

British Journal of Cancer (2016) 114, 44–52 | doi: 10.1038/bjc.2015.426

Keywords: breast cancer; HER2-positive; neoadjuvant chemotherapy; pathological complete response; prognostic factors; trastuzumab

Pathological complete response and prognosis after neoadjuvant chemotherapy for *HER2*-positive breast cancers before and after trastuzumab era: results from a real-life cohort

Anne-Sophie Hamy-Petit¹, Lisa Belin², Hélène Bonsang-Kitzis^{1,3}, Caroline Paquet³, Jean-Yves Pierga⁴, Florence Lerebours⁴, Paul Cottu⁴, Roman Rouzier³, Alexia Savignoni², Marick Lae⁵ and Fabien Reyal^{*,1,3}

¹Institut Curie, PSL Research University, Translational Research Department, INSERM, U932 Immunity and Cancer, Residual Tumor & Response to Treatment Laboratory (RT2Lab), F-75248, Paris, France; ²Biostatistics Department, Institut Curie, Paris 75005, France; ³Department of Surgery, Institut Curie, Paris F-75248, France; ⁴Department of Medical Oncology, Institut Curie, Paris, France and ⁵Department of Tumor Biology, Institut Curie, Paris 75005, France

Background: Trastuzumab was introduced a decade ago and has improved outcomes for *HER2*-positive breast cancer. We investigated the factors predictive of pathological complete response (pCR), prognostic factors for disease-free survival (DFS), and interactions between pCR and DFS after neoadjuvant treatment.

Methods: We identified 287 patients with primary *HER2*-positive breast cancers given neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) between 2002 and 2011. Univariate and multivariate analyses of clinical and pathological factors associated with pCR and DFS were performed.

Results: pCR rates differed between patients receiving neoadjuvant trastuzumab treatment or not (47.7% versus 19.3%, P < 0.0001). DFS also differed significantly between patients receiving adjuvant trastuzumab or not (hazard ratio = 4.84, 95% CI (2.52; 9.31), P < 0.001). We analysed 199 patients given neoadjuvant and adjuvant trastuzumab. Multivariate analysis identified older age and hormone receptor-negative tumours as independent predictors of pCR. T stage (hazard ratio = 2.55, 95% CI (1.01; 6.48), P = 0.05) and strict pCR (hazard ratio = 9.15, 95% CI (1.22; 68.83), P = 0.03) were independent predictors of DFS. The latter association was significant in the HR-negative subgroup (P = 0.02) but not in the HR-positive subgroup (P = 0.12).

Conclusions: Major pCR and DFS gains in *HER2*-positive BC were observed since 'trastuzumab' era. Further improvements rely on the enrollment of accurately selected patients into clinical trials.

Breast cancer (BC) is the most frequently diagnosed cancer and the leading cause of cancer-related death in women. *HER2*-positive breast carcinomas display amplification and overexpression of the *HER2* tyrosine kinase receptor gene (17q12). This subgroup is

defined by aggressive pathological features and a high rate of early distant metastatic events. Trastuzumab-based treatments have been used for the past decade and have improved outcomes in patients with early or metastatic *HER2*-positive breast cancer.

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ 2016 Cancer Research UK. All rights reserved 0007 – 0920/16

^{*}Correspondence: Dr F Reyal; E-mail: fabien.reyal@curie.fr

Revised 2 November 2015; accepted 10 November 2015; published online 10 December 2015

Neoadjuvant treatment is currently being used in patients with early-stage and advanced disease. Its clinical benefits are: (a) higher rates of breast-conserving surgery, (b) similar prognoses for breast cancer patients receiving a neoadjuvant and for those receiving an adjuvant therapy regimen, and (c) a body of evidence showing that the achievement of a pathological complete response (pCR) after neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) is associated with a good prognosis in specific subgroups (triple-negative, *HER2*-positive). Furthermore, it may serve as a test of *in vivo* chemosensitivity, making it possible to evaluate the efficacy of systemic therapy early and to discontinue ineffective treatment.

In parallel, interest has increased in the use of pCR as a surrogate marker for long-term outcome to accelerate the approval process for new drugs since the publication by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) of a set of guidelines entitled 'Guidance for Industry. Pathologic Complete Response in Neoadjuvant Treatment of High-Risk Early-Stage Breast Cancer: Use as an Endpoint to Support Accelerated Approval'.

In the past few years, the combination of trastuzumab with NAC has become standard, as two phase III trials comparing a regimen in which trastuzumab was added to NAC and NAC alone reported higher pCR rates (MD Anderson Cancer Center trial: pCR rates: 26.3% *versus* 65.2% with and without trastuzumab, respectively (Buzdar *et al*, 2007); NOAH trial: pCR rates: 19% *versus* 38%, respectively) and longer disease-free survival (DFS) for the combined treatment (NOAH trial: 3-year EFS, 71% *versus* 56% with and without trastuzumab, respectively (Gianni *et al*, 2010)). In patients with *HER2*-positive breast tumours for whom neoadjuvant treatment is indicated, trastuzumab is generally added to chemotherapy, and the patient then receives 1 year of adjuvant trastuzumab treatment.

However, factors predictive of pCR and prognostic factors for survival have yet to be identified, and there is still no robust demonstration of the correlation between pCR and outcome in patients treated with optimal therapy. The aim of this study was to identify factors predictive of pCR and prognostic factors in a large cohort of *HER2*-positive breast cancer patients treated by NAC plus trastuzumab.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients. We analysed a cohort of 287 T1–3NxM0 patients with *HER2*-positive invasive breast carcinoma (NEOREP Cohort, CNIL declaration number 1547270) treated at Institut Curie between 2002 and 2012. We included only unilateral, non-recurrent, non-inflammatory, non-metastatic tumours, excluding T4 and lobular tumours. All patients received NAC, followed by surgery and radiotherapy. The study was approved by the Breast Cancer Study Group of Institut Curie and was conducted according to institutional and ethical rules concerning research on tissue specimens and patients. Informed consent from the patients was not required.

Tumour samples. The following histological features were retrieved: tumour type, initial tumour size and nodal status, grade (Elston and Ellis), oestrogen receptor (ER) and progesterone receptor (PR) status, *HER2* status, number of metastatic nodes, and total sentinel and non-sentinel nodes. ER and PR status were determined as follows. Tissue sections were rehydrated and antigen retrieval was carried out in citrate buffer (10 mM, pH 6.1). The sections were then incubated with antibodies against for ER (clone 6F11, Novocastra, Leica Biosystems, Newcastle, UK; 1/200) and PR (clone 1A6, Novocastra, 1/200). The antibodies were then detected with the Vectastain Elite ABC peroxidase-conjugated mouse IgG kit (Vector, Burlingame, CA, USA), with diaminobenzidine (Dako A/S, Glostrup, Denmark) as the chromogen. Positive and negative

controls were included in each run. Cases were considered positive for ER and PR if at least 10% of the tumour nuclei were stained, in accordance with standard guidelines used in France (Harvey *et al*, 1999; Gligorov and Namer, 2007). Tumours were considered to be hormone receptor (HR)-positive if they were positive for either ER or PR, and HR-negative if they were negative for both ER and PR. HER2 overexpression status was determined according to the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) guidelines (Wolff *et al*, 2007).

