



Biomarkers of PARP inhibitor sensitivity

Nicholas C. Turner, Alan Ashworth

► **To cite this version:**

Nicholas C. Turner, Alan Ashworth. Biomarkers of PARP inhibitor sensitivity. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*, 2011, 127 (1), pp.283-286. 10.1007/s10549-011-1375-8 . hal-00613923

HAL Id: hal-00613923

<https://hal.science/hal-00613923>

Submitted on 8 Aug 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Biomarkers of PARP inhibitor sensitivity

Nicholas C. Turner^{1,2} and Alan Ashworth¹

¹Breakthrough Breast Cancer Research Centre, The Institute of Cancer Research, London, SW3 6JB, UK and ²Breast Unit, Royal Marsden Hospital, London, SW3 6JJ, UK

Tel.: +44 207 352 5333

Fax: +44 207 352 5340

E-mail: nicholas.turner@icr.ac.uk and alan.ashworth@icr.ac.uk

Text

PARP inhibitors represent one of the most exciting recent developments in cancer therapy. Substantial efficacy has been shown with PARP inhibitors in the treatment of hereditary *BRCA1/2* related Breast and Ovarian cancer as single agents [1-3] and in combination with temozolomide [4]. Similarly, encouraging activity has been shown in sporadic ovarian cancer with a PARP inhibitor as a single agent [5], and in sporadic triple negative breast cancer in combination with gemcitabine/carboplatin chemotherapy [6]. Yet the picture is not universally positive. Negative studies have been reported in heavily pre-treated sporadic triple negative cancer, with PARP inhibitor as a single agent [5] and no evidence of activity in combination with temozolomide [4]. To understand the reasons some studies have succeeded, and others failed, the development of biomarkers that will predict the sensitivity, or resistance, to PARP inhibitors is required.

There are two conceptually independent ways in which PARP inhibitors are thought to act as anti-cancer agents. First, PARP inhibitors work as single agents targeting homologous recombination (HR) deficient cancers through synthetic lethality. Second, PARP inhibitors also act as chemotherapy or radiotherapy sensitizers in the absence of single agent activity. For example, PARP inhibitors substantially increase the potency of temozolomide *in vitro*. Whether this translates to an increased therapeutic window in cancers with normal DNA repair is unclear; substantial bone marrow toxicity has been demonstrated with PARP inhibitor and chemotherapy combinations. In reality many PARP inhibitors are being developed assuming a combination of these two strategies, on the assumption that a combination of a PARP inhibitor with chemotherapy may target HR deficient cancers more effectively than PARP inhibitor alone.

Single gene biomarkers for PARP inhibitor sensitivity

In sporadic cancers there are multiple mechanisms through which HR may be lost, and PARP inhibitors, at least *in vitro*, target HR defective cancers independent of the underlying molecular defect [7]. There is *in vitro* evidence, of varying strength, to support as potentially biomarkers of PARP inhibitor sensitivity, *BRCA1/2* sporadic mutation [8], *BRCA1* promoter methylation [9, 10], *BRCA1* suppression in the absence of methylation [10], *PTEN* deficient cancers [11], *ATM* mutation [12, 13], *MRE11* dominant negative mutations in mismatch repair deficient cancers [14], and *FANCF* promoter methylation [15]. This list can likely be simplified in that each tumour type differs in the potential mechanism of HR deficiency, and therefore each tumour type may ultimately be defined by a panel of biomarkers. However, there is a pressing need to identify unifying biomarkers of HR deficiency that detect the underlying defect in HR that all these diverse mechanisms share. Such a marker of “BRCAness” [16] may predict the benefit from PARP inhibitors in multiple cancer types, regardless of the underlying molecular mechanism.

Set against this background *Concalves et al* report an assessment of *PARP1* mRNA levels in sporadic breast cancer. Reanalysing data from their own previously published whole genome gene expression arrays they show that *PARP1* mRNA expression is highly heterogenous, and related to proliferative rate of the tumour (REF Concalves et al). This association with proliferation has been suggested previously [17], and is a pattern characteristic of multiple DNA repair genes where expression is higher in S phase with active DNA repair required to facilitate DNA replication. This is particularly true in cancer cells as oncogene driven replication is abnormal and prone to the generation of DNA damage [18]. *Concalves et al* also show that *PARP1* levels are associated with genomic copy number, yet the functional significance of this is unclear.

They go on to “meta-analyse” multiple data sets, and combining such data sets is technically challenging and fraught with pitfalls. A particular difficulty is that the authors attribute tumour subtype using predictors that are not robust [19], and therefore for this reason alone this data should be treated with caution.

