n=33)
2016	Crozier et al. [94]	\mathbf{I}	Irinotecane + Cetuximab	ORR: 11%	Metastatic TNBC (n=19)

Abbreviations: EGFR: epidermal growth factor receptor; NAC: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; EC: epirubicin and cyclophosphamide; EFC: epirubicin, fluorouracil and cyclophosphamide; DOC: docetaxel; ORR: overall response rate; TTP: time to progression; pCR: pathological complete response; PFS: progression-free survival; ER: estrogen receptor; BC: breast cancer; TNBC: triple negative breast cancer.

Phase	Intervention	Target	NCT Number	Patient Number and Disease
ı	Metformin Erlotinib	AMPK etc. TKI (1st)	NCT01650506	8 (TNBC)
Ш	Paclitaxel Afatinib	Chemo TKI (2nd)	NCT02511847	40 (TNBC)
Ш	Icotinib	EGFR TKI	NCT02362230	67 (TNBC)
\mathbf{I}	Nab-paclitaxel Erlotinib Bevacizumab	Chemo EGFR TKI VGEF mAb	NCT00733408	63 (TNBC)
II	Ixabepilone Cetuximab	Chemo EGFR mAb	NCT01097642	40 (TNBC)
Ш	Nab-paclitaxel Carboplatin 5-Fluorouracil Epirubicin Cyclophosphamide Panitumumab	Chemo Chemo Chemo Chemo Chemo EGFR mAb	NCT01036087	40 (IBC, include TNBC)
II	Docetaxel Capecitabine Nimotuzumab	Chemo Chemo EGFR mAb	NCT01939054	90 (TNBC)

Table 3. Ongoing clinical trials of EGFR inhibitors in breast cancer

Abbreviations: EGFR, epidermal growth factor receptor; Chemo, Chemotherapy; TKI, tyrosine kinase inhibitor; mAb, monoclonal antibody; mTORi, mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitor; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor; NCT, national clinical trial; TNBC, triple negative breast cancer; IBC, inflammatory breast cancer.

internalization and subsequent degradation [66]. Interestingly, in addition to inhibition of EGFR signaling pathway, EGFR mAbs have been shown to induce antibody-mediated immune response to cancer cells, such as antibodydependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity and T-cell-mediated immune response, which are essential in the efficacy of the EGFR mAb therapy [67, 68]. Aside from EGFR-specific inhibitors, EGFR/HER2 dual kinase inhibitor lapatinib and VEGFR/EGFR/RET inhibitor vandetanib are also being used to treat patients with HER2 positive breast cancer and medullary thyroid cancer, respectively.

The mechanisms underlying EGFR mAb resistance have been widely studied in CRC. Mutant *RAS*, which is able to bypass the EGFR signaling pathway, is reported to be the primary mechanism driving resistance to EGFR mAbs. Consequently, EGFR mAbs are only used to treat CRC patients with wild type *KRAS* and *NRAS* tumors [69]. In addition to *RAS* mutations, various intrinsic resistance mechanisms have been reported, including activation of EGFR downstream signaling by activating *BRAF* and *PIC3CA* mutation, and *PTEN* deletion, as well as alternative receptor activation, such as

HER2 and c-Met [70- 73]. Furthermore, multiple mechanisms of acquired resistance, such as acquired mutations in *KRAS*, *NRAS*, and *BRAF*, and amplification of *HER2* and *c-Met* genes have been reported [73-76]. Besides upregulation of EGFR downstream signaling, the mechanisms that affect mAb binding to EGFR have been identified, including the S492R mutation and arginine methylation (R198/200) in extracellular domain of EGFR [77, 78]. As for predictive factors for therapeutic efficacy of EGFR mAb, so far, the status of *RAS* mutation is the only one used in the clinic. However, among nonresponders to

EGFR mAb, only 30-40% of patients with CRC have *KRAS* mutations, suggesting that other mechanisms also play an important role in cetuximab response, and that identification of additional predictive markers is urgently needed. Although several clinical studies shown that increased *EGFR* gene copy number correlates with the clinical outcome of EGFR mAb therapy in CRC patients, the significance of *EGFR* gene copy number in the efficacy of EGFR mAb therapy remains controversial [79-81]. In TNBC patients, mutations in *KRAS* gene are rare (0-7.7%) [36, 40, 82, 83], suggesting that other mechanisms may be involved in EGFR mAb sensitivity.

Anti-EGFR therapies in breast cancer clinical trials

Several clinical trials investigating the toxicity and efficacy of TKIs in breast cancer have been conducted, but the results thus far have been disappointing for both TKI monotherapy and in combination with chemotherapy (Table 2). Outcomes in phase II clinical trials of gefitinib and erlotinib as a monotherapy in metastatic and recurrent breast cancer demonstrated only a partial response (PR) of 0-3% [84-86]. The

phase I clinical trial of erlotinib combined with chemotherapy (Bendamustine) for stage III and IV TNBC patients was conducted with results indicating an objective response rate (ORR) of 0% but with severe lymphopenia as an adverse effect [87]. A clinical trial to test the additive effect of gefitinib in preoperative chemotherapy in ER-negative breast cancer patients reported no significant difference in pathologic complete response (pCR) between patients treated with gefitinib (17%, 7 out of 41 patients) and placebo (12%, 5 out of 41 patients). Interestingly, however, a significant difference between TNBC and non-TNBC (P=0.03) was observed for gefitinib [88]. In a phase II trial of lapatinib monotherapy for patients with recurrent and anthracycline-refractory inflammatory breast cancer (IBC), the response rate was 50% among the 30 patients with HER2-positive tumors but only 7% among the 15 patients with HER2-negative IBC [89]. In a phase II trial with second-generation irreversible EGFR TKI afatinib in patients with metastatic TNBC, no objective responses were observed [90]. Currently, five EGFR-TKI clinical trials are ongoing in the United States, including TKI monotherapy and TKI in combination with chemotherapy as well as the combination of mTOR inhibitor, AMPK activator (Metformin), or an anti-VEGF mAb with chemotherapy.

