ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Serum HER2 as an adjunct to assess HER2 status for advanced gastric cancer: A prospective multicenter trial (SHERLOCK)

Mayuko Saito^a, Kentaro Yamashita^a, Yoshiaki Arimura^a, Hiroyuki Kaneto^b, Hiroyuki Okuda^c, Masanori Nojima^d, Takeshi Hagiwara^e, Kazuya Suzuki^f, Takeya Adachi^g, Akira Goto^g, Kohei Nakachi^h, Atsushi Yawataⁱ, Mitsuru Yoshimoto^j, Tokuma Tanuma^k, Yasushi Adachi^l, Satoshi Yamaoka^m, Tsunenori Mizukoshiⁿ, Mariko Kawayama^o, Yasuo Hamamoto^p and Yasuhisa Shinomura^a

^aDepartment of Gastroenterology, Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology, Sapporo Medical University, Sapporo, Japan; ^bDepartment of Gastroenterology, Muroran City General Hospital, Muroran, Japan; ^cDepartment of Medical Oncology, Keiyukai Sapporo Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ^dCenter for Translational Research, The Institute of Medical Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan; ^eDepartment of Gastroenterology, Sapporo-Kosei General Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ^fDepartment of Gastroenterology, Kushiro City General Hospital, Kushiro, Japan; ^gDepartment of Gastroenterology, Otaru Municipal Hospital, Otaru, Japan; ^hDepartment of Gastroenterology, Obihiro Kyokai Hospital, Obihiro, Japan; ⁱDepartment of Gastroenterology, Obihiro Kyokai Hospital, Obihiro, Japan; ⁱDepartment of Gastroenterology, Japan; ⁱDepartment of Gastroenterology, Obihiro Kyokai Hospital, Obihiro, Japan; ⁱDepartment of Gastroenterology, Japan; ^jDepartment of Gastroenterology, Tenshi Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ^kCenter for Gastroenterology, Teine Keijinkai Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ⁱDivision of Gastroenterology, Sapporo Satozuka Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ^mDivision of Gastroenterology, Sapporo Satozuka Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ⁿDivision of Gastroenterology, Sapporo Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ^pDivision of Gastroenterology, Japan; ^oDivision of Gastroenterology, Japan; ⁿDivision of Gastroenterology, Sapporo Satozuka Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ⁿDivision of Gastroenterology, Japan; ^oDivision of Gastroenterology, JR Sapporo Hospital, Sapporo, Japan; ^pDivision of Gastroenterology & Hepatology, Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

ABSTRACT

Background: Intratumoral human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) heterogeneity of gastric cancer can be an obstacle to accurate HER2 assessment. Serum HER2, concentrations of the HER2 extracellular domain shed into the bloodstream, has a potential to compensate HER2 immunohistochemistry (IHC) but has not been scrutinized in gastric cancer. This study sought to explore the clinical utility of serum HER2 in gastric cancer.

Methods: We performed a prospective multicenter trial (SHERLOCK trial) involving patients with allstage gastric or gastro-esophageal junction cancer. Serum HER2 was measured using direct chemiluminescence while tissue HER2 status was determined using IHC and fluorescent in situ hybridization. For stage IV cases, concordance between local and central laboratories in tissue HER2 assessment was also evaluated.

Results: Of 224 patients enrolled, both tissue HER2 status and serum HER2 levels were successfully determined in 212 patients and 21% (45/212) were tissue HER2-positive. Serum HER2 levels, ranged from 4.5 to 148.0 ng/ml (median 10.3), correlated with tissue HER2 status (p = 0.003). At a cut-off level of 28.0 ng/ml determined by receiver operating characteristics analysis, sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values of serum HER2 were 22.6%, 100%, 100% and 82.3%, respectively. All nine cases with elevated serum HER2 were tissue HER2-positive stage IV cases. Among 61 stage IV cases, the agreement rate for IHC scoring between the local and the central laboratories was 82% and tissue HER2 judgment was conflicting in five (8.2%) cases. Of these five cases, four were confirmed as false-negative and two of these four patients demonstrated elevated serum HER2.

Conclusions: Serum HER2 levels correlated with tissue HER2 status in gastric cancer. Although the low sensitivity is a drawback, serum HER2 might be a useful adjunct tool to detect tissue HER2 false-negative gastric cancer.

The human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) protein, which is a 185-kDa transmembrane tyrosine kinase (TK) receptor and a member of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) family, has important roles in cell growth, differentiation and survival [1]. HER2 is overexpressed mainly through gene amplification in a subset of breast cancers as well as in other solid tumors [2,3]. With regard to gastric cancer, HER2 overexpression rate varies from 7% to 34% [4–6] and it

was 22% in a large scale international prospective trial (ToGA) [6]. Trastuzumab (HerceptinTM; Genentech Inc., South San Francisco, CA, USA) is a humanized monoclonal antibody directly binding to HER2 extracellular domain (ECD). The study demonstrated adding trastuzumab to platinum-fluoripyrimidine chemotherapy improved time-to-progression and overall survival in patients with HER2-positive advanced gastric cancer [6]. Consequently, tissue HER2 assessment by

CONTACT M. Saito 🔯 m.saitou@sapmed.ac.jp, mayu.921@apost.plala.or.jp 💼 Department of Gastroenterology, Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology, Sapporo Medical University, S1W16 Chuo-ku, Sapporo 060-8543, Japan

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 19 May 2015 Revised 2 October 2015 Accepted 7 October 2015 Published online 8 January 2016 immunohistochemistry (IHC) and fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) has become routine practice in the management of advanced gastric cancer. However, gastric cancer frequently exhibits heterogeneous HER2 overexpression [5,7,8] in contrast to breast cancer that generally shows homogenous pattern. Incomplete and basolateral membrane immunoreactivity also hampers accurate tissue HER2 assessment in gastric cancer [8]. Past studies demonstrated potential risk of falsenegative in tissue HER2 assessment for unresectable gastric cancer [9,10]. Substantial discordance in HER2 assessments among laboratories [11] as well as pathologists [12] was also reported.

