

1032

STRONG ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PATHOLOGICAL RESPONSE TO NEOADJUVANT CHEMOTHERAPY, TILS AND MODELED CA125 KELIM IN OVARIAN CARCINOMAS: CHIVA TRIAL, GINECO

^{1,2,3,4}J Pierre-Alexandre*, ^{1,2}S Moret, ⁵O Colombar, ^{3,6}P Combe, ^{3,7}S Abadie-Lacourtoisie, ^{3,8}J Meunier, ^{3,9}A Floquet, ^{3,10}L Venat-Bouvet, ^{3,11}C Louvet, ^{3,12}L Favier, ^{3,13}P Follana, ^{3,14}JP Lotz, ^{3,15}F Del Piano, ^{3,16}M Leheuteur, ^{3,17}CR Alliot, ^{3,18}G De Rauglaudre, ^{3,19}N Raban, ^{3,20}A Chevalier-Place, ^{3,4,21}A Leary, ^{3,4,5,22}B You. ¹Université de Paris, Faculté de médecine, Paris, France; ²APHP. Centre, Hôpital Cochin, Pathology department, Paris, France; ³GINECO, Paris, France; ⁴GINEGEPS, Paris, France; ⁵Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, EA 3738 CICLY, Lyon, France; ⁶APHP. Centre, Hôpital européen Georges Pompidou, Medical Oncology, Paris, France; ⁷Institut de Cancérologie de l'Ouest – ICO – Site Paul Papin, Medical oncology, Angers, France; ⁸Centre Hospitalier Régional d'Orléans, Medical oncology, Orléans, France; ⁹Institut Bergonié, Oncology, Bordeaux, France; ¹⁰Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Dupuytren, Medical oncology, Limoges, France; ¹¹Institut Mutualiste Montsouris, Medical oncology, Paris, France; ¹²Centre Georges François Lederer, Medical oncology, Dijon, France; ¹³Centre Antoine Lacassagne, Onco-hematology, Nice, France; ¹⁴APHP. Sorbonne Université, Hôpital Tenon, Medical oncology, Paris, France; ¹⁵Hôpitaux du Léman, Surgery, Thonon-les-Bains, France; ¹⁶Centre Henri Becquerel, Medical oncology, Rouen, France; ¹⁷Centre Hospitalier Alpes Léman, Oncology, Contamine-sur-Arve, France; ¹⁸Institut Sainte-Catherine, Clinical cancerology, Avignon, France; ¹⁹CHU de Poitiers – Pôle Régional de Cancérologie – Hôpital de la Milétrie, Oncology, Poitiers, France; ²⁰Centre Oscar Lambret, Gynecology, Lille, France; ²¹Gustave Roussy, Medical oncology, Villejuif, France; ²²Institut de cancérologie des Hospice Civils de Lyon IC-HCL, Medical oncology, CITOHL, Pierre-Bénite, France

10.1136/ijgc-2021-ESGO.601

Introduction/Background* As stated by ESGO-ESMO, there is a need for indicators of chemotherapy efficacy in ovarian carcinoma patients treated in first-line setting (Colombo et al, IGCS, 2020). The pathological chemotherapy response score (CRS) and the modeled CA-125 KELIM during neo-adjuvant chemotherapy were reported as potential markers. Moreover, changes in tumor infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) after neo-adjuvant chemotherapy were reported as a prognostic factor (Leary et al, Cancer Immunol Immunother, 2021). We studied the relationships between changes in TILs, the pathological response (pR) and KELIM in patients treated with neo-adjuvant chemotherapy +/- interval debulking surgery (IDS) from CHIVA phase II trial.

Methodology The patients were enrolled in the randomized phase II trial CHIVA (NCT01583322, neo-adjuvant carboplatin-paclitaxel +/- nintedanib, +/- IDS, n=188 patients). KELIM were previously calculated (You et al CCR 2020). The 30 patients with the highest KELIM (very chemosensitive) or the lowest KELIM (poorly chemosensitive) were selected. HE-stained sections from available tissue blocks at baseline and after chemotherapy were analyzed for stromal TILs (sTILs, surface of the tumor stroma occupied by lymphocytes) and intra-epithelial TILs (ieTILs, brisk or non-brisk). The pathological response (pR) was assessed on the most tumoral available tissue block obtained after chemotherapy (good response if extensive fibrous changes with no or isolated tumor cells, or <2 mm cell clusters). Descriptive statistics assessed the relationships between KELIM, TIL changes, and pR.