To date, 6 phase II clinical trials to investigate the efficacy and safety of anti-EGFR mAbs in patients with TNBC have been reported (Table 2). Carey *et al.* compared cetuximab and cetuximab plus carboplatin in a metastatic advanced recurrent breast cancer clinical trial [91]. The response rate (RR) was 6% with cetuximab alone, and 16% with cetuximab plus carboplatin. During the course of this study [91], a repeat biopsy at the tumor sites was carried out in 16 patients 1 week after the initiation of the treatment; EGFR activation was detected in tumor specimens from 13 patients, and the treatment-mediated inhibition of the EGFR pathway was observed in 5 of these patients. However, the PR outcome was obtained in only one treated patient. Meanwhile, because cetuximab failed to inhibit EGFR signaling in 72% (13 of 18) of the patients, the authors of the study suggested that an alternative pathway may be present. Baselga *et al.* reported that an RR of 20% in the cisplatin-cetuximab combination group and an RR of 10% in the cisplatin alone group in a clinical trial for advanced TNBC [92].

However, no statistically significant difference was found between the two treatment groups. Progression-free survival (PFS) was 1.5 months for the cisplatin alone group and 3.7 months for the cisplatin plus cetuximab group, showing an extension of 2.2 months. Similarly, Tredan *et al.* conducted a phase II trial of ixabepilone alone and ixabepilone plus cetuximab in patients with advanced/metastatic TNBC with results indicating no improvement in the RR or PFS [93]. Meanwhile, a slightly higher response rate to irinotecan and cetuximab was reported by Croziert *et al.* in patients with TNBC compared to one with other subtypes of breast cancer but the difference was not of statistical significance (TNBC 18% vs non-TNBC 0%: P=0.49) [94].

Two studies have investigated EGFR mAbs in neoadjuvant setting in operable TNBC patients [95, 96]. One study examined the standard FEC (5-fluorouracil, epidoxorubicin, and cyclophosphamide) therapy and preoperative chemotherapy with docetaxel combined with panitumumab in TNBC patients, and the other cetuximab combined with docetaxel. Both of those singlearm studies reported modest activities of the therapies administered [95, 96]. Interestingly, the studies also showed that high CD8+ tumorinfiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) in the tumor microenvironment can predict response to EGFR mAb neoadjuvant therapy. Although it has been known that the status of TILs is a general prognostic factor in cancer, including TNBC [97], it may be particularly critical for EGFR mAb therapies since T-cell-mediated immune response plays an essential role in the efficacy of the EGFR mAb therapy [67]. Overall, in TNBC, the outcomes of clinical trials of EGFR mAbs seem slightly better than the ones of EGFR TKIs. In addition to the above-mentioned trials, there are currently 3 ongoing clinical trials evaluating anti EGFR-mAbs combined with chemotherapy in TNBC (Table 3).

Conclusions and future directions

TNBC patients initially respond to conventional chemotherapy, but the disease frequently relapses and leads to worse outcome than patients with other subtypes of breast cancer. Therefore, effective therapeutic strategies for TNBC are urgently needed. A significant number of TNBC is associated with EGFR overexpression, and EGFR-targeted therapies, includ-

ing TKIs and mAbs, are already available to treat various types of cancers, making EGFR inhibitors attractive options for treatment of TNBC patients. While results from clinical trials of EGFR TKI have been disappointing for breast cancer, a small portion of patients may still respond to EGFR inhibitors. It is unfortunate that some breast cancer patients who actually respond to EGFR inhibitors cannot benefit from the therapies already used in clinic due to the low overall response rate of the entire population of breast cancer patients in the clinical trials. Thus, it would be crucial to identify the subpopulation of EGFR-overexpressing breast cancer patients that will respond to treatment with EGFR inhibitors so that they can benefit immediately from existing drugs without waiting for development of new drugs that usually takes over a decade.

One plausible reason for the lack of response to current targeted therapies is that most TNBCs are not exclusively dependent on EGFR signaling for their survival. EGFR TKIs are effective for NSCLC with activating mutations in EGFR, whose survival is largely dependent on EGFR. Although EGFR activating mutations in TNBC are rare, these tumors with EGFR activating mutations may still respond to EGFR TKIs via the aforementioned mechanisms of resistance for EGFR inhibitors other than secondary mutations, including activation of alternative receptors and pathways. Because some patients with NSCLC with wild type *EGFR* gene amplification and wild type *KRAS* demonstrate response to EGFR TKIs [52, 53], these alternative resistant pathways may need to be blocked in wild type EGFR-overexpressing TNBC to increase efficacy. Identification of the biomarkers that are associated with the mechanisms of resistance and potential combination of EGFR TKIs and other inhibitors that attenuate these mechanisms are required.

For anti-EGFR mAbs, certain levels of therapeutic effects have been reported in some studies, but the efficacy has not been satisfactory. Similar to TKIs, it is necessary to dissect the potential pathways associated with intrinsic resistance to EGFR mAbs. Recently, we have reported that extracellular domain of EGFR is methylated by protein arginine methyltransfrase 1 (PRMT1), and that EGFR methylation is involved in mAb resistance in CRC [77]. It would be of interest to determine whether EGFR methylation also plays a role in primary resistance to EGFR mAbs in TNBC. If so, EGFR methylation may help stratify patients to maximize response to EGFR mAb. Inhibitors against PRMT1 are currently under development [98], and the combination of PRMT1 inhibitors and EGFR mAbs may be the effective therapeutic strategy for TNBC with high levels of EGFR methylation.

In addition, EGFR inhibitors may be combined other types of targeted drugs. Currently, the most promising clinical target for TNBC is PARP. Inhibitors against PARP are known to induce synthetic lethal effects in cancer cells with *BRCA* mutations [99]. There are multiple PARP inhibitors that are in clinical trials, and one PARP inhibitor, olaparib, has been approved for the treatment of *BRCA*-deficient metastatic ovarian cancer. Interestingly, inhibition of EGFR was reported to sensitize TNBC and HNSCC cells to PARP inhibitors [100, 101]. Moreover, we recently demonstrated that PARP is directly phosphorylated by c-Met kinase, and that the PARP phosphorylation is involved in PARP inhibitor resistance [102]. Thus, EGFR may also be involved in PARP inhibitor resistance in TNBC, and the combination of EGFR inhibitors and PARP inhibitors may be an effective therapeutic strategy against TNBC.