Treatments. Patients were treated according to national guidelines. NAC regimens changed over time (anthracycline-based regimen or sequential anthracycline-taxane regimen), with trastuzumab used in an adjuvant and/or neoadjuvant setting since the middle of the past decade. Endocrine therapy (tamoxifen, aromatase inhibitor, or GnRH agonists) was prescribed when indicated. Surgery was performed 4–6 weeks after the end of chemotherapy. All patients received adjuvant radiotherapy. Trastuzumab treatments changed over time, and the whole cohort was split into three distinct groups according to trastuzumab use. Patients who did not receive any trastuzumab were indicated as cohort A (n=35); patients who received only adjuvant trastuzumab were indicated as cohort B (n=53); and patients who received both neoadjuvant and adjuvant trastuzumab were indicated as cohort C (n=199).

Pathology assessment at NAC completion. A pCR was defined as the absence of residual invasive cancer cells in the breast and axillary lymph nodes (ypT0/is + /ypN0). Strict pCR (spCR) was defined as an absence of invasive and non-invasive residuals in the breast and invasive disease in the axillary nodes (ypT0 ypN0).

DSF and overall survival (OS). DFS was defined as the time from surgery to death, loco-regional recurrence, or distant recurrence, whichever occurred first, and OS was defined as the time from surgery to death. Patients for whom none of these events were recorded were censored at the date of their last known contact. Survival probabilities were estimated by the Kaplan–Meier method, and survival curves were compared with log-rank tests.

Descriptive analysis of pCR and DFS rates according to the three cohorts. For the pCR rate descriptive analysis, because of the known major impact on trastuzumab use on pCR rates, we chose to pool cohorts A and B (in both of which patients did not receive neaoadjuvant trastuzumab) and compared the resulting pooled cohort with cohort C (in which patients received neoadjuvant trastuzumab).

For the DFS and OS descriptive analysis, because of the known major impact on trastuzumab on DFS rates, we chose to pool cohorts B and C (in both of which patients received trastuzumab) and compared the resulting pooled cohort with cohort A (in which patients did not receive any trastuzumab).

Statistical analysis. The study population was described in terms of frequencies for qualitative variables or medians and associated ranges for quantitative variables. The cutoff date for the analysis was 13 March 2013.

The statistical analyses of the factors predictive of pCR and prognostic for DFS were performed in the cohort C only, as neoadjuvant trastuzumab in association with chemotherapy followed by adjuvant trastuzumab represents the gold standard treatment in 2015.

Factors predictive of pCR were introduced into a univariate logistic regression model. A multivariate logistic model was then implemented. The covariates selected for the multivariate analysis were those with a likelihood ratio test *P*-value < 0.10 in univariate analysis. A backward stepwise selection procedure was used.

Hazard ratios and their associated 95% confidence intervals were calculated with the Cox proportional hazard model. Variables with a *P*-value for the likelihood ratio test <0.10 in univariate analysis were included in the multivariate model. Backward selection was used to establish the final multivariate model. The proportional hazards hypothesis was tested for each factor, with Schoenfeld's residuals test and plotting. The significance threshold was 5%. Analyses were performed with the R software, version 2.13.2 (R Development Core Team, 2011).

RESULTS

Overall, 287 patients were identified in our database. The baseline characteristics of these patients are summarised in Table 1. All 287 patients received NAC and underwent surgery followed by radiotherapy. The median age of the patients was 48 years (27-79); 193 patients had T2 tumours (67.2%), and 169 had clinically involved nodes (58.9%). In total, 129 patients had HR-negative breast cancer (44.9%). Trastuzumab treatments changed over time and the characteristics of the patients are presented by treatment (cohort A, n = 35, no trastuzumab at all; cohort B, n = 53, adjuvant trastuzumab only; cohort C, n = 199, both neoadjuvant and adjuvant trastuzumab) in Table 1. There were significant differences between cohorts A, B, and C for treatment period, number of nodes involved (patients in cohort C were less likely to have nodes involved), and median follow-up. Strict pCR (spCR) and pCR rates differed significantly between the three cohorts (P < 0.0001). These rates were higher in patients given neoadjuvant trastuzumab (cohort C, pCR rate: 47.7%) than in patients who did not receive this treatment (cohorts A and B, pCR rate: 19.3% P < 0.0001) and in the HR-negative subgroups than in the HR-positive subgroups (pCR rate: 48.8% versus 31.2%, P = 0.003) (Table 2).

DFS (Figure 1A) also differed significantly between cohorts (P < 0.001). Patients treated without trastuzumab (cohort A) had a higher risk of relapse (hazard ratio = 4.84 95% CI (2.52; 9.31)) than patients receiving adjuvant trastuzumab with or without neoadjuvant trastuzumab (cohorts B and C pooled). Five-year DFS rates were 48.6% (95% CI (34.5–68.3), cohort A) *versus* 83.5% (95% CI (77.6–89.9), cohorts B and C pooled) and were not different between cohorts B and C (cohort B: 80.0%, 95% CI (69.5–92.0) *versus* cohort C 85.8%, 95% CI (79.0–93.3)).

OS (Figure 1B) was also significantly lower in cohort A (hazard ratio = 9.01, 95% CI (2.95–27.52)) than in cohorts B and C pooled (P < 0.001; 5-year OS rates: 76.9%, 95% CI (64.1–92.3)) versus 96.9; 95% CI (94.2–99.7) respectively).

pCR was predicted and prognostic analysis was performed for cohort C only (patients who received optimal neoadjuvant and adjuvant treatment, n = 199). After neoadjuvant treatment, 66 patients had no residual disease on the surgical specimen, and 29 patients had residual carcinoma *in situ* only (spCR rate: 33.2% (66 out of 199); pCR: 47.7% (95 out of 199)). The following results are given for spCR. Univariate logistic regression analysis identified two factors correlated with spCR: age at diagnosis and HR expression. Both factors remained significant in the multivariate logistic regression model (Table 3). spCR rates increased with age in both HR-positive tumours (12.5, 18.6, and 28.6% for patients <45 years, 45–55, and >55 years, respectively), and in HR-negative ones (27.3, 36.0 and 50.0%, respectively) (Figure 2).

After a median of 33 months of follow-up (range: 6–92), 18 patients experienced relapses (8 local, 3 regional, 7 distant). Two of these patients died. In univariate analysis, the factors associated with DFS were age at diagnosis, spCR and pCR, menopausal status and initial tumour stage. Tumour stage (T3: HR = 2.55, 95% CI (1.01–6.48) *versus* T1–T2: HR = 1, reference class) and spCR (No pCR: HR = 9.15, 95% CI (1.22–68.83) *versus* spCR (reference class), P = 0.03) remained significantly associated with DFS in

multivariate analysis (Table 4), though the number of events was very low in patients whose tumour achieved pCR after NAC. Fiveyear DFS rates were 78% (95% CI (66.9–90.9); no pCR group) *versus* 95% (95% CI (89.4–100); spCR group).