The HER2 receptor is composed of an intracellular domain with TK activity, a transmembrane domain and ECD. Serum HER2 is the circulating HER2 ECD shed from the surface of tumor cells, and thus it could be used as a diagnostic marker for tissue HER2 status. Numerous studies have investigated the clinical utility of serum HER2 analysis in breast cancer and recent reviews concluded that there is insufficient evidence to support the use of serum HER2 in the clinical management of breast cancer patients [13–15]. In contrast, only a small number of retrospective studies have investigated serum HER2 in gastric cancer to date and its clinical significance has not been determined.

SHERLOCK (Serum Her2/neu elevation in gastric cancer; a multicenter trial in Hokkaido, UMIN 000009773) was a prospective multicenter study aimed to evaluate the correlation between tissue HER2 status and serum HER2 levels and their relationship with clinicopathological parameters in gastric cancer. We also evaluated discrepancies in tissue HER2 assessment between local and central laboratories.

Material and methods

Study populations

This prospective multicenter trial was conducted at 14 hospitals in Hokkaido, Japan. Twenty years or older patients with histologically confirmed adenocarcinoma of the stomach or gastro-esophageal junction were included in the study. Major exclusion criteria were previous chemotherapy and other active malignancy or prior malignancy in the previous five years. Recorded clinical and pathological features for each patient included age, gender, histological classification, tumor stage according to the seventh edition of the International Union Against Cancer (UICC) tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) classification, surgical treatment and adjuvant therapy, and chemotherapy. The protocol and consent form for this study were approved by the institutional review board at each participating hospital. All procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1964 and later versions. Informed consent or substitute for it was obtained from all patients for being included in the study.

Serum HER2 assay

Pretreatment blood samples were collected from all patients into sterile tubes. After centrifugation, serum samples were stored at -20 °C until analysis. Serum HER2 levels were

measured using an ADVIA Centaur HER2/neu assay (Siemens Healthcare Diagnostic Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan), a sandwich immunoassay that employs direct chemiluminescence technology using two monoclonal antibodies against the ECD of the HER2 antigen.

Tissue HER2 analysis

Paraffin-embedded block or unstained 4-µm sections of tumor tissue were submitted for central laboratory testing for each patient. The central laboratory performed HER2 IHC using the HercepTestTM (Dako, Glostrup, Denmark) in strict accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. HER2 immunoreactivity was evaluated according to the scoring criteria specifically developed for gastric cancer [5], which were applied to the ToGA trial. In IHC 2+tumors, FISH analyses were carried out using the PathVysionTM HER2 DNA probe kit (Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, IL, USA). The results were reported as the ratio of the average copy number of the *HER2/neu* gene to that of the chromosome 17 centromere. Specimens with a signal ratio of 2.0 or greater were considered as amplified. IHC 3+cases or cases that were IHC 2+ and FISH-positive were considered as tissue HER2-positive.

For stage IV cases, tissue HER2 was first assessed by the local laboratories of each hospital using various anti-HER2 antibodies including the HercepTestTM (Dako), the PATHWAY HER2/neu (4B5) rabbit monoclonal antibody (Ventana Medical System, Tucson, AZ, USA), and the SV2-61 γ monoclonal antibody (Nichirei Biosciences, Tokyo, Japan). The central laboratory then reassessed the same samples using HercepTestTM in a blinded manner. When IHC results were conflicting between the local and the central laboratories, the central laboratory performed additional IHC using SV2-61 γ as well as FISH.

Statistical analysis

Chi-square and Mann-Whitney U-tests were used to assess associations among clinicopathological features, tissue HER2 expression and serum HER2 levels. Kruskal-Wallis test was used to assess correlation between serum HER2 level and IHC staining. All *p*-values were two-sided and results were considered significant when *p*-values were less than 0.05. Statistical analyses were carried out using statistical softwares EZR (http://cran.r-project.org) and GraphPad prism (La Jolla, CA, USA).

To determine efficient cut-offs and to evaluate their applicability, samples were randomly sorted into two groups in a 7:3 ratio (training set and test set) for validation analysis. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for tissue HER2-positive cases were constructed on the basis of serum HER2 levels, followed by calculation of the area under the curve (AUC). Serum HER2 cut-off levels were defined based on the shape of the ROC curves.

Results

Patient profiles and tissue HER2 status

A total of 224 patients were enrolled from 14 institutions from July 2011 to July 2013 (Figure 1). Twelve patients were



Figure 1. Study population and tissue HER2 status.

Table I. Clinical characteristics of tissue HER2-negative and positive patients.