Result(s)* No relationships between KELIM and TILs infiltrates on baseline tumor samples were found. However, strong associations were found between KELIM and TIL infiltrates after neo-adjuvant chemotherapy for sTILs (median KELIM for sTILs 0-5% vs >5%: 0.28 versus 1.32, $P < 0.001$) and for ieTILs (median KELIM for ieTILs non-brisk versus brisk: 0.31 versus 1.31, $P = 0.04$). Similarly, an association was found between KELIM and the quality of pR (median KELIM for patients with poor vs good pR: 0.31 versus 1.32, $P = 0.05$).

Conclusion* High consistency was found between the modeled CA125 KELIM calculated during the first 100 days of neo-adjuvant chemotherapy and the pathological response, consistent with their values as indicators of the tumor chemosensitivity in first-line setting. Moreover, TILs changes were strongly associated with chemosensitivity, opening hypotheses about the mechanisms of chemosensitivity, and immunotherapy opportunity.

1057

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A MACHINE-LEARNING-DERIVED RNASEQ PROGNOSTIC SIGNATURE IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER

^{1,2}G Beinse*, ³MA Le Frere Belda, ^{4,5}J Pierre-Alexandre, ^{3,5}N Bekmezian, ⁶M Koual, ⁷S Garinet, ^{5,7}K Leroy, ⁸N Delanoy, ^{2,7}H Blons, ^{5,8}C Gervais, ^{5,9}C Durdur, ^{5,10}C Chapron, ^{1,5}F Goldwasser, ^{4,5}B Terris, ^{3,5}C Badoual, ^{2,7}P Laurent-Puig, ²V Taly, ^{2,10}B Borghese, ^{2,6}AS Bats, ^{1,2}J Alexandre. ¹Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of medical oncology, Hôpital Cochin, PARIS, France; ²Centre de Recherche des Cordeliers, « Equipe labélisée Ligue Contre le Cancer », Sorbonne Université, Université de Paris, INSERM, PARIS, France; ³Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of pathology, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France; ⁴Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of pathology, Hôpital Cochin, Université de Paris, PARIS, France; ⁵Université de Paris, Paris, France; ⁶Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of gynecological surgery, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France; ⁷Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of Biology, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France; ⁸Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of medical oncology, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France; ⁹Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of radiotherapy, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France; ¹⁰Institut du Cancer Paris CARPEM, AP-HP, APHP.Centre, Department of gynecological surgery, Hôpital Cochin, Paris, France

10.1136/ijgc-2021-ESGO.602

Introduction/Background* Because of inter-tumor heterogeneity of endometrial carcinoma (EC), prognostication remains challenging. We aimed to develop a RNAseq signature to stratify EC patient prognosis beyond molecular subtyping.

Methodology A prognostic signature was identified using a LASSO-penalized Cox regression model on TCGA (N=543 patients). A polyA-RNAseq-based method was developed for validation of the signature in a cohort of stage I-IV EC patients treated in two Paris Hospitals between 2010 and 2017. Model performances were evaluated using time-dependent ROC curves (prediction of disease-specific-survival (DSS)). The additional value of the RNAseq signature was evaluated using uni/multivariable Cox models (hazard ratio (HR) with [95% confidence interval]) and Kaplan-Meier analysis.

Result(s)* Among 209 patients included in the validation cohort (median follow-up 55 months IQR [41-69]), 61 (30%), 10 (5%), 52 (25%), and 82 (40%), had mismatch repair-deficient, POLE-mutated, TP53-mutated tumors, and tumors with no specific molecular profile, respectively. The 38-genes signature accurately predicted DSS (AUC=80%). Using a composite classifier accounting for the RNAseq signature and the TP53-mutated group, three groups were identified: good prognosis tumors based on RNAseq signature and without TP53 mutation, characterized by excellent outcome (N=103 patients, 5-years DSS rates of 99%) (reference), poor prognosis tumors based on RNAseq signature and without TP53 mutation (N=49 patients, 5-years DSS rates of 81%; HR: 5.86 [1.16; 29.7]), and TP53-mutated tumors whatever the RNAseq signature (N=52 patients, 5-years DSS rates of 52%; HR: 11.14 [2.40; 51.7]) (HR adjusted on FIGO stage). In 81 (38%) patients with adverse features (2020 ESGO/ESTRO/ESP