The persistence of *in situ* carcinoma after chemotherapy was not associated with shorter DFS than the absence of any residual disease (P = 0.17) or invasive disease only (P = 0.32).

pCR was positively associated with DFS in patients with HR-negative tumours (Figure 3A) but not in those with HR-positive tumours (Figure 3B).

DISCUSSION

Our retrospective longitudinal study highlights the major impact of the introduction of trastuzumab on *HER2*-positive tumours, with a dramatic improvement in pCR (19.3 to 47.7%), DFS (5-year DFS: 48.6 to 83.5%), and OS rates (5-year OS: 76.9 to 96.9%) between 'pre-trastuzumab' and 'trastuzumab' eras. In patients treated by NAC plus trastuzumab, we identified age at diagnosis and HR status as predictive factors for spCR and pCR and tumour stage at diagnosis as prognostic factors for DFS.

Our study confirms that patients with pCR have excellent DFS and OS. Several studies documented trastuzumab benefits in realworld practice in the adjuvant (Vici et al, 2014; Matos et al, 2014; Inwald et al, 2014; Bonifazi et al, 2014; Seferina et al, 2015; Jackisch et al, 2014) and in the metastatic setting (Olson et al, 2013; Karam et al, 2013; Park et al, 2009; Jackisch et al, 2014). Most of these authors found that the magnitude of trastuzumab benefits was equivalent to what was observed in clinical trials (improvement the relative risk for DFS by approximately 50% and OS by 30%). Few - if any - observational studies focussed on the neoadjuvant setting. Our results suggest an even higher magnitude of trastuzumab benefits in a population of HER2-positive breast tumours treated by NAC. Because of the retrospective, nonrandomised design of the study, we cannot conclude to the single role of trastuzumab effect. Indeed, there were significant differences in the three cohorts in the number of nodes involved as node-negative patients represented 77.4% of cohort C, versus 60% and 47.2% of cohorts A and B respectively. As it is known that the prognostic of breast carcinoma following NAC is largely driven by nodal status (Hennessy et al, 2005), we can assume that the dramatic differences in DFS between the three cohorts are not only explained by the trastuzumab treatment but also by post-NAC nodal status.

As expected from previous studies of neoadjuvant treatment (Untch *et al*, 2012; Baselga *et al*, 2012; Gianni *et al*, 2012), the absence of HR expression was an important predictor of pCR. This relationship may be quantitative, as some authors have reported an inverse correlation between the level of HR expression and pCR (Bhargava *et al*, 2011). Trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1) is an antibody-drug conjugate composed of the cytotoxic agent DM1 and trastuzumab, connected by a stable thioether linker. The ADAPT trial (NCT01745965) is currently investigating if the concomitant adjunction of endocrine therapy to T-DM1 neoadjuvant therapy would increase pCR rates in HER2 + /HR + operable breast cancers.

In our cohort, older age was significantly associated with spCR. These finding are consistent with those of a retrospective study of 229 *HER2*-positive tumours treated by NAC plus trastuzumab, in which both being young and premenopausal status were significantly associated with lower pCR rates (Kim *et al*, 2013). By contrast, Huober *et al* (2010) found no difference in pCR rates between two age groups (<40 years *versus* \geq 40 years) for 475 *HER2*-positive tumours. However, none of these patients were treated with neoadjuvant trastuzumab. Similarly, the German

Table 1. Patients, tumours, and treatment characteristics, by cohort (cohort A, n = 35, no trastuzumab; cohort B, n = 53, adjuvanttrastuzumab only; cohort C, n = 199, both neadjuvant and adjuvant trastuzumab)