Finally, immune checkpoint inhibitors such as PD-1 and CTLA-4 antibodies have drawn considerable attention in cancer treatment development due to the outstanding efficacy in some cancers, such as melanoma and lung cancer [103]. There are multiple trials of immune checkpoint inhibitors in TNBC ongoing. Given that T-cell-mediated immune response is associated with EGFR mAb efficacy [68], the combination of EGFR mAb and immune checkpoint inhibitors may be promising therapeutic approaches for TNBC with high *EGFR* copy numbers.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded in part by the following: Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas (RP150245); National Breast Cancer Foundation, Inc. (to M.-C.H.).

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Hirohito Yamaguchi, Department of Molecular and Cellular Oncology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Blvd., Unit 108, Houston, TX 77030, USA. Tel: 713-794-1698; Fax: 713-794-3270; E-mail: hyamaguc@mdanderson.org

References

- [1] Siegel RL, Miller KD and Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. CA Cancer J Clin 2016; 66: 7-30.
- [2] Foulkes WD, Smith IE and Reis-Filho JS. Triplenegative breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2010; 363: 1938-1948.
- [3] Liedtke C, Mazouni C, Hess KR, Andre F, Tordai A, Mejia JA, Symmans WF, Gonzalez-Angulo AM, Hennessy B, Green M, Cristofanilli M, Hortobagyi GN and Pusztai L. Response to neoadjuvant therapy and long-term survival in patients with triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 1275-1281.
- [4] Carey LA, Dees EC, Sawyer L, Gatti L, Moore DT, Collichio F, Ollila DW, Sartor CI, Graham ML and Perou CM. The triple negative paradox: primary tumor chemosensitivity of breast cancer subtypes. Clin Cancer Res 2007; 13: 2329- 2334.
- [5] Perou CM, Sorlie T, Eisen MB, van de Rijn M, Jeffrey SS, Rees CA, Pollack JR, Ross DT, Johnsen H, Akslen LA, Fluge O, Pergamenschikov A, Williams C, Zhu SX, Lonning PE, Borresen-Dale AL, Brown PO and Botstein D. Molecular portraits of human breast tumours. Nature 2000; 406: 747-752.
- [6] Sorlie T, Perou CM, Tibshirani R, Aas T, Geisler S, Johnsen H, Hastie T, Eisen MB, van de Rijn M, Jeffrey SS, Thorsen T, Quist H, Matese JC, Brown PO, Botstein D, Lonning PE and Borresen-Dale AL. Gene expression patterns of breast carcinomas distinguish tumor subclasses with clinical implications. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2001; 98: 10869-10874.
- [7] Dai X, Li T, Bai Z, Yang Y, Liu X, Zhan J and Shi B. Breast cancer intrinsic subtype classification, clinical use and future trends. Am J Cancer Res 2015; 5: 2929-2943.
- [8] Lehmann BD, Bauer JA, Chen X, Sanders ME, Chakravarthy AB, Shyr Y and Pietenpol JA. Identification of human triple-negative breast cancer subtypes and preclinical models for selection of targeted therapies. J Clin Invest 2011; 121: 2750-2767.
- [9] Foulkes WD, Stefansson IM, Chappuis PO, Begin LR, Goffin JR, Wong N, Trudel M and Akslen LA. Germline BRCA1 mutations and a basal epithelial phenotype in breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2003; 95: 1482-1485.
- [10] Burgess M and Puhalla S. BRCA 1/2-Mutation Related and Sporadic Breast and Ovarian Cancers: More Alike than Different. Front Oncol $2014 \cdot 4 \cdot 19$
- [11] Reis-Filho JS and Tutt AN. Triple negative tumours: a critical review. Histopathology 2008; 52: 108-118.
- [12] Hynes NE and MacDonald G. ErbB receptors and signaling pathways in cancer. Curr Opin Cell Biol 2009; 21: 177-184.
- [13] Yarden Y. The EGFR family and its ligands in human cancer. signalling mechanisms and therapeutic opportunities. Eur J Cancer 2001; 37 Suppl 4: S3-8.
- [14] Burgess AW. EGFR family: structure physiology signalling and therapeutic targets. Growth Factors 2008; 26: 263-274.
- [15] Yarden Y and Sliwkowski MX. Untangling the ErbB signalling network. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2001; 2: 127-137.
- [16] Lee HH, Wang YN and Hung MC. Non-canonical signaling mode of the epidermal growth factor receptor family. Am J Cancer Res 2015; 5: 2944-2958.
- [17] Rimawi MF, Shetty PB, Weiss HL, Schiff R, Osborne CK, Chamness GC and Elledge RM. Epidermal growth factor receptor expression in breast cancer association with biologic phenotype and clinical outcomes. Cancer 2010; 116: 1234-1242.
- [18] Shigematsu H and Gazdar AF. Somatic mutations of epidermal growth factor receptor signaling pathway in lung cancers. Int J Cancer 2006; 118: 257-262.
- [19] Gan HK, Kaye AH and Luwor RB. The EGFRvIII variant in glioblastoma multiforme. J Clin Neurosci 2009; 16: 748-754.
- [20] Bronte G, Terrasi M, Rizzo S, Sivestris N, Ficorella C, Cajozzo M, Di Gaudio F, Gulotta G, Siragusa S, Gebbia N and Russo A. EGFR genomic alterations in cancer: prognostic and predictive values. Front Biosci (Elite Ed) 2011; 3: 879-887.
- [21] Hanawa M, Suzuki S, Dobashi Y, Yamane T, Kono K, Enomoto N and Ooi A. EGFR protein overexpression and gene amplification in squamous cell carcinomas of the esophagus. Int J Cancer 2006; 118: 1173-1180.
- [22] Zhang J, Antonyak MA, Singh G and Cerione RA. A mechanism for the upregulation of EGF receptor levels in glioblastomas. Cell Rep 2013; 3: 2008-2020.
- [23] Vivanco I, Rohle D, Versele M, Iwanami A, Kuga D, Oldrini B, Tanaka K, Dang J, Kubek S, Palaskas N, Hsueh T, Evans M, Mulholland D, Wolle D, Rajasekaran S, Rajasekaran A, Liau LM, Cloughesy TF, Dikic I, Brennan C, Wu H, Mischel PS, Perera T and Mellinghoff IK. The phosphatase and tensin homolog regulates

epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) inhibitor response by targeting EGFR for degradation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2010; 107: 6459-6464.