The ultimate question posed by *Concalves et al* is whether PARP1 levels, assessed either at the mRNA or protein level, predict benefit from PARP inhibitors. Others have previously suggested that high PARP1 levels may predict for the benefit of cytotoxic DNA damaging chemotherapy [20, 21], providing some support for PARP1 levels as a potential biomarker, although this may possibly reflect the association of PARP1 levels with proliferation. So what evidence is there that high PARP1 levels would predict benefit from a PARP inhibitor? It is first important to recall that there is no evidence that PARP1 acts as an oncogene or promotes tumourigenesis, and that biomarkers to predict benefit of DNA repair inhibitors are unlikely to follow the same paradigms as biomarkers of therapies that target oncogenic drivers such as trastuzumab. *In vitro*, sensitivity to PARP inhibitors as single agents is limited to cell lines with HR deficiency. This suggests that PARP1 levels are only likely to be a biomarker for PARP inhibitor sensitivity if HR deficient cancers have higher PARP1 levels, or to put it another way if HR deficiency results in compensatory increase in PARP1 levels and that results in an increase in PARP1 function. Yet at present there is little evidence to support this being the case. PARP1 protein levels do not differ between isogenic pairs of HR deficient and proficient cancers [22], and moreover there is *in vitro* evidence that PARP1 levels do not correlate with PARP1 activity [23]. In contrast, PARP activity is substantially increased in HR deficient cancers; *In vitro* PARP1 is hyperactive in HR deficient cell lines [22]. So rather than total PARP1 levels, a functional assay such as assessment of PAR

(poly(ADP)ribose) polymer levels [24] may potentially assay HR function and possibly be a biomarker of BRCAness.

Biomarkers of BRCAness

Where are we with other potential markers of BRCAness? Potential signatures of BRCAness have been reported based on the differences in gene expression between hereditary *BRCA1/2* related cancers and sporadic cancers [25, 26]. These gene expression signatures may enrich for a group of “hereditary-like” sporadic cancers, and these cancers are more responsive to DNA damaging chemotherapy [25, 26]. At present these studies are interesting proofs of principle, but validation of these signatures is insufficient for use in the clinic. Perhaps the most promising potential biomarker of BRCAness would be if the genomic “scar” of HR deficiency could be identified. In a way analogous to microsatellite instability in mismatch repair deficient cancers, there is likely to be a genomic mutational pattern that predicts for underlying HR deficiency. In part this may be a characteristic degree of gross genomic instability, but there is also some indication that certain complex mutations may be a marker of HR deficiency. For example, *BRCA1* mutant breast cancers frequently have characteristic mutations in *TP53* that are infrequent in sporadic cancer [27]. The presence of these complex mutations in sporadic triple negative breast cancers may predict benefit to neoadjuvant cisplatin [28], providing some support for their use as a biomarkers of HR deficiency, although further validation work is required.

PARP inhibitors in combination or as single agents?

PARP1 inhibitors have been proposed to target HR deficient cells through inhibiting single strand break repair, perhaps trapping PARP1 on the break inhibiting further repair [29]. Ultimately this may cause the collapse of replication forks leading to a DNA double

strand breaks that are only effectively repaired by HR [8]. Yet recent data has added layers of complexity to the story. PARP1 itself may be required for the repair of stalled replication forks [30], but not for replication forks that have collapsed to generate a double strand break. Whether the involvement of PARP1 in stalled fork repair is significant to our understanding of the potency of PARP inhibitors is unclear, but this data does emphasise that the repair of stalled replication forks is complex, and that PARP inhibition may force repair down a particular pathway.

A major issue in biomarker development for PARP inhibitors is to try and dissect the issue of whether PARP inhibitors should be developed as single agents or in combination with chemotherapy. At present it is generally assumed that same biomarkers, of homologous recombination deficiency, will predict for the benefit of PARP inhibitors as single agents, as well as PARP inhibitors in combination with chemotherapy. However, it is probable that different molecular defects in HR may predict sensitivity to PARP inhibitors alone, whereas other defects for benefit to PARP inhibitors in combination with chemotherapy. For example, cancers with a “hard” defect in HR, such as *BRCA1/2* mutations, may be responsive to PARP inhibitors as single agents, whereas potentially cancers with a “soft” or mild defect in HR may not show sensitivity to single agent PARP inhibition, but could show substantial benefit when the cell is stressed by the combination of PARP inhibition and more complex damage created by chemotherapy.

Biomarkers for resistance to therapy

Mechanisms of resistance to PARP inhibitor therapy are beginning to emerge. In hereditary breast cancers reversion mutation of *BRCA1/2* gene, either directly to wild type [31] or by intragenic deletion [32], restoring normal *BRCA1/2* protein function is

highly likely to be a major mechanism of resistance, with the mutation selected by prior platinum therapy [33]. Further potential resistance mechanisms identified include 53BP1 loss as a mechanism of resistance in BRCA1 deficiency [34, 35], that partly rescues the deficiency in HR seen BRCA1 deficient cells. Overexpression of RAD51 has also been suggested to partially rescue HR deficiency [36], but it is uncertain if this is clinically relevant. It is also important to recall that many of the PARP inhibitors in current clinical development are P-glycoprotein substrates.

