

CELL CYCLE PROGRESSION-COMBINED RISK SCORE STRATIFIES PROSTATE CANCER RISK AND SIGNIFICANTLY MODIFIES TREATMENT DECISIONS IN PROSTATE CANCER

Michael K. Brawer, E. David Crawford, Neal Shore, Peter Scardino, John W. Davis, Jonathan Tward, Lowndes Harrison, Ashok Kar, Mark Scholz, Jeffery Fegan, Kelsey Moyes, Rajesh Kaldate, Lisa Fitzgerald, and Steven Stone
Myriad Genetic Laboratories, Inc., University of Colorado Health Science Center, Carolina Urologic Research Center, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Utah Huntsman Cancer Institute, Gadsden Regional Cancer Center, St. Joseph Hospital, Prostate Oncology Specialists, Rocky Mountain Urology Associates, Myriad Genetics, Inc.

BACKGROUND

- The cell cycle progression combined risk (CCP-CR) test (Prolaris®, Myriad Genetic Laboratories, Inc.) has been validated in nine cohorts and provides information on the risk of prostate cancer-specific disease progression and disease specific mortality when combined with standard clinicopathologic parameters.¹⁻⁶
- In this analysis, we evaluated how the CCP score modified the AUA risk in results from our initial commercial testing.
- We also queried clinicians’ judgment regarding the clinical utility of the CCP-CR test in a prospective registry.

METHODS

- Our current laboratory database was evaluated for patients whose biopsy was tested with the CCP-CR test and whose clinicopathologic data was collected by the ordering physician.
 - Formalin fixed, prostate biopsy tissue from patients diagnosed with adenocarcinoma was analyzed.
- The CCP score was calculated by measuring the RNA expression of 31 cell cycle progression genes normalized to 15 housekeeping genes.
 - A relative classification of cancer aggressiveness was developed to interpret how the patient’s CCP score compared to that of patients within the same AUA risk category.
- In addition, clinicians ordering the CCP-CR test commercially were asked to complete a survey regarding their treatment recommendations before and after they received the CCP-CR test result.

REFERENCES

1. Cuzick et al. *Lancet Oncology* 2011; 12(3):245-55.
2. Cuzick et al. *British Journal of Cancer* 2012; 106:1095-99.
3. Cooperberg et al. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2013; 31:1428-34.
4. Freedland et al. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2013; 86(5):848-53.
5. Bishoff et al. *J Urol.* 2014 Feb 6. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2014.02.003
6. Cuzick et al. Accepted for presentation. AUA 2014.

RESULTS

COMMERCIAL TESTING

Table 1. Cancer aggressiveness based on CCP scores

AUA Risk Classification	Considerably Less Aggressive	Less Aggressive	Consistent	More Aggressive	Considerably More Aggressive	Totals
Low	15 (1.7%)	229 (26.6%)	406 (47.1%)	193 (22.4%)	19 (2.2%)	862
Intermediate	24 (2.4%)	263 (26.7%)	442 (44.9%)	217 (22.0%)	39 (4.0%)	985
High	14 (4.3%)	88 (26.7%)	123 (37.4%)	76 (23.1%)	28 (8.5%)	329
Totals	53 (2.4%)	580 (26.7%)	971 (44.6%)	486 (22.3%)	86 (4.0%)	2176

PROSPECTIVE REGISTRY

Table 2. Change in therapeutic burden from pre- to post- Prolaris treatment choice

Change in Intended Therapeutic Options (Pre-CCP Test to Post-CCP Test)	Total (n=305)
Reduction	122 (40.0%)
No Change	107 (35.1%)
Increase	76 (24.9%)

Table 3. Influence of the Prolaris test result in treatment selection

Selection	N (%)
None	7 (2.2%)
Low	32 (10.2%)
Moderate	103 (32.7%)
High	136 (43.2%)
Very High	37 (11.7%)
Total	315

- Test ordered by 457 physicians.
- 2176/2219 (98.1%) samples yielded quality RNA.
- Normal distribution for the CCP score (-2.9 to 3.1).
- Based on the CCP score, 29.1% of men had a less aggressive cancer compared to the clinicopathologic prediction and 26.3% of patients had a more aggressive cancer.

- Currently, 331 patients have been enrolled and 150 clinicians have completed surveys on the influence of the CCP signature test in 305 cases.
- In 65% (198/305) of cases [95% CI: 59%-70%], there was a change recorded between the therapy initially planned and the therapy actually selected.
 - In 122 of 305 (40%) cases, clinicians indicated they would reduce the intended therapeutic burden post-CCP test (Table 2).
- In 88 % (276/315) of cases, the physician felt the CCP score was moderately to very highly influential in their treatment recommendation.

CONCLUSIONS

- The CCP-CR test is a novel assay that can improve risk stratification for men with prostate adenocarcinoma independent of the Gleason score and PSA level.
- Over 50% of men initially tested in the commercial assay were assigned to a different risk category than predicted by their clinicopathologic features alone.
- Based on the judgment of ordering physicians, the CCP-CR score appears to add meaningful new information to risk assessment for localized prostate cancer patients.
- Test results led to major changes in treatment decisions with a significant increase in conservative management options, including active surveillance or watchful waiting.