- [24] Burga LN, Hu H, Juvekar A, Tung NM, Troyan SL, Hofstatter EW and Wulf GM. Loss of BRCA1 leads to an increase in epidermal growth factor receptor expression in mammary epithelial cells, and epidermal growth factor receptor inhibition prevents estrogen receptor-negative cancers in BRCA1-mutant mice. Breast Cancer Res 2011; 13: R30.
- [25] Li D, Bi FF, Cao JM, Cao C, Li CY and Yang Q. Effect of BRCA1 on epidermal growth factor receptor in ovarian cancer. J Exp Clin Cancer Res 2013; 32: 102.
- [26] Nielsen TO, Hsu FD, Jensen K, Cheang M, Karaca G, Hu Z, Hernandez-Boussard T, Livasy C, Cowan D, Dressler L, Akslen LA, Ragaz J, Gown AM, Gilks CB, van de Rijn M and Perou CM. Immunohistochemical and clinical characterization of the basal-like subtype of invasive breast carcinoma. Clin Cancer Res 2004; 10: 5367-5374.
- [27] Choi J, Jung WH and Koo JS. Clinicopathologic features of molecular subtypes of triple negative breast cancer based on immunohistochemical markers. Histol Histopathol 2012; 27: 1481-1493.
- [28] Viale G, Rotmensz N, Maisonneuve P, Bottiglieri L, Montagna E, Luini A, Veronesi P, Intra M, Torrisi R, Cardillo A, Campagnoli E, Goldhirsch A and Colleoni M. Invasive ductal carcinoma of the breast with the "triple-negative" phenotype: prognostic implications of EGFR immunoreactivity. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2009; 116: 317-328.
- [29] Rakha EA, El-Sayed ME, Green AR, Lee AH, Robertson JF and Ellis IO. Prognostic markers in triple-negative breast cancer. Cancer 2007; 109: 25-32.
- [30] Tan DS, Marchio C, Jones RL, Savage K, Smith IE, Dowsett M and Reis-Filho JS. Triple negative breast cancer: molecular profiling and prognostic impact in adjuvant anthracycline-treated patients. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2008; 111: 27-44.
- [31] Martin V, Botta F, Zanellato E, Molinari F, Crippa S, Mazzucchelli L and Frattini M. Molecular characterization of EGFR and EGFRdownstream pathways in triple negative breast carcinomas with basal like features. Histol Histopathol 2012; 27: 785-792.
- [32] Meseure D, Vacher S, Drak Alsibai K, Trassard M, Susini A, Le Ray C, Lerebours F, Le Scodan R, Spyratos F, Marc Guinebretiere J, Lidereau R and Bieche I. Profiling of EGFR mRNA and protein expression in 471 breast cancers compared with 10 normal tissues: a candidate bio-

marker to predict EGFR inhibitor effectiveness. Int J Cancer 2012; 131: 1009-1010.

- [33] Liu D, He J, Yuan Z, Wang S, Peng R, Shi Y, Teng X and Qin T. EGFR expression correlates with decreased disease-free survival in triple-negative breast cancer: a retrospective analysis based on a tissue microarray. Med Oncol 2012; 29: 401-405.
- [34] Park HS, Jang MH, Kim EJ, Kim HJ, Lee HJ, Kim YJ, Kim JH, Kang E, Kim SW, Kim IA and Park SY. High EGFR gene copy number predicts poor outcome in triple-negative breast cancer. Mod Pathol 2014; 27: 1212-1222.
- [35] Gumuskaya B, Alper M, Hucumenoglu S, Altundag K, Uner A and Guler G. EGFR expression and gene copy number in triple-negative breast carcinoma. Cancer Genet Cytogenet 2010; 203: 222-229.
- [36] Grob TJ, Heilenkotter U, Geist S, Paluchowski P, Wilke C, Jaenicke F, Quaas A, Wilczak W, Choschzick M, Sauter G and Lebeau A. Rare oncogenic mutations of predictive markers for targeted therapy in triple-negative breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2012; 134: 561- 567.
- [37] Pintens S, Neven P, Drijkoningen M, Van Belle V, Moerman P, Christiaens MR, Smeets A, Wildiers H and Vanden Bempt I. Triple negative breast cancer: a study from the point of view of basal CK5/6 and HER-1. J Clin Pathol 2009; 62: 624-628.
- [38] Shao MM, Zhang F, Meng G, Wang XX, Xu H, Yu XW, Chen LY and Tse GM. Epidermal growth factor receptor gene amplification and protein overexpression in basal-like carcinoma of the breast. Histopathology 2011; 59: 264-273.
- [39] Santarpia L, Qi Y, Stemke-Hale K, Wang B, Young EJ, Booser DJ, Holmes FA, O'Shaughnessy J, Hellerstedt B, Pippen J, Vidaurre T, Gomez H, Valero V, Hortobagyi GN, Symmans WF, Bottai G, Di Leo A, Gonzalez-Angulo AM and Pusztai L. Mutation profiling identifies numerous rare drug targets and distinct mutation patterns in different clinical subtypes of breast cancers. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2012; 134: 333-343.
- [40] Tilch E, Seidens T, Cocciardi S, Reid LE, Byrne D, Simpson PT, Vargas AC, Cummings MC, Fox SB, Lakhani SR and Chenevix Trench G. Mutations in EGFR, BRAF and RAS are rare in triple-negative and basal-like breast cancers from Caucasian women. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2014; 143: 385-392.
- [41] Jacot W, Lopez-Crapez E, Thezenas S, Senal R, Fina F, Bibeau F, Romieu G and Lamy PJ. Lack of EGFR-activating mutations in European patients with triple-negative breast cancer could emphasise geographic and ethnic variations in

breast cancer mutation profiles. Breast Cancer Res 2011; 13: R133.

