



Q

• Tuesday 1 July 2025, 04:00-21:00 GMT: Taylor & Francis Online is currently being updated. You'll still be activation of tokens, eprints and other features of Your Account will be unavailable during this scheduled work.

Home ► All Journals ► Medicine ► Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy ► List of Issues ▶ Volume 15, Issue 5 ▶ Onartuzumab in lung cancer: the fall of ....

Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy > Volume 15, 2015 - Issue 5

Free access

3,530 31 Views CrossRef citations to date Altmetric

Listen

🔓 Full A

🔒 Repri

Abstra

The dev

cancer

cons

reliab

more fle

the new

compare

versus e

points as

. .

## Editorial Onartuzumab in lung cancer: the fall of **Icarus**?

Christian Rolfo S, Nele Van Der Steen, Patrick Pauwels & Federico Cappuzzo Pages 487-489 | Published online: 30 Mar 2015

**66** Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1586/14737140.2015.1031219



We and our 909 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting "I Accept" enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under "we and our partners" process data to provide," whereas selecting "Reject All" or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. Here

We and our partners process data to provide: . .. . .

cell lung th the wever, to become approval for al that erlotinib cuss several

( Check for updates

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose



During the last decade, there has been a revolution in non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with the development of targeted therapies. The best known example being the inhibition of EGFR-activating mutations by tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs), for example, erlotinib or gefitinib. Unfortunately, after a few months, these patients show signs of resistance. One of the resistance mechanisms against EGFR-TKIs is c-MET amplification, which occurs in approximately 10–20% of patients with acquired resistance [1,2].

Despite its fame as a resistance mechanism, the receptor also plays a role in TKI-naïve patients. In this population, c-MET overexpression can be found in 14–69% of patients [<u>3</u>] and de novo c-MET amplification in about 5% [<u>4,5</u>].

A number of targeted therapies against c-MET have been developed and several are in clinical trials. One of these inhibitors is the c-MET monovalent antibody onartuzumab of Genentech, which has received a lot of attention lately due to the failed Phase III trial in late-stage NSCLC in combination with erlotinib. Although the overall results of the



which showed that there was no cross-reactivity for RON and that the scoring of the IHC was in accordance with the mRNA levels of c-MET. In terms of fixation, the pathologist can be guided by the internal controls of the tissue (endothelium = 1 +staining intensity, bronchial epithelium = 2 + intensity), but the use of semi-quantitative controls is recommended [8]. About 50% of the screened patients could be enrolled in the trial. However, the scoring criteria can greatly influence the number of selected patients. As reported, the choice of biomarker was made based on a comparison between FISH and IHC in the Phase II study (on a small number of 66 patients). It should be noted that, as for IHC, the cutoff value for FISH can make a big difference. In the Phase II study, a MET/CEP7 ratio of 2 or a total copy number of 5 was used as a cutoff, whereas other studies (e.g., crizotinib in c-MET-amplified NSCLC) showed the best response in patients with a ratio of 5 or more. Should we focus more on HGF, the ligand of c-MET? As HGF is produced by the tumor microenvironment or can even be produced by the tumor cells themselves, it can also evoke the activation of c-MET and even resistance against gefitinib [10,11]. The great number of selected patients might have obscured beneficial results in the actual group of patients that could benefit from treatment with onartuzumab.

The second comment that can be made is the fact that the c-MET status is determined on archival tissue of patients treated with one or two lines of chemotherapy. As

resection	x	pression
may cha	× ra	aising the
question	ir	nate for
the leve	p	roblem
that aris		vary
between	ir	nce fixation
can have	ir	nfluence
the re- Third,	e	markable
that only	h	e results
presente	.,	, a lot of
variation	Ę	preclinical
evidence	i	n patients
with wild	tł	nat the c-
MET and	v	ved that c-
MET can activate the EGFR pathway through the upregulation o	f ligand trans	cription

(TGF-β and EGF) [<u>14,15</u>]. However, Breindel et al. showed that EGFR directly activates c-MET, but that c-MET needs the HER3 receptor to activate EGFR [<u>16</u>]. There is no doubt that there exists a connection between both pathways, the only question is if EGFR is as strongly activated by c-MET as c-MET is activated by EGFR. In fact, the dual inhibition of c-MET and EGFR might have no real impact. Nevertheless, the results seen in the Phase II trial might be biased since the c-MET-positive arm contained a higher population of EGFR-mutant NSCLC patients in the erlotinib + onartuzumab arm (20%) in comparison with 7% EGFR-mutant patients in the erlotinib + placebo arm. This would mean that the real potential target population should present with both an EGFR mutation and c-MET positivity. At the American Society of Clinical Oncology 2014, data from the Phase III trial were presented but submolecular analysis was still ongoing.

