Prognostic Value of the Molecular Detection of Circulating Tumor Cells Using a Multimarker Reverse Transcription-PCR Assay for Cytokeratin 19, Mammaglobin A, and HER2 in Early Breast Cancer

Michail Ignatiadis,^{1,3} Galatea Kallergi,³ Maria Ntoulia,⁵ Maria Perraki,³ Stella Apostolaki,³ Maria Kafousi,² Grigorios Chlouverakis,⁴ Efstathios Stathopoulos,² Evi Lianidou,⁵ Vassilis Georgoulias,^{1,3} and Dimitris Mavroudis^{1,3}

Abstract Purpose: To investigate the prognostic value of the molecular detection of circulating tumor cells (*CTCs*) using three markers [cytokeratin 19 (*CK19*), mammaglobin A (*MGB1*), and *HER2*] in early breast cancer.

Experimental Design: CK19mRNA+, MGB1mRNA+, and HER2mRNA+ cells were detected using real-time (*CK19*) and nested (*MGB1* and *HER2*) reverse transcription-PCR in the peripheral blood of 175 women with stage I to III breast cancer before the initiation of adjuvant chemotherapy. The detection of CTCs was correlated with clinical outcome. In 10 patients, immunofluorescence staining experiments were done to investigate the coexpression of cytokeratin, *MGB1*, and *HER2* in CTCs.

Results: CK19mRNA+, *MGB1*mRNA+, and *HER2*mRNA+ cells were detected in 41.1%, 8%, and 28.6% of the 175 patients, respectively. Patients had one of the following molecular profiles: CK19mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA+/*HER2*mRNA+ (n = 8), CK19mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA+/*HER2*mRNA- (n = 1), CK19mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA-/*HER2*mRNA+ (n = 42), CK19mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA-/*HER2*mRNA- (n = 21), CK19mRNA-/*MGB1*mRNA+/*HER2*mRNA- (n = 5), and CK19mRNA-/*HER2*mRNA- (n = 21), CK19mRNA-/*MGB1*mRNA+/*HER2*mRNA- (n = 5), and CK19mRNA-/*MGB1*mRNA-/*HER2*mRNA- (n = 98). Double-immunofluorescence experiments confirmed the following CTC phenotypes: CK+/*MGB1*+, CK+/*MGB1*-, CK-/*MGB1*+, CK+/*HER2*+, CK+/*HER2*-, *MGB1*+/*HER2*-, and *MGB1*+/*HER2*+. In univariate analysis, the detection of CK19mRNA+, *MGB1*mRNA+, and HER2mRNA+ cells was associated with shorter disease-free survival (DFS; P < 0.001, P = 0.001, and P < 0.001, respectively), whereas the detection of CK19mRNA+ and *MGB1*mRNA+ cells was associated with worse overall survival (P = 0.044 and 0.034, respectively). In multivariate analysis, estrogen receptor – negative tumors and the detection of *CK19*mRNA+ and *MGB1*mRNA+ cells were independently associated with worse DFS.

Conclusion: The detection of peripheral blood *CK19*mRNA+ and *MGB1*mRNA+ cells before adjuvant chemotherapy predicts poor DFS in women with early breast cancer.

doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-07-4758

Breast cancer is considered a systemic disease because early tumor dissemination may occur even in patients with small tumors. Micrometastases, which are undetectable by the classic imaging and laboratory studies, can contribute to disease relapse; therefore, their identification in patients with early breast cancer may have substantial effect on determining prognosis and individualizing treatment strategies for these patients. For this purpose, epithelial cells have been identified in the bone marrow (disseminated tumor cells) or the peripheral blood [circulating tumor cells (*CTCs*)] of patients with stage I to III breast cancer using immunocytochemistry or molecular techniques (1–4).

Cytokeratin 19 (CK19), a cytoskeletal protein expressed on epithelial but not on mesenchymal cells, has been the marker most extensively studied for the detection of CTCs (3, 5). Using a highly sensitive and specific real-time reverse transcription-PCR (RT-PCR) assay (6), we showed that the detection of

Authors' Affiliations: Departments of ¹Medical Oncology and ²Pathology, University General Hospital of Heraklion; ³Laboratory of Tumor Cell Biology and ⁴Department of Biostatistics, School of Medicine, University of Crete, Crete, Greece and ⁵Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, University of Athens, Athens, Greece

Received 10/29/07; revised 12/27/07; accepted 1/15/08.

Grant support: M. Ignatiadis and M. Ntoulia were recipients of a Cretan Association for Biomedical Research fellowship.

The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. This article must therefore be hereby marked *advertisement* in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact.

Note: Supplementary data for this article are available at Clinical Cancer Research Online (http://clincancerres.aacrjournals.org/).

Requests for reprints: Dimitris Mavroudis, Department of Medical Oncology, University General Hospital of Heraklion, P. O. Box 1352, Heraklion 711 10, Crete, Greece. Phone: 30-2810-392823; Fax: 30-2810-392802; E-mail: mavrudis@ med.uoc.gr.

^{© 2008} American Association for Cancer Research.

CK19mRNA+ cells before the initiation of adjuvant chemotherapy was an independent prognostic factor for disease recurrence and decreased survival in patients with early breast cancer (7, 8). However, microarray and comparative genomic hybridization studies have shown that breast cancer is a genetically heterogeneous disease (9, 10) and that even the micrometastatic cells of any given patient with early breast cancer may exhibit diverse genomic profiles (11). Moreover, it is known that $\sim 50\%$ of patients with early breast cancer and detectable bone marrow disseminated tumor cells do not relapse even 10 years after diagnosis, whereas there is a significant proportion of patients without detectable disseminated tumor cells who still relapse (12). To increase the sensitivity of detection of CTCs as well as to define clinically relevant subpopulations of CTCs with aggressive biological behavior that could be used more precisely as surrogate markers for relapse, several approaches have been used: (a) the use of other markers apart from cytokeratins for detection of minimal residual disease [e.g., mucins, mammaglobin A (MGB1), maspin, carcinoembryonic antigen, HER2, and epidermal growth factor receptor; refs. 13-17], (b) the use of different multimarker RT-PCR assays (18, 19), and (c) the use of assays to distinguish between apoptotic and nonapoptotic or viable micrometastatic cells (20, 21).