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Total	tHER2-negative	tHER2-positive	
Age (years) Median (range)70 (33–90)71 (40–90)67 (33–88)0.008Gender Male143 (67%)106 (63%)37 (82%)0.020Female69 (33%)61 (37%)8 (18%)1Tumor location Upper and EGJ43 (20%)30 (18%)13 (30%)0.182Middle75 (35%)63 (38%)12 (27%)1Lower94 (44%)74 (44%)20 (43%)2Lauren classification Intestinal113 (53%)83 (50%)30 (67%)0.045Diffuse and mixed99 (47%)84 (50%)15 (33%)0.008I115 (54%)100 (60%)15 (33%)0.008II14 (7%)11 (7%)3 (6%)11IV66 (31%)44 (26%)22 (49%)22 (49%)TotaltHER2-negativetHER2-positiveStage IV cases(n = 66)(n = 44)(n = 22)p-valueNo. of metastatic sites124 (36%)18 (41%)6 (27%)0.416>242 (64%)26 (59%)16 (73%) \leq 0.001No39 (59%)33 (75%)6 (27%)Liver metastasisYes7 (11%)5 (11%)2 (9%)1.000NoNo39 (59%)39 (89%)20 (91%)1.000No39 (55%)22 (50%)8 (36%)0.432No36 (55%)22 (50%)14 (64%)	All	(<i>n</i> = 212)	(<i>n</i> = 167)	(<i>n</i> = 45)	<i>p</i> -value
Median (range) Gender70 (33–90)71 (40–90)67 (33–88) 67 (33–88)0.008GenderMale143 (67%)106 (63%)37 (82%)0.020Female69 (33%)61 (37%)8 (18%)1Tumor locationUpper and EGJ43 (20%)30 (18%)13 (30%)0.182Middle75 (35%)63 (38%)12 (27%)1Lower94 (44%)74 (44%)20 (43%)2Lauren classificationIntestinal113 (53%)83 (50%)30 (67%)0.045Diffuse and mixed99 (47%)84 (50%)15 (33%)0.008StageI115 (54%)100 (60%)15 (33%)0.008I14 (7%)11 (7%)3 (6%)11IN17 (8%)12 (7%)5 (11%)IV66 (31%)44 (26%)22 (49%)TotaltHER2-negativetHER2-positiveStage IV cases(n = 66)(n = 44)(n = 22)p-valueNo. of metastatic sites124 (36%)18 (41%)6 (27%)0.416>242 (64%)26 (59%)16 (73%)≤0.001NoNo39 (59%)33 (75%)6 (27%)1.000No59 (89%)39 (89%)20 (91%)1.000No59 (89%)22 (50%)8 (36%)0.432No36 (55%)22 (50%)14 (64%)0.432	Age (vears)				
Gender Male143 (67%)106 (63%)37 (82%)0.020Female69 (33%)61 (37%)8 (18%)Tumor location Upper and EGJ43 (20%)30 (18%)13 (30%)0.182Middle75 (35%)63 (38%)12 (27%)Lower94 (44%)74 (44%)20 (43%)Lauren classification Intestinal113 (53%)83 (50%)30 (67%)0.045Diffuse and mixed99 (47%)84 (50%)15 (33%)0.008I115 (54%)100 (60%)15 (33%)0.008II14 (7%)11 (7%)3 (6%)11IV66 (31%)44 (26%)22 (49%)TotaltHER2-negativetHER2-positiveStage IV cases(n = 66)(n = 44)(n = 22)p-valueNo. of metastatic sites124 (36%)18 (41%)6 (27%)0.416>242 (64%)26 (59%)16 (73%)≤0.001NoNo39 (59%)33 (75%)6 (27%)1.000No59 (89%)39 (89%)20 (91%)1.000No59 (89%)39 (20 (91%)1.000Peritoneum metastasis Yes30 (45%)22 (50%)8 (36%)0.432No36 (55%)22 (50%)14 (64%)0.432	Median (range)	70 (33–90)	71 (40–90)	67 (33–88)	0.008
Male 143 (67%) 106 (63%) 37 (82%) 0.020 Female 69 (33%) 61 (37%) 8 (18%) 0.020 Tumor location 0 0 13 (30%) 0.182 Middle 75 (35%) 63 (38%) 12 (27%) 0.020 Lower 94 (44%) 74 (44%) 20 (43%) 0.182 Lauren classification Intestinal 113 (53%) 83 (50%) 30 (67%) 0.045 Diffuse and mixed 99 (47%) 84 (50%) 15 (33%) 0.008 1 I 115 (54%) 100 (60%) 15 (33%) 0.008 II 14 (7%) 11 (7%) 3 (6%) 11 IV 66 (31%) 44 (26%) 22 (49%) 0.008 III 17 (8%) 12 (7%) 5 (11%) 11 IV 66 (31%) 44 (26%) 22 (49%) 0.416 Stage IV cases (n = 66) (n = 44) (n = 22) p-value No. of metastatic sites 1 24 (36%) 18 (41%) 6 (27%) 0.416 >2 42 (64%) 26 (59%) <t< td=""><td>Gender</td><td></td><td></td><td> ()</td><td></td></t<>	Gender			()	
Female69 (33%)61 (37%)8 (18%)Tumor locationUpper and EGJ43 (20%)30 (18%)13 (30%)0.182Middle75 (35%)63 (38%)12 (27%)0.045Lower94 (44%)74 (44%)20 (43%)0.045Lauren classificationIntestinal113 (53%)83 (50%)30 (67%)0.045Diffuse and mixed99 (47%)84 (50%)15 (33%)0.008I115 (54%)100 (60%)15 (33%)0.008II14 (7%)11 (7%)3 (6%)11IV66 (31%)44 (26%)22 (49%)0.008VTotaltHER2-negativetHER2-positiveStage IV cases(n = 66)(n = 44)(n = 22)p-valueNo. of metastatic sites124 (36%)18 (41%)6 (27%)0.416>242 (64%)26 (59%)16 (73%) \leq 0.001No39 (59%)33 (75%)6 (27%)Liver metastasisYes7 (11%)5 (11%)2 (9%)1.000NoNo59 (89%)39 (89%)20 (91%)Peritoneum metastasis22 (50%)8 (36%)0.432Yes30 (45%)22 (50%)8 (36%)0.432	Male	143 (67%)	106 (63%)	37 (82%)	0.020
Tumor location Upper and EGJ 43 (20%) 30 (18%) 13 (30%) 0.182 Middle 75 (35%) 63 (38%) 12 (27%) 12 (27%) Lower 94 (44%) 74 (44%) 20 (43%) Lauren classification 113 (53%) 83 (50%) 30 (67%) 0.045 Diffuse and mixed 99 (47%) 84 (50%) 15 (33%) 0.008 I 115 (54%) 100 (60%) 15 (33%) 0.008 II 14 (7%) 11 (7%) 3 (6%) 11 IV 66 (31%) 44 (26%) 22 (49%) 22 (49%) Total tHER2-negative tHER2-positive 5 Stage IV cases (n = 66) (n = 44) (n = 22) p-value No. of metastatic sites 1 24 (36%) 18 (41%) 6 (27%) 0.416 >2 42 (64%) 26 (59%) 16 (73%) ≤0.001 No 39 (59%) 33 (75%) 6 (27%) Liver metastasis Yes 7 (11%) 5 (11%) 2 (9%) 1.000 No No 59 (89%) 39 (89%) 20 (91%) <	Female	69 (33%)	61 (37%)	8 (18%)	