Although this clinical trial may have failed, it gives rise to a lot of new questions and encourages the discussion of which c-MET biomarker to use for optimal patient selection. Should we really quit choosing c-MET IHC as a biomarker? Or do we need to change the IHC cutoffs? Is it ethical to include a large number of patients in a Phase III study (490 patients) when we have evidence of lack of efficacy in the Phase II study? Must we be more cautious with the design of clinical studies? In oncology, history continues to demonstrate that matching the right patient (with the appropriate biomarker) with the appropriate drug is the winning team [13]. Maybe we should, like

Icarus, fl	×	
Financ		
The auth		organization
or entity		ter or
material		ncies,
hond		received or
pending		
No writir		

Related Research Data

Biomarker Analyses from a Placebo-Controlled Phase II Study Evaluating Erlotinib ± Onartuzumab in Advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: MET Expression Levels Are Predictive of Patient Benefit Source: Clinical Cancer Research MET gene amplification or EGFR mutation activate MET in lung cancers untreated with EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors Source: International Journal of Cancer MET Amplification Leads to Gefitinib Resistance in Lung Cancer by Activating ERBB3 Signaling Source: Science Prognostic Value of MET Gene Copy Number and Protein Expression in Patients with Surgically Resected Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Meta-Analysis of Published Literatures Source: PLoS ONE Monovalent antibody design and mechanism of action of onartuzumab, a MET

antagonist with anti-tumor activity as a therapeutic agent



Source: Cancer Research Ligand-triggered resistance to molecular targeted drugs in lung cancer: Roles of hepatocyte growth factor and epidermal growth factor receptor ligands Source: Cancer Science MET-negative patients—eclipsing benefits Source: Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology c-MET/Phospho-MET Protein Expression and MET Gene Copy Number in Nonsmall Cell Lung Carcinomas Source: Journal of Thoracic Oncology "Companion Diagnostics": Has Their Time Come and Gone? Source: Clinical Cancer Research Randomized Phase II Trial of Onartuzumab in Combination With Erlotinib in Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Source: Journal of Clinical Oncology Induction of MET by Ionizing Radiation and Its Role in Radioresistance and Invasive Growth of Cancer Source: JNCI Journal of the National Cancer Institute EGF Receptor Activates MET through MAPK to Enhance Non-Small Cell Lung Carcinoma Invasion and Brain Metastasis Source: Cancer Research Onar × IIb or IV NS aceboconti Sour Trans Hepa Sour Refer gefitinib 1. Engel resista 6:1039-43 Publied web of Science w Google Scholar

 Bean J, Brennan C, Shih JY, et al. MET amplification occurs with or without T790M mutations in EGFR mutant lung tumors with acquired resistance to gefitinib or erlotinib. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2007;104:20932-7

PubMed Web of Science ® Google Scholar

3. Guo B, Cen H, Tan X, et al. Prognostic value of MET gene copy number and protein expression in patients with surgically resected non-small cell lung cancer: a metaanalysis of published literatures. PLoS One 2014;9:e99399



4. Tsuta K, Kozu Y, Mimae T, et al. c-MET/phospho-MET protein expression and MET gene copy number in non-small cell lung carcinomas. J Thorac Oncol 2012;7:331-9

PubMed Web of Science ® Google Scholar

 Kubo T, Yamamoto H, Lockwood WW, et al. MET gene amplification or EGFR mutation activate MET in lung cancers untreated with EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors. Int J Cancer 2009;124:1778-84



Cancer: MET Expression Levels Are Predictive of Patient Benefit. Clin Cancer Res 2014;20:4488-98

PubMed Web of Science ® Google Scholar

 Merchant M, Ma X, Maun HR, et al. Monovalent antibody design and mechanism of action of onartuzumab, a MET antagonist with anti-tumor activity as a therapeutic agent. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2013;110:E2987-96

PubMed Web of Science ® Google Scholar

.0. Yano S, Takeuchi S, Nakagawa T, et al. Ligand-triggered resistance to molecular targeted drugs in lung cancer: roles of hepatocyte growth factor and epidermal growth factor receptor ligands. Cancer Sci 2012;103:1189-94

PubMed Web of Science ® Google Scholar

1. Yano S, Wang W, Li Q, et al. Hepatocyte growth factor induces gefitinib resistance of lung adenocarcinoma with epidermal growth factor receptor-activating mutations. Cancer Res 2008;68:9479-87





5. Guo A, Villén J, Kornhauser J, et al. Signaling networks assembled by oncogenic EGFR and c-Met. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2008;105:692-7



.6. Breindel JL, Haskins JW, Cowell EP, et al. EGF Receptor activates MET through MAP kinases to enhance non-small cell lung carcinoma invasion and brain metastasis. Cancer Res 2013;73(16):5053-65



## Download PDF

## Related research 1

People also read	Recommended articles	Cited by 31
A novel inhibito		🗙 sine kinase
Ryo Fuji Cancer E Publishe		6
Enginee targetir		conjugates
An mAbs Publishe		8

Information for	Open access
Authors	Overview
R&D professionals	Open journals
Editors	Open Select
Librarians	Dove Medical Press
Societies	F1000Research
Opportunities	Help and information
Reprints and e-prints	Help and contact
Advertising solutions	Newsroom
Accelerated publication	All journals
Corporate access solutions	Books

## Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

🔛 Sign me u