Here, we sought to improve the prognostic ability of our CK19mRNA assay by simultaneously studying two additional markers (i.e., MGB1 and HER2). MGB1, a member of a family of epithelial secretory proteins, the uteroglobulins, is considered to be a specific breast marker (22). MGB1 has been studied as a marker for the molecular detection of CTCs using different assays mostly in small patient cohorts, consisting of primary and metastatic breast cancer patients who have not been homogeneously treated (14, 18, 23, 24). Therefore, its role as a prognostic marker in early breast cancer still remains unclear. HER2/neu gene amplification in breast cancer cells was shown to be associated with resistance to treatment and impaired survival (25 - 27). Furthermore, we and others have shown that HER2-positive micrometastatic cells define a subpopulation of patients with a high propensity to develop distant metastasis (28, 29).

In the present study, we evaluated the prognostic value of a multimarker RT-PCR assay by simultaneously studying *CK19*, *MGB1*, and *HER2* for the molecular detection of CTCs in women with early breast cancer.

Materials and Methods

Patients. A total of 175 patients who had all received adjuvant chemotherapy for stage I to III breast cancer at the Medical Oncology Department of the University Hospital of Heraklion (Crete, Greece) were included in this retrospective study. For this study, we used frozen RNA samples from the biobank of the laboratory of Tumor Cell Biology for which enough material was available to simultaneously do the three markers plus one housekeeping gene analysis. The 175 patients included in this study were randomly chosen and not selected based on any predefined criteria so that our results would not be biased by any sort of selection criteria. For every patient enrolled, a complete diagnostic evaluation to exclude the presence of distant metastasis was done consisting of chest X-rays, mammography, ultrasound of the liver, and a whole-body bone scan. Computed tomography scans and/or magnetic resonance imaging studies were done if clinically indicated. Surgical treatment was either mastectomy or lumpectomy with axillary

lymph node dissection. Radiation treatment was delivered to patients with lumpectomy and those with four or more involved axillary lymph nodes. The administration of adjuvant chemotherapy and hormonal treatment was decided independently of the molecular detection of CTCs. All patients included in this study received adjuvant chemotherapy and most of them were treated in the context of research protocols of the Hellenic Oncology Research Group. Adjuvant chemotherapy regimens consisted of either FEC [5-fluorouracil (700 mg/m², day 1) + epirubicin (75 mg/m², day 1) + cyclophosphamide (700 mg/m², day 1) every 3 weeks for six cycles] or EC-T [epirubicin (75 mg/m², day 1) + cyclophosphamide (700 mg/m², day 1) every 3 weeks for four cycles followed by docetaxel (100 mg/m², day 1) every 3 weeks for four additional cycles] or classic CMF [cyclophosphamide (100 mg/m², orally, days 1-14), methotrexate (40 mg/m², days 1 and 8), and fluorouracil (600 mg/m², days 1 and 8) every 4 weeks for six cycles]. Patients with HER2-positive tumors did not receive adjuvant trastuzumab because all patients were enrolled before the positive results from the adjuvant trastuzumab trials were reported (30-32). All patients with estrogen receptor (ER)-positive and/or progesterone receptor (PR)-positive tumors received 20 mg tamoxifen daily for 5 years; premenopausal women also received luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone analogues for 2 years. Patient follow-up consisted of clinical examination with laboratory and imaging studies every 3 months for the first 2 years, every 6 months for the next 3 years, and yearly thereafter. All patients signed an informed consent to participate in the study, which was approved by the ethics and scientific committees of our institution.

Clinical samples and RT-PCR assays for the detection of CK19mRNA+, MGB1mRNA+, and HER2mRNA+ cells. Peripheral blood (20 mL in EDTA) was obtained from every patient 3 to 4 weeks after primary surgery and before the initiation of any adjuvant treatment. To avoid contamination with epithelial cells from the skin, all blood samples were obtained at the middle of vein puncture after the first 5 mL of blood were discarded.

The procedures of RNA extraction and cDNA synthesis have already been described elsewhere (6, 7). The quality of cDNA was confirmed by amplification of the *GAPDH* housekeeping gene for each individual sample. The sequence of the primers as well as the size of the amplified products for the three studied genes (*CK19*, *MGB1*, and *HER2*) are depicted in Supplementary Table S1.

The real-time RT-PCR assay for CK19mRNA+ cells and the primers used have been previously described in detail and were used in this study without any modification (6, 7). According to the analytic detection limit of our assay, the presence of \geq 0.6 MCF-7 equivalents/ 5 µg of total RNA was considered a positive result. The nested RT-PCR assays for the detection of MGB1mRNA+ and HER2mRNA+ cells, respectively, have been used without any modification as previously described (14, 15, 33). The sensitivity of the multimarker assay was tested in spiking experiments with the MCF-7 and SKBR3 cell lines. In three of four experiments, this assay could detect 1 MCF-7 or 1 SKBR3 cell among 10⁶ normal peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC). The specificity of the multimarker RT-PCR assay was investigated in 31 healthy women. Among them, 30 were negative for all three markers, whereas 1 woman had the CK19mRNA+/MGB1mRNA-/HER2mRNAmolecular profile.

Immunofluorescent detection of CTCs—confocal laser scanning microscopy. PBMCs were isolated with Ficoll-Hypaque density gradient (d = 1.077 g/mol) centrifugation at 1,800 rpm for 30 min. The isolated PBMCs were washed with PBS and centrifuged at 1,500 rpm for 10 min. Aliquots of 250,000 cells were centrifuged on glass slides.

Double-staining experiments were done to investigate the expression of cytokeratin, *MGB1*, and *HER2* in PBMC cytospins of 10 breast cancer patients. Two different pancytokeratin antibodies were used: A45-B/B3, an anti-mouse monoclonal specific for CK8, CK18, and *CK19* (Micromet), or a pancytokeratin anti-rabbit polyclonal (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) depending on the second examined antigen as previously described (34). All the slides were also stained for 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole

(Invitrogen). Specifically, PBMC cytospins were fixed with cold acetone/methanol 9:1 for 20 min and stained for cytokeratin with the appropriate antibody. Consequently, the same slide was incubated with *MGB1* anti-goat polyclonal (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) or *HER2* antimouse monoclonal antibodies (Oncogene), respectively, for 45 min. Cells were then exposed for 1 h to the corresponding secondary antibodies: rhodamine anti-rabbit (Chemicon International, Inc.) for pancytokeratin, FITC anti-mouse (Chemicon International) for A45-B/B3 or *HER2*, and rhodamine anti-goat (Chemicon International) for *MGB1*. Double-staining experiments were done also for *MGB1* and *HER2* following the same protocol. All slides were evaluated using a confocal laser scanning microscope module (Leica Lasertechnik), and images were analyzed with the respective software. Each marker was also tested in combination with anti-CD45 (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) to exclude the presence of marker coexpression on hematopoietic cells.