Upper and EGJ Middle43 (20%)30 (18%)13 (30%)0.182Middle75 (35%)63 (38%)12 (27%) Lower94 (44%)74 (44%)20 (43%)Lauren classificationIntestinal113 (53%)83 (50%)30 (67%)0.045Diffuse and mixed99 (47%)84 (50%)15 (33%)0.008I115 (54%)100 (60%)15 (33%)0.008II14 (7%)11 (7%)3 (6%)III17 (8%)12 (7%)5 (11%)IV66 (31%)44 (26%)22 (49%)TotaltHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-positiveStage IV cases124 (36%)18 (41%) $< (n = 62)$ p -valueNo. of metastatic sites124 (36%)18 (41%) < 22 42 (64%)26 (59%)Liver metastasisYes27 (41%)11 (25%)No39 (59%)33 (75%) $< 29\%$ 1.000No59 (89%)29 (89%)NoS (45%)22 (50%)8 (36%)0 (45%)22 (50%)8 (65%)29 (99%)20 (91%)Peritoneum metastasisYes30 (45%)2	Tumor location	(/ - / - / /		- (,	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Upper and EGJ	43 (20%)	30 (18%)	13 (30%)	0.182
Lower94 (44%)74 (44%)20 (43%)Lauren classification113 (53%)83 (50%)30 (67%)0.045Diffuse and mixed99 (47%)84 (50%)15 (33%)0.008Stage1115 (54%)100 (60%)15 (33%)0.008II14 (7%)11 (7%)3 (6%)11IV66 (31%)44 (26%)22 (49%)TotaltHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativetHER2-negativethe display="3">the display="3"the display="3"the display="3"the display="3"the display="3"the display	Middle	75 (35%)	63 (38%)	12 (27%)	
Lauren classification 113 (53%) 83 (50%) 30 (67%) 0.045 Diffuse and mixed 99 (47%) 84 (50%) 15 (33%) 0.045 Stage 1 115 (54%) 100 (60%) 15 (33%) 0.008 I 14 (7%) 11 (7%) 3 (6%) 11 II 14 (7%) 11 (7%) 3 (6%) 11 IV 66 (31%) 44 (26%) 22 (49%) 22 (49%) Total tHER2-negative tHER2-positive 5 Stage IV cases (n = 66) (n = 44) (n = 22) p-value No. of metastatic sites 1 24 (36%) 18 (41%) 6 (27%) 0.416 >2 42 (64%) 26 (59%) 16 (73%) ≤0.001 No 39 (59%) 33 (75%) 6 (27%) 1.000 No 39 (59%) 39 (89%) 20 (91%) 1.000 No 59 (89%) 39 (89%) 20 (91%) 1.000 No 59 (89%) 22 (50%) 8 (36%) 0.432 No 36 (55%) 22 (50%) 14 (64%) 0.432	Lower	94 (44%)	74 (44%)	20 (43%)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Lauren classification				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Intestinal	113 (53%)	83 (50%)	30 (67%)	0.045
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Diffuse and mixed	99 (47%)	84 (50%)	15 (33%)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Stage	. ,	. ,	. ,	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ĩ	115 (54%)	100 (60%)	15 (33%)	0.008
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11	14 (7%)	11 (7%)	3 (6%)	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	111	17 (8%)	12 (7%)	5 (11%)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	IV	66 (31%)	44 (26%)	22 (49%)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Total	tHER2-negative	tHER2-positive	
No. of metastatic sites124 (36%)18 (41%)6 (27%)0.416>242 (64%)26 (59%)16 (73%)0.416Liver metastasisYes27 (41%)11 (25%)16 (73%) ≤ 0.001 No39 (59%)33 (75%)6 (27%) ≤ 0.001 Lung metastasisYes7 (11%)5 (11%)2 (9%)1.000No59 (89%)39 (89%)20 (91%)Peritoneum metastasisYes30 (45%)22 (50%)8 (36%)0.432No36 (55%)22 (50%)14 (64%)0.4320.4320.432	Stage IV cases	(n = 66)	(<i>n</i> = 44)	(n = 22)	<i>p</i> -value
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	No. of metastatic sites				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	24 (36%)	18 (41%)	6 (27%)	0.416
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	>2	42 (64%)	26 (59%)	16 (73%)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Liver metastasis				
No 39 (59%) 33 (75%) 6 (27%) Lung metastasis	Yes	27 (41%)	11 (25%)	16 (73%)	< 0.001
Lung metastasis Yes 7 (11%) 5 (11%) 2 (9%) 1.000 No 59 (89%) 39 (89%) 20 (91%) Peritoneum metastasis Yes 30 (45%) 22 (50%) 8 (36%) 0.432 No 36 (55%) 22 (50%) 14 (64%) 0.432	No	39 (59%)	33 (75%)	6 (27%)	
Yes 7 (11%) 5 (11%) 2 (9%) 1.000 No 59 (89%) 39 (89%) 20 (91%) 1000 Peritoneum metastasis Yes 30 (45%) 22 (50%) 8 (36%) 0.432 No 36 (55%) 22 (50%) 14 (64%) 14 (64%)	Lung metastasis	. ,	. ,	. ,	
No 59 (89%) 39 (89%) 20 (91%) Peritoneum metastasis	Yes	7 (11%)	5 (11%)	2 (9%)	1.000
Peritoneum metastasis 22 (50%) 8 (36%) 0.432 No 36 (55%) 22 (50%) 14 (64%)	No	59 (89%)	39 (89%)	20 (91%)	
Yes 30 (45%) 22 (50%) 8 (36%) 0.432 No 36 (55%) 22 (50%) 14 (64%)	Peritoneum metastasis	. ,	. ,		
No 36 (55%) 22 (50%) 14 (64%)	Yes	30 (45%)	22 (50%)	8 (36%)	0.432
	No	36 (55%)	22 (50%)	14 (64%)	

