# Letter to the Editor <br> EGFR alterations and response to anti-EGFR therapy: is it a matter of gene amplification or gene copy number gain? 
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## Sir,

Gene amplification, a key mechanism of oncogene activation, results from an aberrant DNA replication and leads up to several hundred of gene copies integrated either into extrachromosomal double minutes or chromosomal homogeneously staining regions. Oncogene amplification has a key role in malignant transformation, as illustrated by the canonical example of $c-m y c$ amplification in colorectal cancer (Masramon et al, 1998), and in secondary resistance to therapy, such as MET amplification in non-small-cell lung cancer, which leads to gefitinib resistance (Engelman et al, 2007). In contrast, gene copy number gain in tumours corresponds to a gene copy number $>2$ and may be due to numerous causes ranging from segmental chromosomal duplications to an increase of chromosome number or polyploidisation. Gene copy increase reflects the intrinsic chromosomal instability of cancerous cells and may not have any biological significance. This distinction is crucial for a critical reading of the article recently published in the journal by Ålgars et al (2011) entitled ' $E G F R$ gene copy number assessment from areas with highest EGFR expression predicts response to anti-EGFR therapy in colorectal cancer'. In this study, the authors first perform immunohistochemistry to assess EGFR protein expression in colorectal cancers and then determined, using silver in situ hybridisation, the number of EGFR copy and of chromosome 7 in the areas exhibiting the strongest staining. In patients without detectable KRAS mutation, a clinical benefit defined as partial response to anti-EGFR therapy or stable disease was observed in $23 / 28$ ( $82 \%$ ) of the patients with an EGFR copy number above 4 and in $3 / 16$ (19\%) with a lower EGFR copy
number. Remarkably, almost the same difference was observed between patients with a high ( $>4.5$ ) and low chromosome 7 number ( $80 \%$ vs $19 \%$ ). Furthermore, the authors indicated that the mean value of the EGFR/chromosome 7 copy number ratio was 1.05 suggesting that there was no EGFR amplification. Although the authors indicated that $E G F R /$ chromosome 7 copy number ratio was assessed, unfortunately, they did not correlate this ratio indicative of gene amplification to the anti-EGFR response. Assessment of $E G F R$ gene copy number in CRC has mostly been performed using FISH, and, as highlighted by Martin et al (2009), the evaluation of $E G F R$ FISH patterns must rely on accurate criteria in order to differentiate between a true EGFR amplification (EGFR/Chr-7 copy number ratio $>2$ ) and chromosome 7 aneusomy. If this criterion is used to define $E G F R$ amplification, several studies have shown that there is a clear association between $E G F R$ amplification and clinical response, with percentages of responders varying from 10 up to $89 \%$ among patients displaying EGFR amplification (Moroni et al, 2005; Frattini et al, 2007; Cascinu et al, 2008; Razis et al, 2008). As gene copy number increase has not the same biological significance than amplification, it is essential to distinguish these two quantitative genetic alterations, and we think that the demonstration of a real gene copy number amplification ( $E G F R /$ Chr-7 ratio $>2$ ) in patients' tumour is more significant with respect to their response to monoclonal antibody-based targeted therapies.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

> Ålgars A, Lintunen M, Carpén O, Ristamäki R, Sundström J (2011) EGFR gene copy number assessment from areas with highest EGFR expression predicts response to anti-EGFR therapy in colorectal cancer. Br J Cancer 105: 255-262

*Correspondence: Professor T Frebourg;
E-mail: thierry.frebourg@chu-rouen.fr
Published online 20 December 201I

[^0]Rogers AM, Cappuzzo F, Mok T, Lee C, Johnson BE, Cantley LC, Janne PA (2007) MET amplification leads to gefitinib resistance in lung cancer by activating ERBB3 signaling. Science 316: 1039-1043
Frattini M, Saletti P, Romagnani E, Martin V, Molinari F, Ghisletta M, Camponovo A, Etienne LL, Cavalli F, Mazzucchelli L (2007) PTEN loss of expression predicts cetuximab efficacy in metastatic colorectal cancer patients. Br J Cancer 97: 1139-1145
Martin V, Mazzucchelli L, Frattini M (2009) An overview of the epidermal growth factor receptor fluorescence in situ hybridisation challenge in tumour pathology. J Clin Pathol 62: 314-324
Masramon L, Arribas R, Tórtola S, Perucho M, Peinado MA (1998) Moderate amplifications of the c-myc gene correlate with molecular and
clinicopathological parameters in colorectal cancer. Br J Cancer 77: 2349-2356
Moroni M, Veronese S, Benvenuti S, Marrapese G, Sartore-Bianchi A, Di Nicolantonio F, Gambacorta M, Siena S, Bardelli A (2005) Gene copy number for epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) and clinical response to antiEGFR treatment in colorectal cancer: a cohort study. Lancet Oncol 6: 279-286
Razis E, Briasoulis E, Vrettou E, Skarlos DV, Papamichael D, Kostopoulos I, Samantas E, Xanthakis I, Bobos M, Galanidi E, Bai M, Gikonti I, Koukouma A, Kafiri G, Papakostas P, Kalogeras KT, Kosmidis P, Fountzilas G (2008) Potential value of PTEN in predicting cetuximab response in colorectal cancer: an exploratory study. BMC Cancer 8: 234


[^0]:    Cascinu S, Berardi R, Salvagni S, Beretta GD, Catalano V, Pucci F, Sobrero A, Tagliaferri P, Labianca R, Scartozzi M, Crocicchio F, Mari E, Ardizzoni A (2008) A combination of gefitinib and FOLFOX-4 as first-line treatment in advanced colorectal cancer patients. A GISCAD multicentre phase II study including a biological analysis of EGFR overexpression, amplification and NF-kB activation. Br J Cancer 98: 71-76
    Engelman JA, Zejnullahu K, Mitsudomi T, Song Y, Hyland C, Park JO, Lindeman N, Gale CM, Zhao X, Christensen J, Kosaka T, Holmes AJ,