Primary tumor immunohistochemistry for HER2. HER2 expression of the primary tumors was detected by immunohistochemistry (IHC) with the monoclonal antibody CB11 (Novocastra) using the Optimax automated system (Biogenex Laboratories). Scoring was based on the criteria recommended by DAKO A/S for the HercepTest.

Statistical analysis. Summary descriptive statistics were expressed as mean (SD) or percent, as appropriate. Continuous variables were compared between the two groups with unpaired *t* test and categorical data with χ^2 or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate. The time from study entry until the day of the first evidence of disease recurrence [disease-free survival (DFS)] and the time from study entry to death [overall survival (OS)] were the main dependent variables of the study. DFS and

OS curves for subgroups of patients were constructed using the Kaplan-Meier product limit estimate method (35) and compared by the logrank test to provide a univariate assessment of the prognostic value of selected clinical risk factors, measured at study entry. These log-rank comparisons were done between subgroups containing at least 20 patients each. Clinicopathologic factors known to be associated with prognosis, such as menopausal status (premenopausal versus postmenopausal), tumor size (T2-3 versus T1), axillary nodal status (positive versus negative), histology grade (3 versus 1-2), ER status (negative versus positive), PR status (negative versus positive), HER2 status (positive versus negative), chemotherapy regimen (FEC/EC-T versus CMF), and additionally the detection of CK19mRNA+ cells (yes versus no), MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes versus no), and HER2mRNA+ cells (yes versus no), were tested in univariate analysis. Variables that were found to be significant at the univariate screen were then entered in a stepwise backward multivariate Cox proportional hazards regression model to identify those with independent prognostic information for DFS and OS (36). Entry into and removal from the model were set at 5% and 10%, respectively. All statistical tests were done at the 5% level of significance. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 15 statistical software was used for the analysis.

Results

Patient characteristics and detection of CTCs. Patients' characteristics are shown in Table 1. The patients' median age

Table 1. Patient characteristics							
	All patients, n (%)	CK19mRNA+, <i>n</i> (%)	MGB1mRNA+, <i>n</i> (%)	HER2mRNA+, <i>n</i> (%)			
Patients enrolled	175	72 (41.1)	14 (8)	50 (28.6)			
Age (y)							
Median (min/max)	54 (28-75)	54.5 (28-74)	57.5 (37-75)	55 (28-74)			
Menopausal status	72 (41 1)	21 (42 1)		21 (20 2)			
Premenopausai	/2 (41.1)	31 (43.1)	4 (5.6)	21 (29.2)			
	103 (58.9)	41 (39.8)	10 (9.7)	29 (28.2)			
	58 (33 1)	21 (36 2)	1 (1 7)	14 (24 1)			
>2.0	117 (66 9)	51 (43.6)	1(1.7)	14 (24.1) 36 (30.8)			
Histology grade	117 (00.9)	51 (45.0)	15 (11.1)	30 (30.8)			
1/2	84 (48)	35 (41.7)	8 (9.5)	24 (28.6)			
3	78 (44,6)	31 (39.7)	4 (5.1)	23 (29.5)			
Lobular/unknown	13 (7.4)	6	2	3			
Lymph nodes	(,			-			
0	56 (32)	24 (42.9)	4 (7.1)	16 (28.6)			
1-3	49 (28)	19 (38.8)	4 (8.2)	14 (28.6)			
≥4	70 (40)	29 (41.4)	6 (8.6)	20 (28.6)			
ER							
Positive	101 (57.7)	41 (40.6)	7 (6.9)	29 (28.7)			
Negative	72 (41.1)	31 (43.1)	7 (9.7)	21 (29.2)			
Unknown	2 (1.1)						
PR							
Positive	67 (38.3)	31 (46.3)	5 (7.5)	21 (31.3)			
Negative	106 (60.6)	41 (38.7)	9 (8.5)	29 (27.4)			
Unknown	2 (1.1)						
HER2/neu status							
Negative $(0, 1+, 2+ IHC)$	124 (70.9)	55 (44.4)	10 (8.1)	38 (30.6)			
Positive (3+ IHC)	48 (27.4)	16 (33.3)	3 (6.3)	11 (22.9)			
Unknown	3 (1.7)	1	1	1			
Surgery							
Lumpectomy	117 (66.9)	47 (40.2)	9(7.7)	33 (28.2)			
Mastectomy	58 (33.1)	25 (43.1)	5 (8.6)	17 (29.3)			
СМЕ	26 (14 9)	11 (42 2)	2 (11 5)	8 (30 8)			
FEC	20 (14.9)	39 (41 1)	3(11.3) 7(74)	o (30.0) 27 (28 4)			
FC-T	54 (30 9)	39 (41.1) 22 (40 7)	/ (7.4) 4 (7.4)	27 (20.4)			
Pelances	49 (28)	22 (40.7)	(7.7)	25 (51)			
Deaths	26 (14 9)	16 (61 5)	5 (19 2)	11(423)			
Death5	20 (17.5)	10 (01.5)	5 (15.2)	11 (72.5)			

was 54 years (range, 28-75 years) and 66.9% had undergone a lumpectomy. Among the 175 patients, 41.1% were premenopausal, 66.9% had tumors >2 cm, 44.6% were histology grade 3, 41.1% were ER negative, and 68% had infiltrated axillary lymph nodes. Overall, CK19mRNA+, MGB1mRNA+, and HER2mRNA+ cells were detected in 72 (41.1%), 14 (8%), and 50 (28.6%) of the 175 patients, respectively. The detection of CTCs was not significantly associated with any of the known clinicopathologic characteristics, except for the detection of MGB1mRNA+ cells that was significantly associated with tumor size >2 cm (Table 1). Based on the detection of the three molecular markers, patients had one of the following molecular profiles: CK19mRNA+/MGB1mRNA+/HER2mRNA+ (n = 8), CK19mRNA+/MGB1mRNA+/HER2mRNA- (n = 1), CK19 mRNA+/MGB1 mRNA-/HER2 mRNA+ (n = 42), CK19mRNA+/MGB1mRNA-/HER2mRNA- (n = 21), CK19mRNA-/ MGB1mRNA+/HER2mRNA- (n = 5), and CK19mRNA-/ MGB1MGB1mRNA-/HER2mRNA- (n = 98).