	Whole population (n = 287)		Cohort A (n = 35), no trastuzumab		Cohort B (n = 53), adjuvant tz* only		Cohort C (n = 199), neoadjuvant and adjuvant tz*		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	P-value
Time period	1							· · · · · ·	
2002–2005	70	24.4%	34	97.1%	25	47.2%	11	5.5%	< 0.01
2006–2011	217	75.6%	1	2.9%	28	52.8%	188	94.5%	
Age	445	40.400	10	24.20/	0.4	45.00/	70	20.70	0.70
<45 y.o. 45–55 y.o	94	40.1%	12	34.3% 31.4%	24 18	45.3% 34.0%	65	39.7% 32.7%	0.70
>55 y.o.	78	27.2%	12	34.3%	11	20.8%	55	27.6%	
Menopausal status									
Premenopausal	176	61.3%	20	57.1%	36	67.9%	120	60.3%	0.42
Postmenopausal	110	38.3%	15	42.9%	16	30.2%	/9	39.7%	
	10	(29/	2	0 / 9/	2	2.00/	10	(50/	0.80
T2	193	67.2%	24	68.6%	∠ 35	3.8% 66.0%	13	67.3%	0.89
Т3	75	26.1%	8	22.9%	15	28.3%	52	26.1%	
N stage									
NO	118	41.1%	20	57.1%	17	32.1%	81	40.7%	0.06
N1, N2, N3	169	58.9%	15	42.9%	36	67.9%	118	59.3%	
BMI = 20	252	00.20/	21	00 (0)	40	02.50/	170	0 (00)	0.50
BMI≤30 BMI>30	253	88.2% 11.5%	4	88.6% 11.4%	49	92.5% 7.5%	25	86.9% 12.6%	0.59
Histological type									
Ductal	271	94.4%	29	82.9%	50	94.3%	192	96.5%	0.84
Others	7	2.4%	1	2.9%	1	1.9%	5	2.5%	
Grade (EE)									
Grade I	2	0.7%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	0.23
Grade III	179	62.4%	17	48.6%	20	54.7%	133	66.8%	
Hormone receptor (HR))	1							
	1		1	E4 40/		E0.00/	444	EE 00/	0.88
Positive	157	54.7%	18	51.4%	28	52.8%	111	55.0%	0.00
Positive Negative	157 129	54.7% 44.9%	18 17	51.4% 48.6%	28	52.8% 45.3%	88	44.2%	0.00
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El	157 129 R)	54.7% 44.9%	18 17	51.4% 48.6%	28 24	52.8%	88	44.2%	0.00
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive	157 129 R) 138 149	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9%	18 17 17 17 18	51.4% 48.6% 48.6% 51.4%	28 24 27 26	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1%	94 105	44.2% 47.2% 52.8%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor	157 129 R) 138 149 (PR)	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9%	18 17 17 18	48.6% 48.6% 51.4%	28 24 27 26	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1%	94 105	47.2% 52.8%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative	157 129 R) 138 149 (PR) 183	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9%	18 17 17 18 25	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4%	28 24 27 26 33	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3%	94 105	47.2% 52.8%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive	157 129 R) 138 149 (PR) 183 100	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8%	18 17 17 18 25 9	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8%	94 105 125 72	47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery	157 129 3) (PR) 183 100	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8%	18 17 17 18 25 9	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8%	94 105 125 72	47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 199 88	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 20.7%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 26	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19 	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 25.9%	94 105 125 72 139	47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy	157 129 R) (PR) (PR) 183 100 199 88 88 8	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0%	28 24 27 26 33 19 34 19 0	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8	47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (Ef Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 199 88 8 8 279	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0%	28 24 27 26 33 19 34 19 0 53	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191	53.8% 44.2% 52.8% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 88 8 8 279 ved	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0%	28 24 27 26 33 19 34 19 0 53	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191	47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0%	0.89
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 88 8 279 ved 200	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 69.7%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0%	28 24 27 26 33 19 9 34 19 0 53 25 25	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 154	33.8% 44.2% 47.2% 52.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4%	0.00
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol None 1–3 ≥ 4	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 700 88 8 279 ved 200 67 20	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35 21 11 3	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 60.0% 31.4% 8.6%	28 24 27 26 33 19 0 53 4 19 0 53 25 21 7	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 91 154 35 10	33.8% 44.2% 47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0%	0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection None 1–3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 199 88 88 8 279 ved 200 67 20	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 31.4% 8.6%	28 24 27 26 33 19 34 19 0 53 25 21 7	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 154 35 10	33.8% 44.2% 47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0%	0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection None 1–3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No	157 129 R) 138 149 (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 200 88 8 279 ved 200 67 20 67 20	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35 21 11 3 21 11 3 29	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9%	28 24 27 26 33 19 33 19 34 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 7 49	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 0 8 191 154 35 10 133	33.8% 44.2% 52.8% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 777.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol None 1–3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 211 76	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35 27 11 11 3 3 29 6	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 60.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1%	28 24 27 26 33 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 49 49 4	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 139 60 8 191 154 35 10 133 66	33.8% 44.2% 44.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2%	0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol None 1-3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes pCR	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 88 8 279 ved 200 67 20 200 67 20	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35 21 11 3 21 11 3 29 6	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 60.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1%	28 24 27 26 33 19 34 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 25 21 7 49 49 4	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 139 60 8 191 154 35 10 133 66	33.8% 44.2% 47.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2%	0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection None 1–3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 20 20 200 67 20 67 20 20 211 76	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5% 61.0% 39.0%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 20 35 21 11 3 3 29 6 29 6	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1% 82.57%	28 24 27 26 33 19 34 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 49 4 4 4 5 8	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5% 84.9% 15.1%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 0 8 191 154 35 10 154 35 10 104 95	33.8% 44.2% 52.8% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol None 1-3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes pCR No Yes Adjuvant chemotherapy	157 129 R) (PR) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 (PR) 88 8 279 ved 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 711 76	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5% 61.0% 39.0%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35 21 11 13 3 29 6 20 6 20 29 6	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 60.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1% 74.3% 25.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19 0 53 25 21 7 25 21 7 25 21 7 25 21 7 25 21 7 8	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5% 84.9% 15.1%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 139 60 8 191 154 35 10 10 133 66 104 95	33.8% 44.2% 44.2% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 52.3% 47.7%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol None 1-3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes Adjuvant chemotherapy	157 129 R) (PR) 138 149 (PR) 183 100 200 67 200 67 20 200 67 20 200 67 20 200 67 20 200 57 20 200 57 20 200 67 20 20 20 20 211 76	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5% 61.0% 39.0%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 20 21 11 3 3 29 6 29 6 29 6 29 6 29 33	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1% 82.9% 17.1% 74.3% 25.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 7 49 4 9 4 9 4 53 37	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5% 92.5% 7.5% 84.9% 15.1%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 139 60 8 191 133 66 104 95 184	33.8% 44.2% 52.8% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2% 66.8% 33.2%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection None 1-3 ≥4 Strict pCR No Yes Adjuvant chemotherapy No Yes	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 88 88 8 279 ved 200 67 20 67 20 201 67 20 211 76 76 20 211 76 76	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5% 61.0% 39.0% 88.5% 11.5%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 20 35 21 11 3 3 29 6 26 9 6 26 9 29 6 26 9 29 6	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1% 82.9% 17.1% 74.3% 25.7% 94.3% 5.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19 33 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 8 37 16	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5% 84.9% 15.1% 69.8% 30.2%	111 88 94 105 72 125 72 139 60 8 191 0 8 191 0 154 35 10 104 95 0 104 95 0 184 15	33.8% 44.2% 52.8% 52.8% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2% 66.8% 33.2% 7.5%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection None 1–3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes pCR No Yes Adjuvant chemotherapy No Yes	157 129 R) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 100 20 20 20 67 20 20 67 20 20 211 76 20 211 76 20 211 76 20 211 76	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 73.5% 26.5% 73.5% 26.5% 61.0% 39.0% 88.5% 11.5%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 21 11 3 3 2 29 6 26 9 6 26 9 29 6 26 9 29 6	51.4% 48.6% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1% 74.3% 25.7% 94.3% 5.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19 33 19 0 53 34 19 0 53 25 21 7 25 21 7 25 21 7 49 4 4 4 5 8 8 37 16	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5% 7.5% 84.9% 15.1% 69.8% 30.2%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 139 60 8 191 133 66 104 95 104 95	33.8% 44.2% 52.8% 36.2% 62.8% 36.2% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 77.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2% 92.5% 7.5%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01
Positive Negative Oestrogen receptor (El Negative Positive Progesterone receptor Negative Positive Surgery Lumpectomy Mastectomy Sentinel node Biopsy Axillary node dissection Number of nodes invol None 1-3 ≥ 4 Strict pCR No Yes pCR No Yes Adjuvant chemotherapy No Yes Do Yes No Yes	157 129 R) (PR) (PR) 183 100 (PR) 183 8 8 279 ved 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 67 200 47 200 67 200 57 200 8 8 8 279 ved 211 76 201 211 76 211 212 254 33	54.7% 44.9% 48.1% 51.9% 63.8% 34.8% 69.3% 30.7% 2.8% 97.2% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 69.7% 23.3% 7.0% 88.5% 11.5%	18 17 17 18 25 9 26 9 0 35 26 9 0 35 20 21 11 3 3 2 9 6 20 6 20 9 0 35 20 9 0 35 20 0 35 20 0 35 20 0 35 20 0 35 20 0 35 20 0 35 20 0 35 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	51.4% 48.6% 51.4% 71.4% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 0.0% 100.0% 60.0% 31.4% 8.6% 82.9% 17.1% 74.3% 25.7% 74.3% 25.7% 94.3% 5.7%	28 24 27 26 33 19 0 53 25 21 7 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 25 21 7 25 21 7 7 25 21 7 16 37 16 37 16	52.8% 45.3% 50.9% 49.1% 62.3% 35.8% 64.2% 35.8% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 47.2% 39.6% 13.2% 92.5% 7.5% 7.5% 84.9% 15.1% 69.8% 30.2%	111 88 94 105 125 72 139 60 8 191 133 60 8 191 154 35 10 133 66 104 95 184 15 15 0 0 0 0 0	33.8% 44.2% 47.2% 52.8% 36.2% 62.8% 36.2% 69.8% 30.2% 4.0% 96.0% 777.4% 17.6% 5.0% 777.4% 17.6% 5.0% 66.8% 33.2% 66.8% 33.2% 7.5% 7.5%	0.00 0.89 0.51 0.61 0.32 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01