excluded; two did not meet the inclusion criteria, seven had insufficient tumor tissue or serum samples, and three had errors in FISH analysis. The remaining 212 patients were fully evaluated. Of the 212 patients, 39 (18%) and 28 (14%) were IHC score 3 + and 2+, respectively. FISH revealed *HER2* amplification

in six (21%) of the 28 IHC 2 + cases. Consequently, tissue HER2 was positive in 45 (21.2%) patients.

The clinical features of the 212 patients examined and the relationships between tissue HER2 status and clinicopathological characteristics are summarized in Table I. Of all patients, the median age was 70 years old (range, 33–90), 67% were male, 53% was Lauren's intestinal type. Half of the patients (54%) were at stage I while 31% were at stage IV. Compared with tissue HER2-negative cases, HER2-positive gastric cancer patients were younger, more male-predominant and more intestinal type-predominant, and tissue HER2-positive rates increased as the stage advanced (p = 0.008). Tumor location had no correlation with tissue HER2 status. In stage IV patients, liver metastasis was observed more frequently in the HER2-positive than in the HER2-negative group (p < 0.001), while the rates of lung and peritoneal metastasis were similar between the two groups.

Serum HER2 levels

The median serum HER2 level of the 212 patients was 10.3 ng/ml (SD = 13.8 ng/ml, range 4.5–148.0). The relationship between serum HER2 levels and tissue HER2 IHC scores is shown in Figure 2a. Kruskal-Wallis test demonstrated statistically significant associations between serum HER2 level and IHC staining (p = 0.028) and the serum HER2 level of HER2 IHC 3 + patients was significantly higher than that of patients with a score 0 (p = 0.012) using Steel's test. The mean serum HER2 levels of the tissue HER2-positive and negative groups were 21.8 ng/ml (SD = 27.7 ng/ml, range 6.5–148.0 ng/ml) and 10.6 ng/ml (SD = 3.4 ng/ml, range 4.5–27.2 ng/ml), respectively. There was a significant correlation between the serum HER2 level and tissue HER2 status (p = 0.003) (Figure 2b).



Figure 2. (a) Correlation between serum HER2 levels and tissue HER2 IHC scores. (b) Correlation between serum HER2 levels and tissue HER2 status.

	sHER2 < 28 (n = 36)	$sHER2 \ge 28$ ($n = 9$)	<i>p</i> -value
Age			
Median (range)	68 (33-88)	65 (56-81)	0.435
Gender			
Male	27 (75%)	9 (100%)	0.179
Female	9 (25%)	0 (0%)	
Tumor location			
Upper and GE junction	10 (28%)	3 (33%)	0.571
Middle	11 (31%)	1 (11%)	
Lower	15 (42%)	5 (56%)	
Lauren classification			
Intestinal	27 (75%)	5 (56%)	0.411
Diffuse and Mixed	9 (25%)	4 (44%)	
Stage			
Ĩ	15 (42%)	0 (0%)	0.001
II	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	
111	5 (14%)	0 (0%)	
IV	13 (36%)	9 (100%)	
	sHER2 < 28	sHER2 \geq 28	
Stage IV cases	(<i>n</i> = 13)	(n = 9)	<i>p</i> -value
No. of metastatic sites			
1	4 (31%)	2 (22%)	1.000
>2	9 (69%)	7 (78%)	
Liver metastasis			
Yes	9 (69%)	7 (78%)	1.000
No	4 (31%)	2 (22%)	
Lung metastasis			
Yes	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	0.156
No	13 (100%)	7 (78%)	
Peritoneum metastasis			
Yes	4 (31%)	4 (44%)	0.662
No	9 (69%)	5 (56%)	

Table II. Serum HER2 status in 45 tissue HER2-positive cases.

To determine the optimal cut-off level for serum HER2, we divided the subjects into two groups; a training set for cut-off determination, and a test set for validation. Two cut-offs were tentatively calculated by ROC analysis of the training set: a cut-off at 16.5 ng/ml yielded 94.8% specificity and 29.0% sensitivity to detect tissue HER2-positive gastric cancer while a cut-off at 28.0 ng/ml yielded 100% specificity and 22.6% sensitivity (AUC, 0.647; 95% CI 0.534–0.760) (Figure 3a). These results were

validated by the test set that demonstrated similar trends (Figure 3b). When subjects were limited to stage IV cases, sensitivity and specificity of serum HER2 at a cut-off of 28 ng/ml were 41% and 100%, respectively.

Figure 4 shows the correlation among serum HER2 levels, tissue HER2 status and TNM stages. Using the cut-off value of 28.0 ng/ml, all elevated serum HER2 cases (n = 9) were tissue HER2-positive stage IV cancer. Even if 16.5 ng/ml was adopted as the cut-off value, 17 of the 18 (94.4%) elevated serum HER2 cases were at stage IV and 10 (55.6%) were tissue HER2-positive.

Serum HER2 levels in tissue HER2-positive patients

Using the cut-off level of 28.0 ng/ml, serum HER2 was elevated in nine of the 45 tissue HER2-positive cases while it was normal in the remaining 36. When these 45 tissue HER2-positive cases were divided into the elevated and normal serum HER2 groups, elevated serum HER2 was significantly associated with advanced tumor stages (p = 0.001). There were no differences in other parameters between the two groups (Table II).