HER2 expression on the primary tumor and detection of CTCs. Among the 175 patients, 48 (27.4%) patients were HER2-positive (IHC 3+). Interestingly, both CK19mRNA+ and HER2mRNA+ cells were detected in 11 of 48 (22.9%) patients with HER2-positive primary tumors and in 38 of 124 (30.6%) patients with HER2-negative primary tumors. All the patients who had HER2mRNA+ blood samples were also CK19mRNA+.

CTC immunophenotype. To further validate the presence of the different CTC molecular profiles obtained by the multimarker assay, double-immunofluorescence experiments were done in a small cohort of 10 cytokeratin-positive breast cancer patients. Confocal laser scanning microscopy confirmed the presence of the following CTC phenotypes: CK+/MGB1+, CK+/ MGB1-, CK-/MGB1+, CK+/HER2+, CK+/HER2-, MGB1+/HER2-, and MGB1+/HER2+. Six of the 10 patients had more than one CTC immunophenotype. All the patients with CK+/MGB1+ cells had also CK+/MGB1- cells, implying profound heterogeneity of protein expression pattern in CTCs. Two of the patients with HER2-positive CTCs had HER2+/MGB1+ and HER2+/ MGB1 - cells in the same slide. Remarkably, CK-/MGB1 + cells (Fig. 1) were detected in PBMC cytospins from two patients with CK19-/MGB1+/HER2- molecular profile. Five characteristic CTC immunophenotypes from five different patients are depicted in Fig. 1. Interestingly, the concordance between the CTC phenotype detected by immunofluorescence and the molecular profile detected by RT-PCR was 100% for the 10 patients studied.

CTC molecular profiles and clinical outcome. During the follow-up of this study, 15 (15.3%) relapses were observed in the 98 patients with no positive marker detected in their peripheral blood (*CK19*mRNA-/*MGB1*mRNA-/*HER2*mRNA-) versus 8 (30.7%) relapses in the 26 patients with one positive marker (*CK19*mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA-/*HER2*mRNA- or *CK19*mRNA-/*MGB1*mRNA+/*HER2*mRNA-), 20 (46.5%) relapses in the 43 patients with two positive markers (*CK19*mRNA+/*HER2*mRNA-), and 6 (75%) relapses in the 8 patients with three positive markers (*CK19*mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*HER2*mRNA+), and 6 (75%) relapses in the 8 patients with three positive markers (*CK19*mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*MGB1*mRNA+//*HER2*mRNA+), and 6 (75%) relapses in the 8 patients with three positive markers (*CK19*mRNA+/*MGB1*mRNA+//*MG1*mRNA+//*MG1*mRN



Fig. 1. A to E, five different CTC immunophenotypes from five different patients: CK+/MGB1- (A), CK-/MGB1+ (B), CK+/MGB1+ (C), CK+/HER2+ (D), and MGB1+/HER2+ (E). A to C, representative micrograph of confocal laser scanning microscopic sections of PBMC cytospins double stained with pancytokeratins A45-B/B3 monoclonal antibody (green; a, d, and g) and MGB1 (red; b, e, and h) goat polyclonal antibody and the overlay sections (c, f, and i). Magnification, ×600. D, representative micrograph of confocal laser scanning microscopic sections of PBMC cytospins double stained with pancytokeratins polyclonal antibody (red; j) and HER2 monoclonal antibody (green; k) and overlay section (/). Magnification, \times 600. E, representative micrograph of confocal laser scanning microscopic sections of PBMC cytospins double stained with MGB1 goat polyclonal antibody (red; m) and HER2 mouse monoclonal antibody (green; n) and overlay section (o). Magnification, ×600.





HER2 mRNA+) Table 2. The estimated median DFS was 2 years (95% confidence interval, 0-4.1 years) for patients with three positive markers, 7.2 years (95% confidence interval, 6-8.5 years) for patients with two positive markers, whereas the median DFS has not been reached for patients with one or none positive markers (Fig. 2A). Moreover, compared with patients with no positive markers, patients with one positive marker had a nonsignificant trend for shorter DFS (P = 0.092, log-rank test), whereas patients with two positive markers had significantly shorter DFS (P < 0.001, log-rank test). The estimated 5-year DFS for patients with three, two, one, and zero positive markers was 25%, 67%, 76.3%, and 86%, respectively.

Similarly, 9 (9.1%) deaths occurred in the 98 patients with no positive marker, 5 (19.2%) in the 26 patients with one positive marker, 9 (20.9%) in the 43 patients with two positive markers, and 3 (37.5%) in the 8 patients with three positive markers Table 2. The median OS for these patient subgroups cannot as of yet be estimated (Fig. 2B). However, compared with patients who had no positive markers, patients with one and two positive markers had a nonsignificant trend for worse OS (P = 0.202 and 0.104, respectively, log-rank test). The estimated 5-year OS for patients with three, two, one, and zero positive markers was 62.5%, 85.9%, 79.5%, and 92.4%, respectively.

The association between the detection of single-marker (*CK19*, *MGB1*, and HER2) or two-marker combinations (*CK19*/*MGB1*, *CK19*/*HER2*, and *MGB1*/*HER2*) and DFS/OS is presented in Supplementary Figs. S1 and S2.

Univariate and multivariate analysis. For DFS, primary tumor size >2 cm, ER-negative tumors, and the detection of CK19mRNA+, *MGB1*mRNA+, and *HER2*mRNA+ cells were all significantly associated with unfavorable outcome in the univariate analysis (Table 3A), whereas ER-negative tumors and the detection of CK19mRNA+ and *MGB1*mRNA+ cells emerged as independent adverse prognostic factors in the multivariate analysis (Table 3B). For OS, in the univariate analysis, the detection of *CK19*mRNA+ and *MGB1*mRNA+ cells was significantly associated with reduced survival (Table 3A), whereas they marginally failed to emerge as independent prognostic factors in the multivariate analysis (Table 3B).