Table 1. (Continued)									
	Whole population (n = 287)		Cohort A (n = 35), no trastuzumab		Cohort B (<i>n</i> =53), adjuvant tz* only		Cohort C (n = 199), neoadjuvant and adjuvant tz*		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	P-value
Endocrine therapy									
No	150	52.3%	19	54.3%	32	60.4%	99	49.7%	0.38
Yes	137	47.7%	16	45.7%	21	39.6%	100	50.3%	
Tamoxifen	65	22.6%	14	40.0%	7	13.2%	44	22.1%	
Aromatase inhibitor	50	17.4%	1	2.9%	5	9.4%	44	22.1%	
Others	22	7.7%	1	2.9%	9	17.0%	12	6.0%	
Follow-up									
Median (range)	46	(6–122)	96	(40–122)	67	(25–95)	33	(6–92)	< 0.01
Abbreviations: $EE = Elston Ellis; p$ n = 9; grade $n = 13;$ HR, $n = 1;$ PR	CR = pathologicR: n = 4; radiothe	cal complete response rapy $n = 2$; adjuvant	se; tz* = trastuzu chemotherapy /	mab; y.o. = years old n = 34.	. Missing value	es: menopausal sta	tus n=1; T stage	e n = 1; BMI n = 1;	histological type

Table 2. Pathological response rates by definition, by cohort, and by hormone receptor status								
	Whole population (n=287)	Р	Cohort A (<i>n</i> = 35)	Cohort B (n = 53)	Cohort C (n = 199)	Р		
pCR								
No Yes	175/287 (60.9%) 112/287 (39.0%)		26/35 (74.3%) 9/35 (25.7%)	45/53 (84.9%) 8/53 (15.1%)	104/199 (52.3%) 95/199 (47.7%)	< 0.0001		
			17/88	(19.3%)	95/199 (47.7%)	< 0.0001		
HR positive HR negative	49/157 (31.2%) 63/129 (48.8%)	0.0035	2/18 (11.1%) 7/17 (41.2%)	5/28 (17.9%) 3/24 (12.5%)	42/111 (37.8%) 53/88 (60.2%)			
Strict pCR								
No Yes	211/287 (73.5%) 76/287 (26.5%)		29/35 (82.8%) 6/35 (17.1%)	49/53 (92.5%) 4/53 (7.5%)	133/199 (66.8%) 66/199 (33.1%)	0.0002		
			10/88	(11.4%)	66/199 (33.1%)	< 0.00001		
HR positive HR negative	29/157 (18.5%) 47/129 (36.4%)	0.001	1/18 (5.6%) 5/17 (29.4%)	2/28 (7.1%) ^a 2/24 (8.3%)	26/111 (23.4%) 40/88 (45.5%)			
Abbreviations: $HR = hor$ ^a HR not available $n = 1$	mone receptor; pCR = pathological	complete respons	e.					



Figure 1. (A) DFS and (B) OS by cohort (cohort A: no trastuzumab; cohort B: adjuvant trastuzumab only; cohort C: neoadjuvant and adjuvant trastuzumab).

Breast Group (GBG) and the AGO-B study group published a meta-analysis focussing on the impact of age on NAC outcomes. In 1820 patients with *HER2*-positive tumours, pCR rates did not differ significantly with age in either HR-positive or HR-negative tumours (Loibl *et al*, 2015). Patients with *HER2*-positive disease received anti-*HER2* treatment as part of the neoadjuvant treatment in three of the eight trials of this meta-analysis.

Initial T stage remained a significant prognostic factor. This finding is consistent with those of several other studies (Kim *et al*, 2013; Takada *et al*, 2014; Tanioka *et al*, 2014), although similar results were obtained only for the HR-negative subgroup in the study by Takada *et al* (2014).

In a sub-study of EORTC 10994/BIG 1-00 phase III trial (Fei *et al*, 2015) on 283 patients with pCR achievement after NAC, only clinical tumour size independently predicted relapse. Several hypotheses can be drawn to explain the independent impact of tumoral size. The first one is that large tumours may be more likely to present intrinsic or acquired chemoresistance. Causal factors

Table 3. Odds	ratios for predic	ting strict pCR (univariate and m	ultivariate analy	/ses)			
			Univariate analysis	;	Multivariate analysis			
	pCR (%)	OR	95% CI	P-value	OR	95% CI	P-value	
BMI, kg m ⁻²								
BMI≤30 BMI>30	33.5 32.0	1 0.93	(0.36; 2.23)	0.88				
Age								
<45 y.o. 45–55 y.o >55 y.o.	24.1 35.4 43.6	1 1.73 2.44	(0.84; 3.60) (1.17; 5.19)	0.02	1 1.44 2.74		0.03	
Menopausal sta	tus							
Premenopausal Postmenopausal	29.2 39.2	1 1.57	(0.86; 2.86)	0.14				
T stage								
T1–T2 T3	34.0 30.8	1 0.86	(0.43; 1.68)	0.67				
N stage								
N0 N1, N2, N3	37.0 30.5	1 0.75	(0.41; 1.36)	0.34				
Grade (EE)								
Grade I–II Grade III	35.5 32.3	1 0.87	(0.46; 1.65)	0.66				
ER								
Positive Negative	21.9 45.7	1 3.01	(1.64; 5.56)	< 0.01				
PR								
Positive Negative	19.4 41.6	1 2.95	(1.51; 5.88)	< 0.01				
HR		-						
Positive Negative	23.4 45.5	1 2.72	(1.49; 5.05)	< 0.01	1 2.97	(1.57; 5.63)	< 0.01	
Abbreviations: BMI = b	body mass index; $CI = cc$	onfidence interval; EE =	Elston Ellis; ER=oestroge	en receptor; HR = horm	one receptor; OR = odd	ds ratio; pCR = pathologica	al complete response;	

PR=progesterone receptor; y.o.=years old



Figure 2. pCR rates by age and HR status.

may first include a variety of physical and mechanical effects (e.g., inefficient distribution of the drug, central necrosis and hypoxia, anarchic neoangiogenesis). Second, the immune reaction appears to evolve with tumour progression, and it is known that immune subpopulations densities change with increasing stage (Bindea *et al*, 2013; Fridman *et al*, 2012) potentially impairing the response to chemotherapy. Third, tumoral heterogeneity increases with tumour size, leading to the potential emergence of drug-multiresistant clones.

A second hypothesis considers the kinetics of the tumour growth. Mathematical modellings (Hartung *et al*, 2014) validate the link between primary tumour size and emission rate, that is, metastatic spreading. In clinical practice, this relation between a large tumour size and the presence of circulating tumour cells in peripheral blood has also been identified (Liao *et al*, 2014). Considering initial exponential growth phase of the Gompertz model (Benzekry *et al*, 2014) and the high proliferation rate of *HER2*-positive breast cancers, it seems plausible that these tumours may rapidly toggle from localised breast cancers to a micrometastatic disease. The subsequent pivotal transition between micrometastases and macrometastases (namely the metastatic colonisation) is still poorly understood. It remains unknown if tumoral size may impact this process. Both phenomena (chemoresistance and micrometastic spreading) may coexist and share pathways by complex homing interactions.