- [42] Teng YH, Tan WJ, Thike AA, Cheok PY, Tse GM, Wong NS, Yip GW, Bay BH and Tan PH. Mutations in the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) gene in triple negative breast cancer: possible implications for targeted therapy. Breast Cancer Res 2011; 13: R35.
- [43] Lv N, Lin S, Xie Z, Tang J, Ge Q, Wu M, Xie X and Wei W. Absence of evidence for epidermal growth factor receptor and human homolog of the Kirsten rat sarcoma-2 virus oncogene mutations in breast cancer. Cancer Epidemiol 2012; 36: 341-346.
- [44] Toyama T, Yamashita H, Kondo N, Okuda K, Takahashi S, Sasaki H, Sugiura H, Iwase H and Fujii Y. Frequently increased epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) copy numbers and decreased BRCA1 mRNA expression in Japanese triple-negative breast cancers. BMC Cancer 2008; 8: 309.
- [45] Nakajima H, Ishikawa Y, Furuya M, Sano T, Ohno Y, Horiguchi J and Oyama T. Protein expression, gene amplification, and mutational analysis of EGFR in triple-negative breast cancer. Breast Cancer 2014; 21: 66-74.
- [46] Cao WM, Gao Y and Wang XJ. Lack of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR)-activating mutations in triple-negative breast cancer in China. Breast Cancer Res 2015; 17: 115.
- [47] Janne PA, Engelman JA and Johnson BE. Epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in non-small-cell lung cancer: implications for treatment and tumor biology. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23: 3227-3234.
- [48] Bemanian V, Sauer T, Touma J, Lindstedt BA, Chen Y, Odegard HP, Vetvik KM, Bukholm IR and Geisler J. The epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR/HER-1) gatekeeper mutation T790M is present in European patients with early breast cancer. PLoS One 2015; 10: e0134398.
- [49] Carey KD, Garton AJ, Romero MS, Kahler J, Thomson S, Ross S, Park F, Haley JD, Gibson N and Sliwkowski MX. Kinetic analysis of epidermal growth factor receptor somatic mutant proteins shows increased sensitivity to the epidermal growth factor receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor, erlotinib. Cancer Res 2006; 66: 8163-8171.
- [50] Lynch TJ, Bell DW, Sordella R, Gurubhagavatula S, Okimoto RA, Brannigan BW, Harris PL, Haserlat SM, Supko JG, Haluska FG, Louis DN, Christiani DC, Settleman J and Haber DA. Activating mutations in the epidermal growth factor receptor underlying responsiveness of non-small-cell lung cancer to gefitinib. N Engl J Med 2004; 350: 2129-2139.
- [51] Paez JG, Janne PA, Lee JC, Tracy S, Greulich H, Gabriel S, Herman P, Kaye FJ, Lindeman N, Boggon TJ, Naoki K, Sasaki H, Fujii Y, Eck MJ, Sellers WR, Johnson BE and Meyerson M. EGFR mutations in lung cancer: correlation with clinical response to gefitinib therapy. Science 2004; 304: 1497-1500.
- [52] Cappuzzo F, Finocchiaro G, Grossi F, Bidoli P, Favaretto A, Marchetti A, Valente ML, Cseh A, Clementi L, Massey D and Santoro A. Phase II study of afatinib, an irreversible ErbB family blocker, in EGFR FISH-positive non-small-cell lung cancer. J Thorac Oncol 2015; 10: 665- 672.
- [53] Zhu CQ, da Cunha Santos G, Ding K, Sakurada A, Cutz JC, Liu N, Zhang T, Marrano P, Whitehead M, Squire JA, Kamel-Reid S, Seymour L, Shepherd FA and Tsao MS. Role of KRAS and EGFR as biomarkers of response to erlotinib in National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group Study BR.21. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 4268-4275.
- [54] Thress KS, Paweletz CP, Felip E, Cho BC, Stetson D, Dougherty B, Lai Z, Markovets A, Vivancos A, Kuang Y, Ercan D, Matthews SE, Cantarini M, Barrett JC, Janne PA and Oxnard GR. Acquired EGFR C797S mutation mediates resistance to AZD9291 in non-small cell lung cancer harboring EGFR T790M. Nat Med 2015; 21: 560-562.
- [55] Jia Y, Yun CH, Park E, Ercan D, Manuia M, Juarez J, Xu C, Rhee K, Chen T, Zhang H, Palakurthi S, Jang J, Lelais G, DiDonato M, Bursulaya B, Michellys PY, Epple R, Marsilje TH, McNeill M, Lu W, Harris J, Bender S, Wong KK, Janne PA and Eck MJ. Overcoming EGFR(T790M) and EGFR(C797S) resistance with mutant-selective allosteric inhibitors. Nature 2016; 534: 129-132.
- [56] Engelman JA, Zejnullahu K, Mitsudomi T, Song Y, Hyland C, Park JO, Lindeman N, Gale CM, Zhao X, Christensen J, Kosaka T, Holmes AJ, Rogers AM, Cappuzzo F, Mok T, Lee C, Johnson BE, Cantley LC and Janne PA. MET amplification leads to gefitinib resistance in lung cancer by activating ERBB3 signaling. Science 2007; 316: 1039-1043.
- [57] Takezawa K, Pirazzoli V, Arcila ME, Nebhan CA, Song X, de Stanchina E, Ohashi K, Janjigian YY, Spitzler PJ, Melnick MA, Riely GJ, Kris MG, Miller VA, Ladanyi M, Politi K and Pao W. HER2 Amplification: A Potential Mechanism of Acquired Resistance to EGFR Inhibition in EGFR-Mutant Lung Cancers That Lack the Second-Site EGFRT790M Mutation. Cancer Discov 2012; 2: 922-933.
- [58] Terai H, Soejima K, Yasuda H, Nakayama S, Hamamoto J, Arai D, Ishioka K, Ohgino K, Ikemura S, Sato T, Yoda S, Satomi R, Naoki K

and Betsuyaku T. Activation of the FGF2-FGFR1 autocrine pathway: a novel mechanism of acquired resistance to gefitinib in NSCLC. Mol Cancer Res 2013; 11: 759-767.