Discussion

We have previously shown that the detection of peripheral blood *CK19*mRNA+ cells before the initiation of adjuvant chemotherapy is an independent prognostic factor for shorter DFS and OS (7, 8). In the present study, we report for the first time that, using a three-marker RT-PCR analysis, the detection of *CK19*mRNA+ cells as well as the detection of *MGB1*mRNA+ cells were both independent prognostic factors for reduced DFS. The detection of *HER2*mRNA+ cells was a prognostic factor for shorter DFS in the univariate screen but did not retain independent prognostic value in the multivariate analysis. Therefore, *MGB1* but not *HER2* adds statistically independent and complementary prognostic information to the knowledge gained by *CK19* alone.

The multimarker RT-PCR assay used in the present study showed slightly increased sensitivity for the detection of CTCs over the single-marker (CK19) RT-PCR by detecting five additional CK19-/MGB1+/HER2- patients. Interestingly, two of these five patients relapsed and one died of breast cancer. In two of these five patients, PBMC cytospins were available and the presence of CK-/MGB1+ cells was confirmed by immunofluorescence (Fig. 1B). CK-/MGB1+ has already been reported as a rare immunophenotypic profile of CTCs (37). Additionally, the following CTC phenotypes were confirmed in the 10 patients studied by immunofluorescence: CK+/MGB1+, CK+/ MGB1-, CK+/HER2+, CK+/HER2-, MGB1+/HER2-, and MGB1+/HER2+. Interestingly, we observed a complete concordance (100%) between the CTC phenotype as detected by immunofluorescence and the molecular profile as detected by RT-PCR in these 10 patients. The fact that the CTC molecular profiles obtained by our multimarker RT-PCR assay were confirmed by immunofluorescence in a small cohort of 10 patients provides further evidence for the validity of our findings. This is especially true for the two patients with the rare CK19mRNA-/MGB1mRNA+/HER2mRNA- molecular profile. However, these results should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of patients examined.

Although in our study the detection of *MGB1* emerged as an independent prognostic factor for DFS, its low sensitivity (only 8% positive patients) limits its further development as a single

No positive markers	No. patients	CK19mRNA	MGB1mRNA	HER2mRNA	Relapses	Deaths	Median DFS, y (95% CI)	Ρ*	Median OS	P *
0	98	-	-	-	15	9	NR		NR	
1	26	+	-	-	8	5	NR	0.092	NR	0.202
		-	+	-						
2	43	+	-	+	20	9	7.25 (6-8.5)	< 0.001	NR	0.104
		+	+	-						
3	8	+	+	+	6	3	2 (0-4.1)		NR	
Total	175				49	26	NR		NR	

Table 2. Patient groups based on CTC molecular profiles and clinical outcome

Abbreviations: NR, not reached; 95% CI, 95 confidence interval.

^{*}Refers to the comparison with the zero/three marker (CK19mRNA-/MGB1mRNA-/HER2mRNA-) group; log-rank comparisons were done between subgroups containing at least 20 patients each.

marker for clinical use. The *MGB1* detection could be improved by using an epithelial cell enrichment step with immunomagnetic beads as has been reported by other investigators (18). *MGB1* detection rates in early breast cancer have varied considerably in published studies from 2% to 22% (23, 24, 38, 39). This variation can be attributed to the

different detection techniques used with different sensitivities and specificities, the different patient populations studied, and possibly the lack of correlation data about *MGB1* expression in the primary tumor. Indeed, one limitation of the present study is the lack of information about *MGB1* expression on primary tumors. *MGB1* detection by IHC has been reported in only a