It remains a matter of debate whether pCR can be used as a surrogate for DFS in HER2-positive breast carcinomas, particularly those that are HR-positive. In our cohort, residual disease was associated with a hazard ratio for relapse of 9 relative to patients with spCR. This effect was limited to HR-negative tumours. In a large meta-analysis of 6377 patients with primary breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant anthracycline-taxane-based chemotherapy in seven randomised trials, Von Minckwitz et al (2012) identified pCR as a surrogate marker for both DFS and OS in HER2-positive subgroups. In patients with HER2-positive tumours treated with trastuzumab (n = 662), pCR was associated with a hazard ratio of 2.85 ((1.69-4.83), P<0.001) for DFS and of 14.11 ((1.93-103.03), P < 0.009) for OS. However, the prognostic impact of pCR was restricted to HR-negative tumours. It was not observed in the luminal B/HER2-positive subgroup. In a recent pooled analysis of 12 international trials and 11955 patients (CTNeoBC), Cortazar et al (2014) found a significant association between pCR and

Table 4. Hazard	ratios for predicti	ng DFS (univariate a	nd multivariate ar	nalyses)			
		Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis			
	HR	95% CI	Р	HR	95% CI	Р	
BMI, kg m ⁻²							
BMI≤30 BMI>30	1 2.05	(0.67; 6.26)	0.24				
Age							
<45 y.o. 45–55 y.o >55 y.o.	1 1.32 0.17	(0.51; 3.43) (0.02; 1.36)	0.04				
Menopausal statu	s						
Premenopausal Postmenopausal	1 0.40	(0.13; 1.21)	0.08				
T stage							
T1–T2 T3	1 2.44	(0.96; 6.19)	0.07	1 2.55	(1.01–6.48)	0.05	
N stage							
N0 N1, N2, N3	1 1.45	(0.55; 3.87)	0.45				
Grade (EE)							
Grade I–II Grade III	1 0.65	(0.25; 1.71)	0.39				
HR							
Positive Negative	1 1.48	(0.59; 3.76)	0.41				
pCR							
Yes No	1 4.68		< 0.01				
Strict pCR							
Yes No	1 8.81		<0.01	1 9.15	(1.22; 68.83)	0.03	
Abbreviations: BMI = boo response; y.o. = years old	dy mass index; CI=confi d.	dence interval; DFS=disease	-free survival; $EE = Elston$	Ellis; HR=hazard ratio; H	HR = hormone receptor; pCR =	pathological complete	

event-free survival in both the HR-positive and HR-negative subgroups, although the magnitude of this effect was greater in HR-negative tumours (HR-positive, 0.58 (0.42-0.82); HR-negative: 0.25 (0.18-0.34)). However, a subset of *HER2*-positive breast cancer did not receive adjuvant trastuzumab. When the analysis was restricted to patients who received trastuzumab, the association between pCR and OS was not significant in HR-positive tumours (0.56 (0.23-1.37)). In addition, three multicenter retrospective studies on *HER2*-positive breast tumours treated with NAC and trastuzumab identified pCR as a surrogate marker for DFS in HR-negative disease (Tanioka *et al*, 2014; Takada *et al*, 2014; Kim *et al*, 2013), but the results for the HR-positive group were discordant, with a positive association retrieved by some authors (Kim *et al*, 2013) but not by others (Takada *et al*, 2014; Tanioka *et al*, 2014).

Our study adds weight to the findings of previous investigations, because it focusses on a particular breast cancer subtype and reports results for a large population treated with NAC and trastuzumab, the gold standard treatment in 2015. This study provides a better representation of real-life experience than previous meta-analyses of clinical trials, because, although meta-analysis provide an effective means of acquiring large amounts of data, the patients included in clinical trials differ from the general population. Our data confirm the association of pCR with DFS in *HER2*-positive, HR-negative breast cancers and provide new insight that could improve prognostic prediction. The absence of a significant effect in the HR-positive subgroup might be due to biological differences though we cannot exclude a lack of statistical power.

The confirmation of a quantitative correlation between increments in pCR and gains in survival in large data sets is of paramount importance for accelerated drug approval for the neoadjuvant model. It is particularly important because the HER2-targeting drug pipeline contains many candidates. The novel anti-HER2 antibody pertuzumab has obtained accelerated approval from the US FDA (Prowell and Pazdur, 2012) for use in the neoadjuvant setting for HER2positive breast cancer, based on the results of the NEOSPHERE trial (Gianni et al, 2012). Definitive approval for pertuzumab will depend on the results of the APHINITY trial evaluating the addition of pertuzumab to adjuvant trastuzumab-based chemotherapy. Controversy concerning the legitimacy of pCR as a surrogate re-emerged with the results of the ALTTO trial in ASCO 2014 (Piccart-Gebhart et al, 2014). In this study, addition of lapatinib to standard trastuzumab adjuvant therapy was not found to improve survival in women with HER2-positive early breast cancer. This result was unexpected, because the combination of lapatinib and trastuzumab was associated with higher rates of pCR rates in the neoALTTO trial (Baselga et al, 2012). Improving pCR rates may theoretically: (i) increase conservative treatment probabilities; and (ii) identify a population at higher risk of relapse and thus help selecting patients likely to benefit from new therapies. Accurate and sharp patient selection may avoid failure of all-comers trials such as ALTTO and MARIANNE (NCT01120184). The KATHERINE trial (NCT01772472) is currently investigating TDM-1 as alternative adjuvant treatment to trastuzumab in HER2-positive patients with residual disease following NAC. Our study supports this design for new drug testing, bearing in mind that even in patients with residual disease DFS rates were high in our cohort.