Finally the issue of tumour heterogeneity, and the influence of prior therapy, on a biomarker is a likely to be a major confounding factor in predicting response. PARP inhibitors share potential resistance mechanisms with conventional chemotherapy, and this emphasises the importance of not relying fully on biomarkers present in the primary tissue, or germline, when treating patients in the metastatic setting. Therefore, to maximise clinical potential it will be important to assess PARP inhibitors and companion biomarkers either in previously untreated cancers, such as the neoadjuvant setting, or with metastatic disease biopsies immediately prior to treatment.

Conflict of Interest Statement

Professor Ashworth may benefit financially from the development of PARP inhibitors through patents held jointly with AstraZeneca through the Institute of Cancer Research “rewards to inventors” scheme.

References

1. Audeh, M.W., et al., *Oral poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitor olaparib in patients with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations and recurrent ovarian cancer: a proof-of-concept trial*. *Lancet*. **376**(9737): p. 245-51.

2. Tutt, A., et al., *Oral poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitor olaparib in patients with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations and advanced breast cancer: a proof-of-concept trial*. *Lancet*. **376**(9737): p. 235-44.
3. S. K. Sandhu, R.M.W., G. Wilding, M. McFadden, L. Sun, C. Toniatti, M. Stroh, C. L. Carpenter, J. S. De Bono, W. R. Schelman, *First-in-human trial of a poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitor MK-4827 in advanced cancer patients (pts) with antitumor activity in BRCA-deficient and sporadic ovarian cancers*. *J Clin Oncol*, 2010. **28**(15s): p. Abstract 3001.
4. S. J. Isakoff, B.O., N. M. Tung, R. S. Gelman, V. L. Giranda, K. M. Bernhard, K. R. Habin, L. W. Ellisen, E. P. Winer and P. E. Goss, *A phase II trial of the PARP inhibitor veliparib (ABT888) and temozolomide for metastatic breast cancer*. *J Clin Oncol*, 2010. **28**(15s): p. Abstract 1019.
5. K. A. Gelmon, H.W.H., A. Robidoux, K. S. Tonkin, M. Tischkowitz, K. Swenerton, D. Huntsman, J. Carmichael, E. Macpherson, A. M. Oza, *Can we define tumors that will respond to PARP inhibitors? A phase II correlative study of olaparib in advanced serous ovarian cancer and triple-negative breast cancer*. *J Clin Oncol*, 2010. **28**(15s): p. Abstract 3002.
6. J. O'Shaughnessy, C.O., J. Pippen, M. Yoffe, D. Patt, G. Monaghan, C. Rocha, V. Ossovskaya, B. Sherman, C. Bradley, *Efficacy of BSI-201, a poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase-1 (PARP1) inhibitor, in combination with gemcitabine/carboplatin (G/C) in patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC): Results of a randomized phase II trial*. *J Clin Oncol*, 2009. **27**(18s): p. Abstract 3.
7. McCabe, N., et al., *Deficiency in the repair of DNA damage by homologous recombination and sensitivity to poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibition*. *Cancer Res*, 2006. **66**(16): p. 8109-15.
8. Farmer, H., et al., *Targeting the DNA repair defect in BRCA mutant cells as a therapeutic strategy*. *Nature*, 2005. **434**(7035): p. 917-21.
9. Esteller, M., et al., *Promoter hypermethylation and BRCA1 inactivation in sporadic breast and ovarian tumors*. *J Natl Cancer Inst*, 2000. **92**(7): p. 564-9.
10. Yu, P.J., et al., *Basic fibroblast growth factor (FGF-2): the high molecular weight forms come of age*. *J Cell Biochem*, 2007. **100**(5): p. 1100-8.
11. Mendes-Pereira, A.M., et al., *Synthetic lethal targeting of PTEN mutant cells with PARP inhibitors*. *EMBO Mol Med*, 2009. **1**(6-7): p. 315-22.
12. Schaffner, C., et al., *Somatic ATM mutations indicate a pathogenic role of ATM in B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia*. *Blood*, 1999. **94**(2): p. 748-53.
13. Stilgenbauer, S., et al., *Biallelic mutations in the ATM gene in T-prolymphocytic leukemia*. *Nat Med*, 1997. **3**(10): p. 1155-9.
14. Wen, Q., et al., *A mutant allele of MRE11 found in mismatch repair-deficient tumor cells suppresses the cellular response to DNA replication fork stress in a dominant negative manner*. *Mol Biol Cell*, 2008. **19**(4): p. 1693-705.
15. Olopade, O.I. and M. Wei, *FANCF methylation contributes to chemoselectivity in ovarian cancer*. *Cancer Cell*, 2003. **3**(5): p. 417-20.
16. Turner, N., A. Tutt, and A. Ashworth, *Hallmarks of 'BRCAness' in sporadic cancers*. *Nat Rev Cancer*, 2004. **4**(10): p. 814-9.
17. Brustmann, H., *Poly(adenosine diphosphate-ribose) polymerase expression in serous ovarian carcinoma: correlation with p53, MIB-1, and outcome*. *Int J Gynecol Pathol*, 2007. **26**(2): p. 147-53.
18. Bartkova, J., et al., *Oncogene-induced senescence is part of the tumorigenesis barrier imposed by DNA damage checkpoints*. *Nature*, 2006. **444**(7119): p. 633-7.