- [59] Ohashi K, Sequist LV, Arcila ME, Moran T, Chmielecki J, Lin YL, Pan Y, Wang L, de Stanchina E, Shien K, Aoe K, Toyooka S, Kiura K, Fernandez-Cuesta L, Fidias P, Yang JC, Miller VA, Riely GJ, Kris MG, Engelman JA, Vnencak-Jones CL, Dias-Santagata D, Ladanyi M and Pao W. Lung cancers with acquired resistance to EGFR inhibitors occasionally harbor BRAF gene mutations but lack mutations in KRAS, NRAS, or MEK1. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2012; 109: E2127-2133.
- [60] Bivona TG, Hieronymus H, Parker J, Chang K, Taron M, Rosell R, Moonsamy P, Dahlman K, Miller VA, Costa C, Hannon G and Sawyers CL. FAS and NF-kappaB signalling modulate dependence of lung cancers on mutant EGFR. Nature 2011; 471: 523-526.
- [61] Zhang Z, Lee JC, Lin L, Olivas V, Au V, LaFramboise T, Abdel-Rahman M, Wang X, Levine AD, Rho JK, Choi YJ, Choi CM, Kim SW, Jang SJ, Park YS, Kim WS, Lee DH, Lee JS, Miller VA, Arcila M, Ladanyi M, Moonsamy P, Sawyers C, Boggon TJ, Ma PC, Costa C, Taron M, Rosell R, Halmos B and Bivona TG. Activation of the AXL kinase causes resistance to EGFR-targeted therapy in lung cancer. Nat Genet 2012; 44: 852-860.
- [62] Sos ML, Koker M, Weir BA, Heynck S, Rabinovsky R, Zander T, Seeger JM, Weiss J, Fischer F, Frommolt P, Michel K, Peifer M, Mermel C, Girard L, Peyton M, Gazdar AF, Minna JD, Garraway LA, Kashkar H, Pao W, Meyerson M and Thomas RK. PTEN loss contributes to erlotinib resistance in EGFR-mutant lung cancer by activation of Akt and EGFR. Cancer Res 2009; 69: 3256-3261.
- [63] Byers LA, Diao L, Wang J, Saintigny P, Girard L, Peyton M, Shen L, Fan YH, Giri U, Tumula P, Nilsson MB, Gudikote J, Tran HT, Cardnell RJ, Bearss DJ, Warner SL, Foulks JM, Kanner SB, Gandhi V, Krett NL, Rosen ST, Kim ES, Herbst RS, Blumenschein GR, Lee JJ, Lippman SM, Ang KK, Mills GB, Hong WK, Weinstein JN, Wistuba, II, Coombes K, Minna JD and Heymach JV. An epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) gene signature predicts resistance to EGFR and PI3K inhibitors and identifies Axl as a therapeutic target for overcoming EGFR inhibitor resistance. Clin Cancer Res 2013; 19: 279-90.
- [64] Zakowski MF, Ladanyi M and Kris MG. EGFR mutations in small-cell lung cancers in patients who have never smoked. N Engl J Med 2006; 355: 213-215.
- [65] Kim ES, Khuri FR and Herbst RS. Epidermal growth factor receptor biology (IMC-C225). Curr Opin Oncol 2001; 13: 506-513.
- [66] Doody JF, Wang Y, Patel SN, Joynes C, Lee SP, Gerlak J, Rolser RL, Li Y, Steiner P, Bassi R, Hicklin DJ and Hadari YR. Inhibitory activity of cetuximab on epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in non small cell lung cancers. Mol Cancer Ther 2007; 6: 2642-2651.
- [67] Trivedi S, Jie HB and Ferris RL. Tumor antigenspecific monoclonal antibodies and induction of T-cell immunity. Semin Oncol 2014; 41: 678- 684.
- [68] Yang X, Zhang X, Mortenson ED, Radkevich-Brown O, Wang Y and Fu YX. Cetuximabmediated tumor regression depends on innate and adaptive immune responses. Mol Ther 2013; 21: 91-100.
- [69] Allegra CJ, Rumble RB, Hamilton SR, Mangu PB, Roach N, Hantel A and Schilsky RL. Extended RAS Gene Mutation Testing in Metastatic Colorectal Carcinoma to Predict Response to Anti-Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor Monoclonal Antibody Therapy: American Society of Clinical Oncology Provisional Clinical Opinion Update 2015. J Clin Oncol 2016; 34: 179-185.
- [70] Yonesaka K, Zejnullahu K, Okamoto I, Satoh T, Cappuzzo F, Souglakos J, Ercan D, Rogers A, Roncalli M, Takeda M, Fujisaka Y, Philips J, Shimizu T, Maenishi O, Cho Y, Sun J, Destro A, Taira K, Takeda K, Okabe T, Swanson J, Itoh H, Takada M, Lifshits E, Okuno K, Engelman JA, Shivdasani RA, Nishio K, Fukuoka M, Varella-Garcia M, Nakagawa K and Janne PA. Activation of ERBB2 signaling causes resistance to the EGFR-directed therapeutic antibody cetuximab. Sci Transl Med 2011; 3: 99ra86.
- [71] Frattini M, Saletti P, Romagnani E, Martin V, Molinari F, Ghisletta M, Camponovo A, Etienne LL, Cavalli F and Mazzucchelli L. PTEN loss of expression predicts cetuximab efficacy in metastatic colorectal cancer patients. Br J Cancer 2007; 97: 1139-1145.
- [72] De Roock W, Claes B, Bernasconi D, De Schutter J, Biesmans B, Fountzilas G, Kalogeras KT, Kotoula V, Papamichael D, Laurent-Puig P, Penault-Llorca F, Rougier P, Vincenzi B, Santini D, Tonini G, Cappuzzo F, Frattini M, Molinari F, Saletti P, De Dosso S, Martini M, Bardelli A, Siena S, Sartore-Bianchi A, Tabernero J, Macarulla T, Di Fiore F, Gangloff AO, Ciardiello F, Pfeiffer P, Qvortrup C, Hansen TP, Van Cutsem E, Piessevaux H, Lambrechts D, Delorenzi M and Tejpar S. Effects of KRAS, BRAF, NRAS, and PIK3CA mutations on the efficacy of cetuximab plus chemotherapy in chemotherapy-refractory metastatic colorectal

cancer: a retrospective consortium analysis. Lancet Oncol 2010; 11: 753-762.