Variable Hazard ratio (95% CI) P A. DFS	Table 3. Univariate (A) and multivariate (B) analysis for DFS and OS in women with early breast cancer				
Å. DFS Menopausal status (pre vs post) 0.739 (0.410-1.331) 0.313 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.292 (1.112-4.725) 0.025 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.661 (0.911-3.030) 0.098 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 1.587 (0.827-3.046) 0.165 ER (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.057 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.2920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001 MBB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.869 (1.538-5.025) <0.001 MERDamRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.869 (1.538-5.025) <0.001 Menopausal status (pre vs post) 1.032 (0.474-2.246) 0.938 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.670 (0.297-7.50) 0.071 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.806 (0.797-4.524) 0.055 ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.588 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.490 (0.539-2.896)	Variable	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	Р		
DFS University 0.739 (0.410-1.331) 0.313 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.292 (1.112-4.725) 0.025 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.661 (0.911-3.030) 0.098 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 1.587 (0.827-3.046) 0.165 ER (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (ves vs no) 2.369 (1.638-5.025) <0.001	A.				
Menopausal status (pre vs post) 0.739 (0.410-1.331) 0.313 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.292 (1.112-4.725) 0.025 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.661 (0.911-3.030) 0.098 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 1.587 (0.827-3.046) 0.165 ER (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.367 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	DFS				
Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.292 (1.112-4.725) 0.025 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.661 (0.911-3.030) 0.098 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 1.587 (0.827-3.046) 0.165 ER (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (ves vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	Menopausal status (pre vs post)	0.739 (0.410-1.331)	0.313		
Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.661 (0.911-3.030) 0.098 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 1.587 (0.827-3.046) 0.165 ER (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1)	2.292 (1.112-4.725)	0.025		
Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 1.587 (0.827-3.046) 0.165 ER (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.675 (0.527-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.267 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	Histology grade (3 vs 1/2)	1.661 (0.911-3.030)	0.098		
FR (negative vs positive) 2.446 (1.375-4.350) 0.002 PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	Lymph nodes (positive vs negative)	1.587 (0.827-3.046)	0.165		
PR (negative vs positive) 1.072 (0.597-1.923) 0.816 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	ER (negative vs positive)	2.446 (1.375-4.350)	0.002		
HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.651 (0.920-2.963) 0.093 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	PR (negative vs positive)	1.072 (0.597-1.923)	0.816		
Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.708 (0.677-4.310) 0.257 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative)	1.651 (0.920-2.963)	0.093		
CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.967 (1.647-5.344) <0.001	Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF)	1.708 (0.677-4.310)	0.257		
MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.275 (1.586-6.763) 0.001 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.869 (1.638-5.025) <0.001	CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.967 (1.647-5.344)	<0.001		
HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.869 (1.638-5.025) <0.001	MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	3.275 (1.586-6.763)	0.001		
OS Menopausal status (pre vs post) 1.032 (0.474-2.246) 0.938 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.670 (0.920-7.750) 0.071 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.806 (0.781-4.173) 0.167 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 2.836 (0.977-8.234) 0.055 ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.058 PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2 regative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 B. DFS Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.633 (1.251-5.541) 0.011 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.633 (1.251-5.541) 0.011 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.633 (1.251	HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.869 (1.638-5.025)	<0.001		
Menopausal status (pre vs post) 1.032 (0.474-2.246) 0.938 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.670 (0.920-7.750) 0.071 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.806 (0.781-4.173) 0.167 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 2.836 (0.977-8.234) 0.055 ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.058 PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2. Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 B. DFS Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 0.955 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	OS				
Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 2.670 (0.920-7.750) 0.071 Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.806 (0.781-4.173) 0.167 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 2.836 (0.977-8.234) 0.055 ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.058 PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 0.011 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	Menopausal status (pre vs post)	1.032 (0.474-2.246)	0.938		
Histology grade (3 vs 1/2) 1.806 (0.781-4.173) 0.167 Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 2.836 (0.977-8.234) 0.055 ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.058 PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2, primary tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1)	2.670 (0.920-7.750)	0.071		
Lymph nodes (positive vs negative) 2.836 (0.977-8.234) 0.055 ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.058 PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 0.011 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	Histology grade (3 vs 1/2)	1.806 (0.781-4.173)	0.167		
ER (negative vs positive) 2.122 (0.973-4.626) 0.058 PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 0.001 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	Lymph nodes (positive vs negative)	2.836 (0.977-8.234)	0.055		
PR (negative vs positive) 1.040 (0.472-2.293) 0.922 HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS 0.054 0.002 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.001 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	ER (negative vs positive)	2.122 (0.973-4.626)	0.058		
HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative) 1.249 (0.539-2.896) 0.604 Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS 0.054 0.002 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.001 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	PR (negative vs positive)	1.040 (0.472-2.293)	0.922		
Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF) 1.459 (0.438-4.863) 0.538 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS 0.054 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	HER2, primary tumor (positive vs negative)	1.249 (0.539-2.896)	0.604		
CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.257 (1.024-4.977) 0.044 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS 0.091 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	Adjuvant chemotherapy (FEC/EC-T vs CMF)	1.459 (0.438-4.863)	0.538		
MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.867 (1.081-7.606) 0.034 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS 0.091 0.091 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.257 (1.024-4.977)	0.044		
HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.806 (0.828-3.938) 0.137 B. DFS 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.867 (1.081-7.606)	0.034		
B. DFS Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.633 (1.251-5.541) OS CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.102 (0.947-4.665) 0.068 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.521 (0.942-6.745)	HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	1.806 (0.828-3.938)	0.137		
DFS 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	В.				
Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1) 1.954 (0.899-4.248) 0.091 ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	DFS				
ER (negative vs positive) 2.459 (1.375-4.398) 0.002 CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	Tumor size (T2-3 vs T1)	1.954 (0.899-4.248)	0.091		
CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 3.085 (1.687-5.642) <0.001	ER (negative vs positive)	2.459 (1.375-4.398)	0.002		
MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.633 (1.251-5.541) 0.011 HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.781 (0.750-4.229) 0.191 OS 2.102 (0.947-4.665) 0.068 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.521 (0.942-6.745) 0.066	CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	3.085 (1.687-5.642)	<0.001		
HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 1.781 (0.750-4.229) 0.191 OS 2.102 (0.947-4.665) 0.068 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.521 (0.942-6.745) 0.066	MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.633 (1.251-5.541)	0.011		
OS 2.102 (0.947-4.665) 0.068 MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.521 (0.942-6.745) 0.066	HER2mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	1.781 (0.750-4.229)	0.191		
CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)2.102 (0.947-4.665)0.068MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)2.521 (0.942-6.745)0.066	OS				
MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no) 2.521 (0.942-6.745) 0.066	CK19mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.102 (0.947-4.665)	0.068		
	MGB1mRNA+ cells (yes vs no)	2.521 (0.942-6.745)	0.066		

Abbreviations: NR, not reached; 95% CI, 95 confidence interval.

fraction of primary breast tumors ranging from 48% to 80% (40, 41). Similarly, at the mRNA level, although *MGB1* has been reported to be expressed in 93% of patients with breast cancer, *MGB1* expression levels have varied over 10,000-fold (42). High levels of *MGB1* in the primary tumor have been associated with tumors with a less aggressive phenotype (low-grade, ER-positive tumors; ref. 42). At present, it is not known if the differential expression of *MGB1* in the primary tumor has an effect on the detection of peripheral blood *MGB1* mRNA+ cells.

Although the multimarker RT-PCR only slightly improved the sensitivity of detection of CTCs over the single-marker CK19 assay, the presence of two or three positive markers in the peripheral blood was associated with progressively worse prognosis compared with that of one positive marker. Therefore, the three-marker assay could provide important prognostic information for patients' risk stratification in adjuvant breast cancer trials.

Until now, only molecularly-based detection of CTCs is a prognostic marker for clinical outcome (7, 8). A more standardized, automated, immunofluorescence-based approach (CellSearch, Veridex) has yielded a low CTC detection rate (10%) in a large cohort of 1,767 early breast cancer patients, whereas correlation with clinical outcome is still pending (43). In this context, the proposed multimarker RT-PCR assay could be a more suitable tool for the assessment of CTCs in early breast cancer. However, an important limitation of our study is that all patients were recruited in one center and the CTC analysis was done in one laboratory. An international, prospective, multicenter trial with different participating laboratories in which issues of stability during shipment of the samples, interlaboratory reproducibility of the multimarker assay, and validation of our results in a diverse patient population is urgently needed. Further development of this assay should take into consideration the problems related to tumor marker prognostic studies described by McShane et al. (44).