CONCLUSION

Trastuzumab considerably modifies the prognosis of HER2positive breast carcinomas. These tumours have an excellent prognosis when pCR is achieved. However, it remains unclear whether second-line HER2-targeted treatments with pertuzumab, lapatinib or TDM1 following NAC improve survival in selected patients. Our findings suggest that patients with HER2-positive tumours of a large initial size, for which pCR is not achieved at the end of NAC, remain at risk of relapse despite adjuvant trastuzumab treatments. Such patients could be studied in second-line treatment trials. However, there is a need to rethink future clinical trial designs bearing in mind several pitfalls: (i) sufficient recruitment of patients despite the scarcity of trastuzumab-resistant patients; (ii) consider a different disease setting with possibly already micrometastatic populations and thus consider new therapeutic targets to investigate (Mina and Sledge, 2011); and (iii) finally, expected events may be low, and only international collaborative works will allow sufficient population size. The challenge still needs to be overcome.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Roche, France for financial support for construction of the Institut Curie neoadjuvant database (NEOREP). Funding was also obtained from the Site de Recherche Integrée en Cancérologie/ Institut National du Cancer (Grant No. INCa-DGOS-4654). A-S Hamy-Petit was supported by an ITMO-INSERM-AVIESAN cancer translational research grant.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Baselga J, Bradbury I, Eidtmann H, Di Cosimo S, de Azambuja E, Aura C, Gómez H, Dinh P, Fauria K, Van Dooren V, Aktan G, Goldhirsch A, Chang T-W, Horváth Z, Coccia-Portugal M, Domont J, Tseng L-M, Kunz G, Sohn JH, Semiglazov V, Lerzo G, Palacova M, Probachai V, Pusztai L, Untch M, Gelber RD, Piccart-Gebhart M. NeoALTTO Study Team (2012) Lapatinib with trastuzumab for HER2-positive early breast cancer (NeoALTTO): a randomised, open-label, multicentre, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 379: 633–640.
- Benzekry S, Lamont C, Beheshti A, Tracz A, Ebos JML, Hlatky L, Hahnfeldt P (2014) Classical mathematical models for description and prediction of experimental tumor growth. *PLoS Comput Biol* **10**: e1003800.
- Bhargava R, Dabbs DJ, Beriwal S, Yildiz IA, Badve P, Soran A, Johnson RR, Brufsky AM, Lembersky BC, McGuire KP, Ahrendt GM (2011) Semiquantitative hormone receptor level influences response to trastuzumab-containing neoadjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-positive breast cancer. *Mod Pathol* 24: 367–374.
- Bindea G, Mlecnik B, Tosolini M, Kirilovsky A, Waldner M, Obenauf AC, Angell H, Fredriksen T, Lafontaine L, Berger A, Bruneval P, Fridman WH, Becker C, Pagès F, Speicher MR, Trajanoski Z, Galon J (2013) Spatiotemporal dynamics of intratumoral immune cells reveal the immune landscape in human cancer. *Immunity* **39**: 782–795.
- Bonifazi M, Franchi M, Rossi M, Zambelli A, Moja L, Zambon A, Corrao G, La Vecchia C, Zocchetti C, Negri E (2014) Long term survival of HER2positive early breast cancer treated with trastuzumab-based adjuvant regimen: a large cohort study from clinical practice. *Breast* 23: 573–578.
- Buzdar AU, Valero V, Ibrahim NK, Francis D, Broglio KR, Theriault RL, Pusztai L, Green MC, Singletary SE, Hunt KK, Sahin AA, Esteva F, Symmans WF, Ewer MS, Buchholz TA, Hortobagyi GN (2007) Neoadjuvant therapy with paclitaxel followed by 5-fluorouracil, epirubicin, and cyclophosphamide chemotherapy and concurrent trastuzumab in human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive operable breast cancer: an update of the initial randomized study population and data of additional patients treated with the same regimen. *Clin Cancer Res* 13: 228–233.
- Cortazar P, Zhang L, Untch M, Mehta K, Costantino JP, Wolmark N, Bonnefoi H, Cameron D, Gianni L, Valagussa P, Swain SM, Prowell T, Loibl S, Wickerham DL, Bogaerts J, Baselga J, Perou C, Blumenthal G, Blohmer J, Mamounas EP, Bergh J, Semiglazov V, Justice R, Eidtmann H, Paik S, Piccart M, Sridhara R, Fasching PA, Slaets L, Tang S, Gerber B, Geyer CE, Pazdur R, Ditsch N, Rastogi P, Eiermann W, von Minckwitz G (2014) Pathological complete response and long-term clinical benefit in breast cancer: the CTNeoBC pooled analysis. *Lancet* 384: 164–172.
- Fei F, Messina C, Slaets L, Chakiba C, Cameron D, Bogaerts J, Bonnefoi H (2015) Tumour size is the only predictive factor of distant recurrence after pathological complete response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with large operable or locally advanced breast cancers: a sub-study of EORTC 10994/BIG 1-00 phase III trial. Eur J Cancer 51: 301–309.
- Fridman WH, Pagès F, Sautès-Fridman C, Galon J (2012) The immune contexture in human tumours: impact on clinical outcome. *Nat Rev Cancer* 12: 298–306.
- Gianni L, Eiermann W, Semiglazov V, Manikhas A, Lluch A, Tjulandin S, Zambetti M, Vazquez F, Byakhow M, Lichinitser M, Climent MA, Ciruelos E, Ojeda B, Mansutti M, Bozhok A, Baronio R, Feyereislova A, Barton C, Valagussa P, Baselga J (2010) Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with trastuzumab followed by adjuvant trastuzumab versus neoadjuvant chemotherapy alone, in patients with HER2-positive locally advanced breast cancer (the NOAH trial): a randomised controlled superiority trial with a parallel HER2-negative cohort. *Lancet* **375**: 377–384.
- Gianni L, Pienkowski T, Im Y-H, Roman L, Tseng L-M, Liu M-C, Lluch A, Staroslawska E, de la Haba-Rodriguez J, Im S-A, Pedrini JL, Poirier B, Morandi P, Semiglazov V, Srimuninnimit V, Bianchi G, Szado T,

Ratnayake J, Ross G, Valagussa P (2012) Efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant pertuzumab and trastuzumab in women with locally advanced, inflammatory, or early HER2-positive breast cancer (NeoSphere): a randomised multicentre, open-label, phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol* **13**: 25–32.

Gligorov J, Namer M (2007) Recommandations pour la Pratique Clinique: Saint Paul de Vence. *Oncologie* **9**: 593–644.

Hartung N, Mollard S, Barbolosi D, Benabdallah A, Chapuisat G, Henry G, Giacometti S, Iliadis A, Ciccolini J, Faivre C, Hubert F (2014) Mathematical modeling of tumor growth and metastatic spreading: validation in tumor-bearing mice. *Cancer Res* 74: 6397–6407.

Harvey JM, Clark GM, Osborne CK, Allred DC (1999) Estrogen receptor status by immunohistochemistry is superior to the ligand-binding assay for predicting response to adjuvant endocrine therapy in breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* **17**: 1474–1481.

Hennessy BT, Hortobagyi GN, Rouzier R, Kuerer H, Sneige N, Buzdar AU, Kau SW, Fornage B, Sahin A, Broglio K, Singletary SE, Valero V (2005) Outcome after pathologic complete eradication of cytologically proven breast cancer axillary node metastases following primary chemotherapy. J Clin Oncol 23: 9304–9311.

Huober J, von Minckwitz G, Denkert C, Tesch H, Weiss E, Zahm DM, Belau A, Khandan F, Hauschild M, Thomssen C, Högel B, Darb-Esfahani S, Mehta K, Loibl S (2010) Effect of neoadjuvant anthracycline-taxane-based chemotherapy in different biological breast cancer phenotypes: overall results from the GeparTrio study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 124: 133–140.

Inwald EC, Ortmann O, Zeman F, Koller M, Hofstädter F, Gerstenhauer M, Klinkhammer-Schalke M (2014) Guideline concordant therapy prolongs survival in HER2-positive breast cancer patients: results from a large population-based cohort of a cancer registry. *BioMed Res Int* 2014: 137304.

Jackisch C, Schoenegg W, Reichert D, Welslau M, Selbach J, Harich H-D, Tesch H, Wohlfarth T, Eustermann H, Hinke A (2014) Trastuzumab in advanced breast cancer–a decade of experience in Germany. *BMC Cancer* 14: 924.