- [73] Bardelli A, Corso S, Bertotti A, Hobor S, Valtorta E, Siravegna G, Sartore-Bianchi A, Scala E, Cassingena A, Zecchin D, Apicella M, Migliardi G, Galimi F, Lauricella C, Zanon C, Perera T, Veronese S, Corti G, Amatu A, Gambacorta M, Diaz LA Jr, Sausen M, Velculescu VE, Comoglio P, Trusolino L, Di Nicolantonio F, Giordano S and Siena S. Amplification of the MET receptor drives resistance to anti-EGFR therapies in colorectal cancer. Cancer Discov 2013; 3: 658-673.
- [74] Diaz LA Jr, Williams RT, Wu J, Kinde I, Hecht JR, Berlin J, Allen B, Bozic I, Reiter JG, Nowak MA, Kinzler KW, Oliner KS and Vogelstein B. The molecular evolution of acquired resistance to targeted EGFR blockade in colorectal cancers. Nature 2012; 486: 537-540.
- [75] Bertotti A, Migliardi G, Galimi F, Sassi F, Torti D, Isella C, Cora D, Di Nicolantonio F, Buscarino M, Petti C, Ribero D, Russolillo N, Muratore A, Massucco P, Pisacane A, Molinaro L, Valtorta E, Sartore-Bianchi A, Risio M, Capussotti L, Gambacorta M, Siena S, Medico E, Sapino A, Marsoni S, Comoglio PM, Bardelli A and Trusolino L. A molecularly annotated platform of patient-derived xenografts ("xenopatients") identifies HER2 as an effective therapeutic target in cetuximab-resistant colorectal cancer. Cancer Discov 2011; 1: 508-523.
- [76] Misale S, Arena S, Lamba S, Siravegna G, Lallo A, Hobor S, Russo M, Buscarino M, Lazzari L, Sartore-Bianchi A, Bencardino K, Amatu A, Lauricella C, Valtorta E, Siena S, Di Nicolantonio F and Bardelli A. Blockade of EGFR and MEK intercepts heterogeneous mechanisms of acquired resistance to anti-EGFR therapies in colorectal cancer. Sci Transl Med 2014; 6: 224ra226.
- [77] Liao HW, Hsu JM, Xia W, Wang HL, Wang YN, Chang WC, Arold ST, Chou CK, Tsou PH, Yamaguchi H, Fang YF, Lee HJ, Lee HH, Tai SK, Yang MH, Morelli MP, Sen M, Ladbury JE, Chen CH, Grandis JR, Kopetz S and Hung MC. PRMT1-mediated methylation of the EGF receptor regulates signaling and cetuximab response. J Clin Invest 2015; 125: 4529-4543.
- [78] Montagut C, Dalmases A, Bellosillo B, Crespo M, Pairet S, Iglesias M, Salido M, Gallen M, Marsters S, Tsai SP, Minoche A, Seshagiri S, Serrano S, Himmelbauer H, Bellmunt J, Rovira A, Settleman J, Bosch F and Albanell J. Identification of a mutation in the extracellular domain of the Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor conferring cetuximab resistance in colorectal cancer. Nat Med 2012; 18: 221- 223.
- [79] Sartore-Bianchi A, Moroni M, Veronese S, Carnaghi C, Bajetta E, Luppi G, Sobrero A, Barone C, Cascinu S, Colucci G, Cortesi E, Nichelatti M, Gambacorta M and Siena S. Epidermal growth factor receptor gene copy number and clinical outcome of metastatic colorectal cancer treated with panitumumab. J Clin Oncol 2007; 25: 3238-3245.
- [80] Moroni M, Veronese S, Benvenuti S, Marrapese G, Sartore-Bianchi A, Di Nicolantonio F, Gambacorta M, Siena S and Bardelli A. Gene copy number for epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) and clinical response to antiEG-FR treatment in colorectal cancer: a cohort study. Lancet Oncol 2005; 6: 279-286.
- [81] Personeni N, Fieuws S, Piessevaux H, De Hertogh G, De Schutter J, Biesmans B, De Roock W, Capoen A, Debiec-Rychter M, Van Laethem JL, Peeters M, Humblet Y, Van Cutsem E and Tejpar S. Clinical usefulness of EGFR gene copy number as a predictive marker in colorectal cancer patients treated with cetuximab: a fluorescent in situ hybridization study. Clin Cancer Res 2008; 14: 5869-5876.
- [82] Shah SP, Roth A, Goya R, Oloumi A, Ha G, Zhao Y, Turashvili G, Ding J, Tse K, Haffari G, Bashashati A, Prentice LM, Khattra J, Burleigh A, Yap D, Bernard V, McPherson A, Shumansky K, Crisan A, Giuliany R, Heravi-Moussavi A, Rosner J, Lai D, Birol I, Varhol R, Tam A, Dhalla N, Zeng T, Ma K, Chan SK, Griffith M, Moradian A, Cheng SW, Morin GB, Watson P, Gelmon K, Chia S, Chin SF, Curtis C, Rueda OM, Pharoah PD, Damaraju S, Mackey J, Hoon K, Harkins T, Tadigotla V, Sigaroudinia M, Gascard P, Tlsty T, Costello JF, Meyer IM, Eaves CJ, Wasserman WW, Jones S, Huntsman D, Hirst M, Caldas C, Marra MA and Aparicio S. The clonal and mutational evolution spectrum of primary triple-negative breast cancers. Nature 2012; 486: 395- 399.
- [83] Pereira CB, Leal MF, de Souza CR, Montenegro RC, Rey JA, Carvalho AA, Assumpcao PP, Khayat AS, Pinto GR, Demachki S, de Arruda Cardoso Smith M and Burbano RR. Prognostic and predictive significance of MYC and KRAS alterations in breast cancer from women treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy. PLoS One 2013; 8: e60576.
- [84] von Minckwitz G, Jonat W, Fasching P, du Bois A, Kleeberg U, Luck HJ, Kettner E, Hilfrich J, Eiermann W, Torode J and Schneeweiss A. A multicentre phase II study on gefitinib in taxane- and anthracycline-pretreated metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2005; 89: 165-172.
- [85] Baselga J, Albanell J, Ruiz A, Lluch A, Gascon P, Guillem V, Gonzalez S, Sauleda S, Marimon I, Tabernero JM, Koehler MT and Rojo F. Phase II

and tumor pharmacodynamic study of gefitinib in patients with advanced breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23: 5323-5333.