Tissue HER2 assessment by local and central laboratories and serum HER2

For 61 stage IV cases, IHC was performed by both the local and the central laboratories using the same samples (Table III). The local laboratories used various anti-HER2 antibodies while the central laboratory performed IHC using HercepTest. The agreement rate between the local and the central laboratories for IHC scoring was 82.0%. When FISH analysis was added for IHC 2+cases, the final judgments (tissue HER2-positive or negative) by the local and the central laboratory agreed in 56 (91.8%) while conflicted in five of 61 (8.2%) cases (Table III).

Details of the five cases with discordant results are shown in Table IV. Cases #1 to #4 were initially scored as IHC 0 or 1 + bythe local laboratories but the central laboratory judged as 3+. Reevaluation using the SV2-61 γ antibody and FISH proved



Figure 3. (a) The ROC curve of serum HER2 on a training set of 147 subjects. n = 147 (70% of all subjects) (Positive: 31, Negative: 116). (b) The ROC curve of serum HER2 on a test set of 65 subjects. n = 65 (30% of all subjects) (Positive: 51).

tissue HER2-positive in all the four cases. Of note, cases #1 and #2 demonstrated elevated serum HER2 levels (61.2 and 53.3 ng/ml, respectively). Discrepant IHC findings for case #2 were shown in Figure 5. Initial diagnosis by the local laboratory was tissue HER2-negative (score 1+, Figure 5a,b) but IHC by the central laboratory showed a strong membranous staining (score 3+, Figure 5c,d) and serum HER2 was elevated (53.3 ng/ml). After tissue HER2-positivity was confirmed by IHC using two antibodies as well as FISH (Figure 5e), trastuzumab was added to the chemotherapy.

Discussion

Over the past two decades, many studies have investigated clinical utility of serum HER2 levels in breast cancer and they were recently reviewed. As summarized by Leyland-Jones et al. [15], 16 studies demonstrated significant association between serum HER2 levels and tissue HER2 status while 10 studies did not. The review therefore does not recommend serum HER2 level as a determinant of HER2 status in breast cancer. However, the target population as well as methodological approach for serum HER2 testing varied between the studies. Seven of the 10 studies showing negative

results included significant number of stage I–III cases. In contrast, 12 of the 16 studies with positive results limited the subjects to metastatic breast cancer. These results suggest that serum HER2 level elevates when HER2-positive breast cancer metastasizes to distant organs.

To the best of our knowledge, only seven studies [16-22] to date have investigated the serum HER2 level in gastric cancer and results were conflicting like breast cancer: five studies [16,19-22] demonstrated significant correlation between serum and tissue HER2 levels while two [17,18] did not. Similar to the condition of breast cancer studies, the latter included only 13% [17] or no [18] metastatic gastric cancer. Kono and colleagues [16] reported а significant relationship between serum and tissue levels of the HER2/neu protein in 57 gastric cancers. They also commented that serum HER2 levels were higher in stage IV cases than in stage I-III cases. Our study also demonstrated significant correlation between serum and tissue HER2 levels and serum HER2 was elevated mostly in metastatic tissue HER2-positive cases (Figure 4). These findings suggest that it would be appropriate to limit serum HER2 test to metastatic gastric cancer patients who might be eligible for the HER2-targeted therapy.



Figure 4. Serum HER2, tissue HER2 and TNM stages. *The proportion of each tumor stage group that was serum HER2 >28 ng/ml was compared using Fisher's exact test.

	Central Lab.							
	IHC 0/1+	IHC 2+	IHC 3+	Total	tHER2-negative	tHER2-positive	Total	Agreement rate
Local Lab.								
IHC 0/1+	32	1	4	37	-	-	-	82.0%
IHC 2+	3	3	0	6	-	-	-	
IHC 3+	1	2	15	18	-	-	-	
Total	36	6	19	61	-	-	-	
tHER2-negative	-	-	-	-	39	4	43	91.8%
tHER2-positive	-	-	-	-	1	17	18	
Total	-	-	-	-	40	21	61	

Table III.	HER2	testing	by	local	and	central	laboratories.
------------	------	---------	----	-------	-----	---------	---------------

Table IV. Cases with a discordant IHC r	result.
---	---------

No. Histology Liver		liver metastasis	Local Laboratories	Central Laboratories			(HEP2 (ng/ml)	
				IHC score			SHENZ (H9/HIL)	
			IHC score (Anti-HER2 antibody)	HercepTest	SV2-61 γ	FISH		
1	intestinal	Yes	0 (Pathway)	3+	3+	UE	61.2	
2	mixed	Yes	1+ (Pathway)	3+	3+	+	53.3	
3	diffuse	No	0 (HercepTest)	3+	3+	+	9	
4	diffuse	No	0 (Pathway)	3+	0	+	8.7	
5	intestinal	Yes	3+ (Pathway)	1+	2+	-	18.9	

UE: unevaluable.

Cut-off value of serum HER2 has been set around 15.0 ng/ml in most studies of breast cancer [23,24] while it has not been validated in gastric cancer. Past studies of gastric cancer also set cut-off value at 15.0–16.5 ng/ml and low sensitivity (36.0–53.0%) was a common issue [19,20,22]. We selected two cut-off values (16.5 ng/ml and 28.0 ng/ml) from the ROC analysis but either cut-off value yielded low sensitivity (29.0% and 22.6%, respectively). Of the 45 cases with positive tissue

HER2 status, only nine and 11 cases were positive for serum HER2 when the cut-off values were 28 and 16.5 ng/ml, respectively. Consequently, serum HER2 testing by itself is not suitable for screening purposes and cannot a substitute for IHC and FISH. However, 100% specificity and 100% PPV were obtained when the cut-off value was elevated to 28.0 ng/ml. Dai et al. also indicated a specificity of 100% with a cut-off value of 22 ng/ml [19]. Considering risks of tissue HER2



Figure 5. HER2 testing (Case #2). (a,b) The HER2 IHC assay (Pathway) at the local laboratory showed a faint, partial membrane staining (scored as 1+). (×40, ×400, respectively); (c,d) The HER2 IHC assay (HerceptestTM) at the central laboratory revealed some tumor cell clusters with a strong complete membrane staining (scored as 3+). (×40, ×400, respectively); (e) Fluorescence in situ (FISH) analysis showed a high level HER2 amplification.

misjudgment, we would like to recommend 28.0 ng/ml as a cut-off value for advanced gastric cancer, limiting the purpose to identify tissue HER2 false-negative cases.