In the present study, patients with positive CTCs detected by our multimarker assay had worse prognosis compared with those with nondetectable CTCs despite the fact that they had received both adjuvant chemotherapy and, if appropriate, tamoxifen. Therefore, in future trials, the value of secondary adjuvant treatment strategies should be prospectively investigated in patients with detectable CTCs to improve their clinical outcome. For example, the presence of peripheral blood HER2mRNA+ cells in early breast cancer could be used to select patients that could benefit from anti-HER2 targeted agents (45). Recently, preliminary results from subset analysis of the NSABP B-31 trial have suggested that benefit from adjuvant trastuzumab may not be exclusively confined to patients with IHC 3+-positive or fluorescence in situ hybridization-positive primary tumors (46). The benefit of trastuzumab in these patients could be related to effective targeting of HER2-positive CTCs (45). In our study, both CK19mRNA+ and HER2mRNA+ cells were detected in 38 of 124 (30.6%) patients with HER2-negative primary tumors and those women would have been ineligible for adjuvant trastuzumab based on current criteria. Although the finding of HER2mRNA+ cells in women with "HER2-negative" primary tumors could be simply due to the fact that the RT-PCR for HER2 is more sensitive than immunocytochemistry for HER2, it might also have important therapeutic implications. We and others have shown that trastuzumab can effectively eliminate CTCs and disseminated tumor cells overexpressing HER2 regardless of the HER2 status of the primary tumor in patients with early or metastatic breast cancer (45, 47). Similarly, the presence of peripheral blood MGB1mRNA+ cells in early breast cancer could be used to select patients that could derive potential benefit from vaccine strategies against MGB1expressing cells (48, 49).

The role of the above multimarker RT-PCR assay as a prognostic tool in early breast cancer as well as a predictive tool to define patient groups that could benefit from anti-*HER2* and/or anti-*MGB1* targeted therapies should be validated in prospective clinical trials where the prognostic or predictive value of detection of CTCs will be the primary objective of the trial (50).

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

References

- 1. Pantel K, Brakenhoff RH. Dissecting the metastatic cascade. Nat Rev Cancer 2004;4:448–56.
- Slade MJ, Coombes RC. The clinical significance of disseminated tumor cells in breast cancer. Nat Clin Pract Oncol 2007;4:30–41.
- Lacroix M. Significance, detection and markers of disseminated breast cancer cells. Endocr Relat Cancer 2006;13:1033–67.
- Ignatiadis M, Georgoulias V, Mavroudis D. Circulating tumor cells in breast cancer. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol 2008;20:55–60.
- Stathopoulou A, Vlachonikolis I, Mavroudis D, et al. Molecular detection of cytokeratin-19-positive cells in the peripheral blood of patients with operable breast cancer: evaluation of their prognostic significance. J Clin Oncol 2002;20:3404–12.
- **6.** Stathopoulou A, Gizi A, Perraki M, et al. Realtime quantification of CK-19 mRNA-positive cells in peripheral blood of breast cancer patients using the lightcycler system. Clin Cancer Res 2003;9: 5145–51.
- 7. Xenidis N, Perraki M, Kafousi M, et al. Predictive and prognostic value of peripheral blood cytokeratin-19

mRNA-positive cells detected by real-time polymerase chain reaction in node-negative breast cancer patients. J Clin Oncol 2006;24:3756–62.

- Ignatiadis M, Xenidis N, Perraki M, et al. Different prognostic value of cytokeratin-19 mRNA-positive circulating tumor cells according to estrogen receptor and HER2 status in early breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2007;25:5194–202.
- 9. Perou CM, Sorlie T, Eisen MB, et al. Molecular portraits of human breast tumours. Nature 2000;406: 747–52.
- Ignatiadis M, Desmedt C. Predicting risk of breast cancer recurrence using gene-expression profiling. Pharmacogenomics 2007;8:101 – 11.
- **11.** Klein CA, Blankenstein TJ, Schmidt-Kittler O, et al. Genetic heterogeneity of single disseminated tumour cells in minimal residual cancer. Lancet 2002;360: 683–9.
- **12.** Braun S, Vogl FD, Naume B, et al. A pooled analysis of bone marrow micrometastasis in breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2005;353:793–802.
- Zach O, Kasparu H, Krieger O, Hehenwarter W, Girschikofsky M, Lutz D. Detection of circulating

mammary carcinoma cells in the peripheral blood of breast cancer patients via a nested reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction assay for mammaglobin mRNA. J Clin Oncol 1999;17:2015–9.

- Ntoulia M, Stathopoulou A, Ignatiadis M, et al. Detection of mammaglobin A-mRNA-positive circulating tumor cells in peripheral blood of patients with operable breast cancer with nested RT-PCR. Clin Biochem 2006;39:879–87.
- 15. Apostolaki S, Perraki M, Pallis A, et al. Circulating HER2 mRNA-positive cells in the peripheral blood of patients with stage I and II breast cancer after the administration of adjuvant chemotherapy: evaluation of their clinical relevance. Ann Oncol 2007;18:851–8.
- **16.** Silva HA, Abraul E, Raimundo D, et al. Molecular detection of EGFRvIII-positive cells in the peripheral blood of breast cancer patients. Eur J Cancer 2006; 42:2617–22.
- **17.** Stathopoulou A, Mavroudis D, Perraki M, et al. Molecular detection of cancer cells in the peripheral blood of patients with breast cancer: comparison of CK-19, CEA and maspin as detection markers. Anticancer Res 2003;23:1883–90.