Karam I, Hamilton S, Nichol A, Woods R, Speers C, Kennecke H, Tyldesley S (2013) Population-based outcomes after brain radiotherapy in patients with brain metastases from breast cancer in the pre-Trastuzumab and Trastuzumab eras. *Radiat Oncol* 8: 12.

Kim MM, Allen P, Gonzalez-Angulo AM, Woodward WA, Meric-Bernstam F, Buzdar AU, Hunt KK, Kuerer HM, Litton JK, Hortobagyi GN, Buchholz TA, Mittendorf EA (2013) Pathologic complete response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy with trastuzumab predicts for improved survival in women with HER2-overexpressing breast cancer. Ann Oncol 24: 1999–2004.

Liao Y, Wang S-Y, Meng X-Y, Yang J, Shi M-J, Liu H-L, Chen F-F, Xiong B (2014) Circulating tumor cells in breast cancer and its association with tumor clinicopathological characteristics: a meta-analysis. *Med Oncol* 31: 343.

Loibl S, Jackisch C, Lederer B, Untch M, Paepke S, Kümmel S, Schneeweiss A, Huober J, Hilfrich J, Hanusch C, Gerber B, Eidtmann H, Denkert C, Costa SD, Blohmer J-U, Nekljudova V, Mehta K, von Minckwitz G (2015) Outcome after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in young breast cancer patients: a pooled analysis of individual patient data from eight prospectively randomized controlled trials. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* **152**: 377–387.

Matos E, Zakotnik B, Kuhar CG (2014) Effectiveness of adjuvant trastuzumab in daily clinical practice. *Radiol Oncol* 48: 403–407.

Mina LA, Sledge GW (2011) Rethinking the metastatic cascade as a therapeutic target. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* **8**: 325–332.

Olson EM, Najita JS, Sohl J, Arnaout A, Burstein HJ, Winer EP, Lin NU (2013) Clinical outcomes and treatment practice patterns of patients with HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer in the post-trastuzumab era. *Breast* **22**: 525–531.

Park YH, Park MJ, Ji SH, Yi SY, Lim DH, Nam DH, Lee J-I, Park W, Choi DH, Huh SJ, Ahn JS, Kang WK, Park K, Im Y-H (2009) Trastuzumab treatment improves brain metastasis outcomes through control and durable prolongation of systemic extracranial disease in HER2-overexpressing breast cancer patients. *Br J Cancer* 100: 894–900. Piccart-Gebhart MJ, Holmes AP, Baselga J, Azambuja ED, Dueck AC, Viale G, Zujewski JA, Goldhirsch A, Santillana S, Pritchard KI, Wolff AC, Jackisch C, Lang I, Untch M, Smith IE, Boyle F, Xu B, Gomez HL, Gelber RD, Perez EA (2014) First results from the phase III ALTTO trial (BIG 2-06; NCCTG [Alliance] N063D) comparing one year of anti-HER2 therapy with lapatinib alone (L), trastuzumab alone (T), their sequence (T \rightarrow L), or their combination (T + L) in the adjuvant treatment of HER2positive early breast cancer (EBC). *J Clin Oncol* **32**: 5s.

Prowell TM, Paźdur R (2012) Pathological complete response and accelerated drug approval in early breast cancer. N Engl J Med 366: 2438–2441.

R Development Core Team (2011) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. The R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, Available from http://www.R-project.org/.

Seferina SC, Lobbezoo DJA, de Boer M, Dercksen MW, van den Berkmortel F, van Kampen RJW, van de Wouw AJ, de Vries B, Joore MA, Peer PGM, Voogd AC, Tjan-Heijnen VCG (2015) Real-life use and effectiveness of adjuvant trastuzumab in early breast cancer patients: a study of the Southeast Netherlands Breast Cancer Consortium. Oncologist 20: 856–863.

Takada M, Ishiguro H, Nagai S, Ohtani S, Kawabata H, Yanagita Y, Hozumi Y, Shimizu C, Takao S, Sato N, Kosaka Y, Sagara Y, Iwata H, Ohno S, Kuroi K, Masuda N, Yamashiro H, Sugimoto M, Kondo M, Naito Y, Sasano H, Inamoto T, Morita S, Toi M (2014) Survival of HER2-positive primary breast cancer patients treated by neoadjuvant chemotherapy plus trastuzumab: a multicenter retrospective observational study (JBCRG-C03 study). Breast Cancer Res Treat 145: 143–153.

Tanioka M, Sasaki M, Shimomura A, Fujishima M, Doi M, Matsuura K, Sakuma T, Yoshimura K, Saeki T, Ohara M, Tsurutani J, Watatani M, Takano T, Kawabata H, Mukai H, Naito Y, Hirokaga K, Takao S, Minami H (2014) Pathologic complete response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-overexpressing breast cancer according to hormonal receptor status. *Breast* 23: 466–472.

Untch M, Loibl S, Bischoff J, Eidtmann H, Kaufmann M, Blohmer J-U, Hilfrich J, Strumberg D, Fasching PA, Kreienberg R, Tesch H, Hanusch C, Gerber B, Rezai M, Jackisch C, Huober J, Kühn T, Nekljudova V, von Minckwitz G. German Breast Group (GBG)Arbeitsgemeinschaft Gynäkologische Onkologie-Breast (AGO-B) Study Group (2012) Lapatinib versus trastuzumab in combination with neoadjuvant anthracycline-taxane-based chemotherapy (GeparQuinto, GBG 44): a randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* **13**: 135–144.

Vici P, Pizzuti L, Natoli C, Moscetti L, Mentuccia L, Vaccaro A, Sergi D, Di Lauro L, Trenta P, Seminara P, Santini D, Iezzi L, Tinari N, Bertolini I, Sini V, Mottolese M, Giannarelli D, Giotta F, Maugeri-Saccà M, Barba M, Marchetti P, Michelotti A, Sperduti I, Gamucci T (2014) Outcomes of HER2-positive early breast cancer patients in the pre-trastuzumab and trastuzumab eras: a real-world multicenter observational analysis. The RETROHER study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 147: 599–607.

Von Minckwitz G, Untch M, Blohmer J-U, Costa SD, Eidtmann H, Fasching PA, Gerber B, Eiermann W, Hilfrich J, Huober J, Jackisch C, Kaufmann M, Konecny GE, Denkert C, Nekljudova V, Mehta K, Loibl S (2012) Definition and impact of pathologic complete response on prognosis after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in various intrinsic breast cancer subtypes. J Clin Oncol 30: 1796–1804.

Wolff AC, Hammond MEH, Schwartz JN, Hagerty KL, Allred DC, Cote RJ, Dowsett M, Fitzgibbons PL, Hanna WM, Langer A, McShane LM, Paik S, Pegram MD, Perez EA, Press MF, Rhodes A, Sturgeon C, Taube SE, Tubbs R, Vance GH, van de Vijver M, Wheeler TM, Hayes DF. American Society of Clinical OncologyCollege of American Pathologists (2007) American Society of Clinical Oncology/College of American Pathologists guideline recommendations for human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 testing in breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 25: 118–145.

This work is published under the standard license to publish agreement. After 12 months the work will become freely available and the license terms will switch to a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 Unported License.