The inter-laboratory discrepancy of tissue HER2 assessment was substantial in our study, and it has also demonstrated in breast cancer [25,26]. Perez et al. evaluated diagnostic agreement rates of tissue HER2 status among local, central and reference laboratories in a large scale adjuvant trastuzumab trial for breast cancer [25]. The discordance rate was 12.0% (305/2535) between the local and the central laboratories while it was lower between the central and the reference laboratories. Huang et al. also demonstrated a similar trend in gastric cancer and they suggested that the main reason for this discrepancy was misinterpretation of the IHC score by local laboratories [11]. Methodological factors may also contribute to the discordance between laboratories, e.g. IHC testing can yield false-negative results when the HER2 epitope is destroyed through longer formalin fixation time. In addition, intratumoral HER2 heterogeneity might be a cause of misjudgment of tissue HER2 status in gastric cancer [9,10]. Although 6–8 biopsy samplings are recommended for accurate HER2 assessment in unresectable gastric cancer [8], this is not always feasible due to tumor bleeding. Tissue HER2 analysis by trained pathologists at experienced laboratories using sufficient number of samples is ideal but difficult in most clinical settings. In our study, of the four cases with false-negative tissue HER2 status determined by the local laboratories, two cases had elevated serum HER2 levels. Adopting higher cut-off value than for breast cancer, serum HER2 could be an adjunct to IHC in order to identify tissue HER2 false-negative gastric cancer.

There is another possibility of serum HER2 for advanced gastric cancer patients who have discordance of HER2 status

between primary and metastatic site. A meta-analysis concluded that HER2 discordance between paired primary and metastatic site is not rare, demonstrating 7% (95% Cl 5–10%) of the pooled discordance rate [27]. As biopsy of metastatic site cannot be easy to be carried out, serum HER2 might be useful tool to find out HER2-positive metastases with negative primary gastric cancer patients.

HER2 testing algorithms in gastric cancer still vary among guidelines [28]. The guideline by the Japanese society of pathology as well as European society for medical oncology (ESMO) recommends IHC for the initial screening and FISH for IHC 2+patients [29,30] while concurrent IHC and FISH test irrespective of IHC results is still common among National Cancer Institute (NCI)-designated cancer center [31]. Serum HER2 testing is less invasive, relatively inexpensive and quick manner, and our study demonstrated the potential of serum HER2 to detect false-negative results of tissue HER2 status. Thus serum HER2 testing in combination with tissue-based analysis might be a reasonable approach for unresectable gastric cancer. When serum HER2 are elevated in IHC 0 or 1 + cases, FISH analysis, IHC reevaluation or re-biopsy could be beneficial.

In conclusion, serum HER2 levels correlated with tissue HER2 status in gastric cancer. As trastuzumab has demonstrated significant positive impact on treatment for unresectable HER2-positive gastric cancer, efforts should be made to minimize HER2 false-negative cases. Although the low sensitivity is a drawback, analysis of serum HER2 might compensate for the aforementioned problems of tissue HER2 evaluation in advanced gastric cancer. Larger scale prospective studies are needed to confirm these findings.

Acknowledgments

We thank all the patients and the investigators who participated in this study. This study was partly funded by Chugai Pharmaceutical.

Declaration of interest

MS has received honoraria from Chugai and Takeda. KY has received research funding from Taiho and received honoraria from Chugai, Takeda and Ajinomoto. YA has received research funding from Astellas, AstraZeneca, Eizai and Takeda and received honoraria from Kyorin and Takeda. YH has received honoraria from Chugai. YS has received research funding from Pfizer, Novartis, Chugai and Daiichi Sankyo, and received honoraria from Eizai, Daiichi Sankyo, and Mitsubishi-Tanabe. All remaining authors have declared no conflicts of interest. The funding source of the study had no role in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data; or in the writing of this report.

References

- 1. Yarden Y, Sliwkowski MX. Untangling the ErbB singalling network. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2001;2:127–37.
- Slamon DJ, Godolphin W, Jones LA, Holt JA, Wong SG, Keith DE, et al. Studies of the HER-2/neu proto-oncogene in human breast and ovarian cancer. Science 1989;244:707–12.
- Koeppen HK, Wright BD, Burt AD, Quirke P, McNicol AM, Dybdal NO, et al. Overexpression of HER2/neu in solid tumours: An immunohistochemical survey. Histopathology 2001;38:96–104.
- Gravalos C, Jimeno A. HER2 in gastric cancer: a new prognostic factor and a novel therapeutic target. Ann Oncol 2008;19:1523–29.
- Hofmann M, Stoss O, Shi D, Büttner R, van de Vijver M, Kim W, et al. Assessment of a HER2 scoring system for gastric cancer: Results from a validation study. Histopathology 2008;52:797–805.