- [86] Dickler MN, Cobleigh MA, Miller KD, Klein PM and Winer EP. Efficacy and safety of erlotinib in patients with locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2009; 115: 115-121.
- [87] Layman RM, Ruppert AS, Lynn M, Mrozek E, Ramaswamy B, Lustberg MB, Wesolowski R, Ottman S, Carothers S, Bingman A, Reinbolt R, Kraut EH and Shapiro CL. Severe and prolonged lymphopenia observed in patients treated with bendamustine and erlotinib for metastatic triple negative breast cancer. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 2013; 71: 1183-1190.
- [88] Bernsdorf M, Ingvar C, Jorgensen L, Tuxen MK, Jakobsen EH, Saetersdal A, Kimper-Karl ML, Kroman N, Balslev E and Ejlertsen B. Effect of adding gefitinib to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in estrogen receptor negative early breast cancer in a randomized phase II trial. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2011; 126: 463-470.
- [89] Johnston S, Trudeau M, Kaufman B, Boussen H, Blackwell K, LoRusso P, Lombardi DP, Ben Ahmed S, Citrin DL, DeSilvio ML, Harris J, Westlund RE, Salazar V, Zaks TZ and Spector NL. Phase II study of predictive biomarker profiles for response targeting human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2) in advanced inflammatory breast cancer with lapatinib monotherapy. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 1066- 1072.
- [90] Schuler M, Awada A, Harter P, Canon JL, Possinger K, Schmidt M, De Greve J, Neven P, Dirix L, Jonat W, Beckmann MW, Schutte J, Fasching PA, Gottschalk N, Besse-Hammer T, Fleischer F, Wind S, Uttenreuther-Fischer M, Piccart M and Harbeck N. A phase II trial to assess efficacy and safety of afatinib in extensively pretreated patients with HER2-negative metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2012; 134: 1149-1159.
- [91] Carey LA, Rugo HS, Marcom PK, Mayer EL, Esteva FJ, Ma CX, Liu MC, Storniolo AM, Rimawi MF, Forero-Torres A, Wolff AC, Hobday TJ, Ivanova A, Chiu WK, Ferraro M, Burrows E, Bernard PS, Hoadley KA, Perou CM and Winer EP. TBCRC 001: randomized phase II study of cetuximab in combination with carboplatin in stage IV triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2012; 30: 2615-2623.
- [92] Baselga J, Gomez P, Greil R, Braga S, Climent MA, Wardley AM, Kaufman B, Stemmer SM, Pego A, Chan A, Goeminne JC, Graas MP, Kennedy MJ, Ciruelos Gil EM, Schneeweiss A, Zubel A, Groos J, Melezinkova H and Awada A. Randomized phase II study of the anti-epider-

mal growth factor receptor monoclonal antibody cetuximab with cisplatin versus cisplatin alone in patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2013; 31: 2586-2592.

- [93] Tredan O, Campone M, Jassem J, Vyzula R, Coudert B, Pacilio C, Prausova J, Hardy-Bessard AC, Arance A, Mukhopadhyay P, Aloe A and Roche H. Ixabepilone alone or with cetuximab as first-line treatment for advanced/ metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. Clin Breast Cancer 2015; 15: 8-15.
- [94] Crozier JA, Advani PP, LaPlant B, Hobday T, Jaslowski AJ, Moreno-Aspitia A and Perez EA. N0436 (Alliance): A Phase II Trial of Irinotecan With Cetuximab in Patients With Metastatic Breast Cancer Previously Exposed to Anthracycline and/or Taxane-Containing Therapy. Clin Breast Cancer 2016; 16: 23-30.
- [95] Nabholtz JM, Abrial C, Mouret-Reynier MA, Dauplat MM, Weber B, Gligorov J, Forest AM, Tredan O, Vanlemmens L, Petit T, Guiu S, Van Praagh I, Jouannaud C, Dubray-Longeras P, Tubiana-Mathieu N, Benmammar KE, Kullab S, Bahadoor MR, Radosevic-Robin N, Kwiatkowski F, Desrichard A, Cayre A, Uhrhammer N, Chalabi N, Chollet P and Penault-Llorca F. Multicentric neoadjuvant phase II study of panitumumab combined with an anthracycline/ taxane-based chemotherapy in operable triplenegative breast cancer: identification of biologically defined signatures predicting treatment impact. Ann Oncol 2014; 25: 1570-1577.
- [96] Nabholtz JM, Chalabi N, Radosevic-Robin N, Dauplat MM, Mouret-Reynier MA, Van Praagh I, Servent V, Jacquin JP, Benmammar KE, Kullab S, Bahadoor MR, Kwiatkowski F, Cayre A, Abrial C, Durando X, Bignon YJ, Chollet P and Penault-Llorca F. Multicentric neoadjuvant pilot Phase II study of cetuximab combined with docetaxel in operable triple negative breast cancer. Int J Cancer 2016; 138: 2274-2280.
- [97] Pruneri G, Vingiani A, Bagnardi V, Rotmensz N, De Rose A, Palazzo A, Colleoni AM, Goldhirsch A and Viale G. Clinical validity of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes analysis in patients with triplenegative breast cancer. Ann Oncol 2016; 27: 249-256.
- [98] Mai A, Cheng D, Bedford MT, Valente S, Nebbioso A, Perrone A, Brosch G, Sbardella G, De Bellis F, Miceli M and Altucci L. epigenetic multiple ligands: mixed histone/protein methyltransferase, acetyltransferase, and class III deacetylase (sirtuin) inhibitors. J Med Chem 2008; 51: 2279-2290.
- [99] Sonnenblick A, de Azambuja E, Azim HA Jr and Piccart M. An update on PARP inhibitors--moving to the adjuvant setting. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2015; 12: 27-41.
- [100] Nowsheen S, Bonner JA, Lobuglio AF, Trummell H, Whitley AC, Dobelbower MC and Yang ES. Cetuximab augments cytotoxicity with poly (adp-ribose) polymerase inhibition in head and neck cancer. PLoS One 2011; 6: e24148.
- [101] Nowsheen S, Cooper T, Stanley JA and Yang ES. Synthetic lethal interactions between EGFR and PARP inhibition in human triple negative breast cancer cells. PLoS One 2012; 7: e46614.
- [102] Du Y, Yamaguchi H, Wei Y, Hsu JL, Wang HL, Hsu YH, Lin WC, Yu WH, Leonard PG, Lee GRt, Chen MK, Nakai K, Hsu MC, Chen CT, Sun Y, Wu Y, Chang WC, Huang WC, Liu CL, Chang YC, Chen CH, Park M, Jones P, Hortobagyi GN and Hung MC. Blocking c-Met-mediated PARP1 phosphorylation enhances anti-tumor effects of PARP inhibitors. Nat Med 2016; 22: 194- 201.

[103] Postow MA, Callahan MK and Wolchok JD. Immune Checkpoint Blockade in Cancer Therapy. J Clin Oncol 2015; 33: 1974-1982.