19. Weigelt, B., et al., *Breast cancer molecular profiling with single sample predictors: a retrospective analysis*. *Lancet Oncol.* **11**(4): p. 339-49.
20. von Minckwitz G, M.I.B., Loibl S, Blohmer JU, duBois A, Huober J, Kandolf and B.J. R, Denkert C, *PARP is expressed in all subtypes of early breast cancer and is a predictive factor for response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy*. *European Journal of Cancer Supplements*, 2010. **8**: p. 188.
21. S. Loibl, B.M., G. Von Minckwitz, J. U. Blohmer, A. d. Bois, J. B. Huober, F. Fend, J. Budczies, C. Denkert, *PARP expression in early breast cancer and its predictive value for response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy*. *J Clin Oncol* 2010. **28**(15s): p. abstr 10511.
22. Gottipati, P., et al., *Poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase is hyperactivated in homologous recombination-defective cells*. *Cancer Res.* **70**(13): p. 5389-98.
23. Zaremba, T., et al., *Poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase-1 polymorphisms, expression and activity in selected human tumour cell lines*. *Br J Cancer*, 2009. **101**(2): p. 256-62.
24. Yang, S.X., et al., *Immunohistochemical detection of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibition by ABT-888 in patients with refractory solid tumors and lymphomas*. *Cancer Biol Ther*, 2009. **8**(21): p. 2004-9.
25. Konstantinopoulos, P.A., et al., *Gene expression profile of BRCAness that correlates with responsiveness to chemotherapy and with outcome in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer*. *J Clin Oncol.* **28**(22): p. 3555-61.
26. Rodriguez, A.A., et al., *DNA repair signature is associated with anthracycline response in triple negative breast cancer patients*. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* **123**(1): p. 189-96.
27. Holstege, H., et al., *High incidence of protein-truncating TP53 mutations in BRCA1-related breast cancer*. *Cancer Res*, 2009. **69**(8): p. 3625-33.
28. Silver, D.P., et al., *Efficacy of neoadjuvant Cisplatin in triple-negative breast cancer*. *J Clin Oncol.* **28**(7): p. 1145-53.
29. Godon, C., et al., *PARP inhibition versus PARP-1 silencing: different outcomes in terms of single-strand break repair and radiation susceptibility*. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 2008. **36**(13): p. 4454-64.
30. Bryant, H.E., et al., *PARP is activated at stalled forks to mediate Mre11-dependent replication restart and recombination*. *EMBO J*, 2009. **28**(17): p. 2601-15.
31. Swisher, E.M., et al., *Secondary BRCA1 mutations in BRCA1-mutated ovarian carcinomas with platinum resistance*. *Cancer Res*, 2008. **68**(8): p. 2581-6.
32. Edwards, S.L., et al., *Resistance to therapy caused by intragenic deletion in BRCA2*. *Nature*, 2008. **451**(7182): p. 1111-5.
33. Fong, P.C., et al., *Poly(ADP)-ribose polymerase inhibition: frequent durable responses in BRCA carrier ovarian cancer correlating with platinum-free interval*. *J Clin Oncol.* **28**(15): p. 2512-9.
34. Bouwman, P., et al., *53BP1 loss rescues BRCA1 deficiency and is associated with triple-negative and BRCA-mutated breast cancers*. *Nat Struct Mol Biol.* **17**(6): p. 688-95.
35. Bunting, S.F., et al., *53BP1 inhibits homologous recombination in Brca1-deficient cells by blocking resection of DNA breaks*. *Cell.* **141**(2): p. 243-54.
36. Schild, D. and C. Wiese, *Overexpression of RAD51 suppresses recombination defects: a possible mechanism to reverse genomic instability*. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **38**(4): p. 1061-70.