- Bang YJ, Van Cutsem E, Feyereislova A, Chung HC, Shen L, Sawaki A, et al. ToGA Trial Investigators. Trastuzumab in combination with chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for treatment of HER2positive advanced gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction cancer (ToGA): A phase 3, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2010;376:687–97.
- Lee HE, Park KU, Yoo SB, Nam SK, Park do J, Kim HH, et al. Clinical significance of intratumoral HER2 heterogeneity in gastric cancer. Eur J Cancer 2013;49:1448–57.
- Rüschoff J, Hanna W, Bilous M, Hofmann M, Osamura RY, Penault-Llorca F, et al. HER2 testing in gastric cancer: A practical approach. Mod Pathol 2012;25:637–50.
- Warneke VS, Behrens HM, Böger C, Becker T, Lordick F, Ebert MP, et al. Her2/neu testing in gastric cancer: Evaluating the risk of sampling errors. Ann Oncol 2013;24:725–33.
- Pirrelli M, Caruso ML, Di Maggio M, Armentano R, Valentini AM. Are biopsy specimens predictive of HER2 status in gastric cancer patients? Dig Dis Sci 2013;58:397–404.
- Huang D, Lu N, Fan Q, Sheng W, Bu H, Jin X, et al. HER2 status in gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancer assessed by local and central laboratories: Chinese results of the HER-EAGLE study. PLoS One 2013;8:e80290.
- Kushima R, Kuwata T, Yao T, Kuriki H, Hashizume K, Masuda S, et al. Interpretation of HER2 tests in gastric cancer: Confirmation of interobserver differences and validation of a QA/QC educational program. Virchows Arch 2014;464:539–45.
- Lennon S, Barton C, Banken L, Gianni L, Marty M, Baselga J, et al. Utility of serum HER2 extracellular domain assessment in clinical decision making: Pooled analysis of four trials of trastuzumab in metastatic breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:1685–93.
- Leary AF, Hanna WM, van de Vijver MJ, Penault-Llorca F, Rüschoff J, Osamura RY, et al. Value and limitations of measuring HER-2 extracellular domain in the serum of breast cancer patients. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:1694–705.
- Leyland-Jones B, Smith BR. Serum HER2 testing in patients with HER2-positive breast cancer: The death knell tolls. Lancet Oncol 2011;12:286–95.
- Kono K, Naganuma H, Sekikawa T, Amemiya H, Takahashi A, lizuka H, et al. Serum level of HER-2/neu in patients with gastric cancer: Correlation with HER-2/neu overexpression in gastric carcinoma tissue. Tumour Biol 2000;21:139–44.
- Takehana T, Kunitomo K, Kono K, Kitahara F, Iizuka H, Matsumoto Y, et al. Status of c-erbB-2 in gastric adenocarcinoma: A comparative study of immunohistochemistry, fluorescence in situ hybridization and enzyme-linked immuno-sorbent assay. Int J Cancer 2002;98: 833–7.
- Narita T, Seshimo A, Suzuki M, Murata J, Kameoka S. Status of tissue expression and serum levels of HER2 in gastric cancer patients in Japan. Hepatogastroenterology 2013;60:1083–8.
- Dai SQ, An X, Wang F, Shao Q, Chen YC, Kong YN, et al. Serum HER 2 extracellular domain level is correlated with tissue HER 2 status in metastatic gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction adenocarcinoma. PLoS One 2013;8:e63458.
- Oyama K, Fushida S, Tsukada T, Kinoshita J, Watanabe T, Shoji M, et al. Evaluation of serum HER2-ECD levels in patients with gastric cancer. J Gastroenterol 2015;50:41–5.
- Peng Z, Liu Y, Li Y, Zhang X, Zhou J, Lu M, et al. Serum HER2 extracellular domain as a potential alternative for tissue HER2 status in metastatic gastric cancer patients. Biomark Med 2014;8:663–70.
- Sasaki T, Fuse N, Kuwata T, Nomura S, Kaneko K, Doi T, et al. Serum HER2 levels and HER2 status in tumor cells in advanced gastric cancer patients. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2015;45:43–8.
- Cook GB, Neaman IE, Goldblatt JL, Cambetas DR, Hussain M, Lüftner D, et al. Clinical utility of serum HER-2/neu testing on the Bayer Immuno 1 automated system in breast cancer. Anticancer Res 2001;21:1465–70.
- Schwartz MK, Smith C, Schwartz DC, Dnistrian A, Neiman I. Monitoring therapy by serum HER-2/neu. Int J Biol Markers 2000;15:324–9.

- 25. Perez EA, Suman VJ, Davidson NE, Martino S, Kaufman PA, Lingle WL, et al. HER2 testing by local, central, and reference laboratories in specimens from the North Central Cancer Treatment Group N9831 intergroup adjuvant trial. J Clin Oncol 2006;24:3032–8.
- 26. Kaufman PA, Bloom KJ, Burris H, Gralow JR, Mayer M, Pegram M, et al. Assessing the discordance rate between local and central HER2 testing in women with locally determined HER2-negative breast cancer. Cancer 2014;120:2657–64.
- 27. Z Peng, J Zou, X Zhang, Y Yang, J Gao, Y Li, et al. HER2 discordance between paired primary gastric cancer and metastasis: A metaanalysis. Chin J Cancer Res 2015;27:163–71.
- Jørgensen JT. Role of human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 in gastric cancer: Biological and pharmacological aspects. World J Gastroenterol 2014;20:4526–35.
- Japanese Society of Pathology. Pathological Specimen Preparation and HER2 Expression in Gastric Cancer: Guidelines for Pathologic Diagnosis (draft) [In Japanese]. 2011. http://www.med.hirosaki-u.ac.jp/~patho2/SeidoKanri/Igan_Her2.pdf. [Accessed Sept 18 2012].
- Chung H, Bang Y, Xu J, Lordick F, Sawaki A, Lipatov O, et al. Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) in gastric cancer (GC): Results of the ToGA trial screening programme and recommendation for HER2 testing. ECCO 15–34th ESMO Multidisciplinary Congress. Berlin, Germany; ECCO, 2009.
- Trosman JR, Weldon CB, Tsongalis GJ, Schink JC, Benson AB. What are NCI-designated cancer centers using for gastric and esophageal cancer HER2 testing? J Clin Oncol 2013;31(Suppl): Abstract e15010.