- Reinholz MM, Nibbe A, Jonart LM, et al. Evaluation of a panel of tumor markers for molecular detection of circulating cancer cells in women with suspected breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2005;11: 3722–32.
- 19. Zehentner BK, Secrist H, Hayes DC, et al. Detection of circulating tumor cells in peripheral blood of breast cancer patients during or after therapy using a multigene real-time RT-PCR assay. Mol Diagn Ther 2006; 10:41 – 7.
- 20. Fehm T, Becker S, Becker-Pergola G, et al. Presence of apoptotic and nonapoptotic disseminated tumor cells reflects the response to neoadjuvant systemic therapy in breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res 2006;8:R60.
- Alix-Panabieres C, Vendrell JP, Pelle O, et al. Detection and characterization of putative metastatic precursor cells in cancer patients. Clin Chem 2007;53: 537–9.
- 22. Watson MA, Fleming TP. Mammaglobin, a mammary-specific member of the uteroglobin gene family, is overexpressed in human breast cancer. Cancer Res 1996;56:860–5.
- 23. Silva AL, Tome MJ, Correia AE, Passos-Coelho JL. Human mammaglobin RT-PCR assay for detection of occult breast cancer cells in hematopoietic products. Ann Oncol 2002;13:422–9.
- 24. Zach O, Kasparu H, Wagner H, Krieger O, Lutz D. Prognostic value of tumour cell detection in peripheral blood of breast cancer patients. Acta Med Austriaca Suppl 2002;59:32–4.
- 25. Coussens L, Yang-Feng TL, Liao YC, et al. Tyrosine kinase receptor with extensive homology to EGF receptor shares chromosomal location with neu oncogene. Science 1985;230:1132–9.
- 26. Slamon DJ, Clark GM, Wong SG, Levin WJ, Ullrich A, McGuire WL. Human breast cancer: correlation of relapse and survival with amplification of the HER-2/ neu oncogene. Science 1987;235:177–82.
- 27. Toikkanen S, Helin H, Isola J, Joensuu H. Prognostic significance of HER-2 oncoprotein expression in breast cancer: a 30-year follow-up. J Clin Oncol 1992;10:1044–8.
- 28. Ignatiadis M, Perraki M, Apostolaki S, et al. Molecular detection and prognostic value of circulating CK-19 messenger RNA-positive and HER2 messenger RNA-positive cells in the peripheral blood of women

with early-stage breast cancer. Clin Breast Cancer 2007;7:883-9.

- 29. Braun S, Schlimok G, Heumos I, et al. ErbB2 overexpression on occult metastatic cells in bone marrow predicts poor clinical outcome of stage I-III breast cancer patients. Cancer Res 2001;61:1890–5.
- **30.** Piccart-Gebhart MJ, Procter M, Leyland-Jones B, et al. Trastuzumab after adjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-positive breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2005; 353:1659–72.
- Romond EH, Perez EA, Bryant J, et al. Trastuzumab plus adjuvant chemotherapy for operable HER2-positive breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2005; 353:1673–84.
- Joensuu H, Kellokumpu-Lehtinen PL, Bono P, et al. Adjuvant docetaxel or vinorelbine with or without trastuzumab for breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2006; 354:809–20.
- Mavroudis D, Perraki M, Kallergi G, et al. Molecular detection of HER2 mRNA-positive cells in the peripheral blood of patients with operable breast cancer [abstract 668]. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 2005;23:668.
- Kallergi G, Mavroudis D, Georgoulias V, Stournaras C. Phosphorylation of FAK, PI-3K, and impaired actin organization in CK-positive micrometastatic breast cancer cells. Mol Med 2007;13:79–88.
- Kaplan E, Meier P. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. J Am Stat Assoc 1958;53: 457–81.
- **36.** Collett D. Modeling survival data in medical research. London (United Kingdom): Chapman and Hall/CRC; 1999.
- Meng S, Tripathy D, Frenkel EP, et al. Circulating tumor cells in patients with breast cancer dormancy. Clin Cancer Res 2004;10:8152–62.
- 38. Benoy IH, Elst H, Philips M, et al. Real-time RT-PCR detection of disseminated tumour cells in bone marrow has superior prognostic significance in comparison with circulating tumour cells in patients with breast cancer. Br J Cancer 2006;94:672–80.
- 39. Gargano G, Agnese V, Calo V, et al. Detection and quantification of mammaglobin in the blood of breast cancer patients: can it be useful as a potential clinical marker? Preliminary results of a GOIM (Gruppo Oncologico dell'Italia Meridionale) prospective study. Ann Oncol 2006;17 Suppl 7:vii41 – 5.

- **40.** Watson MA, Dintzis S, Darrow CM, et al. Mammaglobin expression in primary, metastatic, and occult breast cancer. Cancer Res 1999;59:3028–31.
- 41. Sasaki E, Tsunoda N, Hatanaka Y, Mori N, Iwata H, Yatabe Y. Breast-specific expression of MGB1/mammaglobin: an examination of 480 tumors from various organs and clinicopathological analysis of MGB1positive breast cancers. Mod Pathol 2007;20:208–14.
- **42.** Span PN, Waanders E, Manders P, et al. Mammaglobin is associated with low-grade, steroid receptorpositive breast tumors from postmenopausal patients, and has independent prognostic value for relapse-free survival time. J Clin Oncol 2004;22:691–8.
- **43.** Rack B, Schindlbeck C, Hofmann S, et al. Circulating tumor cells (CTCs) in peripheral blood of primary breast cancer patients [abstract 10595]. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 2007;25:10595.
- McShane LM, Altman DG, Sauerbrei W, Taube SE, Gion M, Clark GM. Reporting recommendations for tumor marker prognostic studies. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23:9067–72.
- **45.** Bozionellou V, Mavroudis D, Perraki M, et al. Trastuzumab administration can effectively target chemotherapy-resistant cytokeratin-19 messenger RNA-positive tumor cells in the peripheral blood and bone marrow of patients with breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2004;10:8185–94.
- 46. Paik S, Kim C, Jeong J, et al. Benefit from adjuvant trastuzumab may not be confined to patients with IHC 3+ and/or FISH-positive tumors: central testing results from NSABP B-31. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 2007;25:511.
- 47. Meng S, Tripathy D, Shete S, et al. HER-2 gene amplification can be acquired as breast cancer progresses. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2004;101:9393–8.
- Narayanan K, Jaramillo A, Benshoff ND, et al. Response of established human breast tumors to vaccination with mammaglobin-A cDNA. J Natl Cancer Inst 2004;96:1388–96.
- 49. Viehl CT, Frey DM, Phommaly C, et al. Generation of mammaglobin-A-specific CD4 T cells and identification of candidate CD4 epitopes for breast cancer vaccine strategies. Breast Cancer ResTreat 2007.
- 50. Henry NL, Hayes DF. Uses and abuses of tumor markers in the diagnosis, monitoring, and treatment of primary and metastatic breast cancer. Oncologist 2006;11:541–52.