

Methodology We performed targeted transcriptomics analysis of 50 genes using qPCR and estrogen metabolism analyses using LC-MS/MS. The model systems were high-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC) cell lines OVSAHO, Kuramochi, COV632, and immortalized normal ovarian epithelial HIO-80 cells. The results in cell lines were compared with public transcriptome and proteome data for the HGSOC tissues.

Results In all model systems, HGSOC cell lines and tissues, high steroid sulfatase expression, and weak/undetected aromatase (*CYP19A1*) expression supported the formation of estrogens from the E1-S precursor. In ovarian cancer cells, the metabolism of E1-S to estradiol was the highest in OVSAHO, followed by Kuramochi and COV362 cells, and decreased with increasing chemoresistance. In addition, higher *HSD17B14* and *CYP1A2* expressions were observed in highly chemoresistant COV362 cells and platinum-resistant tissues compared to HIO-80 cells and platinum-sensitive tissues. The HGSOC cell models differed in *HSD17B10*, *CYP1B1*, and *NQO1* expression. Proteomic data also showed different levels of *HSD17B10*, *CYP1B1*, *NQO1*, and *SULT1E1* between the four HGSOC subtypes: differentiated, immunoreactive, proliferative, and mesenchymal.

Conclusion The results of our study suggest that in HGSOCs, the metabolism of E1-S precursor into estrogens decreases with increasing chemoresistance and that HGSOC subtypes form different levels of estrogens and their metabolites. The estrogen-biosynthesis-associated targets identified in our research present a base for further studies leading to potential personalized treatment development.

2022-RA-1505-ESGO

OVARIAN CANCER RETROSPECTIVE EUROPEAN (O'CARE) OBSERVATIONAL STUDY: ANALYSIS OF FIRST-LINE (1L) OUTCOMES IN PATIENTS WITH OVARIAN CANCER (OC) STRATIFIED BY NUMBER OF RISK FACTORS FOR PROGRESSION

¹Jonathan Krell, ²Thumulurua K Madhuri, ³Danielle Shaw, ⁴John McGrane, ⁵Anjana Anand, ⁶Andreas Hartkopf, ⁷Ana Herrero, ⁸Cheng Yeoh, ⁹Maria Masvidal, ¹⁰Jean-David Fumet, ¹¹Gunther Rogmans, ¹²Francesco Raspagliesi, ¹³Celine Gavoille, ¹⁴Whitney York, ¹⁴Jeanne M Schilder, ¹⁵Barbara Mascialino, ¹⁵Eleanor McDermott, ¹⁶Linda Kalilani, ¹⁷Lars Hanker. ¹Imperial College London, London, UK; ²Royal Surrey NHS Foundation Trust, Guildford, UK; ³The Clatterbridge Cancer Centre NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK; ⁴Royal Cornwall Hospitals NHS Trust, Cornwall, UK; ⁵Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK; ⁶Universitätsklinikum Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ⁷Hospital Universitario Miguel Servet, Zaragoza, Spain; ⁸Queen Alexandra Hospital, Portsmouth, UK; ⁹Hospital Universitari Sant Joan de Reus, Tarragona, Spain; ¹⁰Centre Georges François Leclerc, Dijon, France; ¹¹Helios Klinik, Krefeld, Germany; ¹²Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milano, Italy; ¹³Institut de Cancerologie de Lorraine (ICL) Nancy – Unicancer, Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France; ¹⁴GSK, Philadelphia, PA; ¹⁵GSK, Stevenage, UK; ¹⁶GSK, Research Triangle, NC; ¹⁷Arbeitsgemeinschaft Gynäkologische Onkologie (AGO), University Hospital Schleswig-Holstein, Campus Lübeck, Germany

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.732

Introduction/Background The O'CaRE study assessed real-world burden of disease, treatment patterns, and outcomes in patients with OC in 5 European countries (UK, France, Germany, Spain, and Italy). The analysis presented provides real-world data on the cumulative impact of risk factors (RFs) on disease progression and survival following 1L treatment.

Methodology O'CaRE was a multicentre, noninterventional retrospective medical chart review study of patients aged ≥18 years diagnosed with epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal cancer from 1 January 2014 to 31

December 2015. Patients were classified into moderate- or high-risk categories based on number of RFs for progression (Table). High-risk patients were further grouped by total number of RFs. Patients were followed from index date (date of diagnosis) until last activity or study end (maximum follow of 4 years). Kaplan-Meier methodology was used to estimate progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS).

Results The analysis included 412 patients: 7 (1.7%) had moderate risk of progression, whereas 405 (98%) had high risk of progression (table 1). For those with high risk, 84 (20.4%), 133 (32.3%), 139 (33.7%), and 49 (11.9%) had 1, 2, 3, and 4 RFs, respectively. Median PFS was 31.3 months for patients with 0 RFs and 12.6, 7.9, 5.9, and 3.5 months for patients with 1, 2, 3, or 4 RFs, respectively. Median OS was 41.9 months for patients with 0 RFs and not reached, 25.0, 18.0, and 7.4 months for patients with 1, 2, 3, or 4 RFs, respectively.

Abstract 2022-RA-1505-ESGO Table 1 Outcomes by risk factors

	Risk Factor Classifications				
	Moderate risk		High risk		
	Stage III disease No VRD PDS BRCAm		Presence of ≥1 of the following: Stage IV disease VRD IDS or other surgery BRCAwt or BRCAunk		
	Moderate risk		High risk		
	0 Risk Factors	1 Risk Factor	2 Risk Factors	3 Risk Factors	4 Risk Factors
n (%)	7 (1.7)	84 (20.4)	133 (32.3)	139 (33.7)	49 (11.9)
mPFS (95% CI), months	31.3 (14.2–NR)	12.6 (10.8–19.6)	7.9 (6.3–11.1)	5.9 (4.5–8.2)	3.5 (1.9–5.0)
mOS (95% CI), months	41.9 (41.9–NR)	NR (34.4–NR)	25.0 (21.1–30.2)	18.0 (13.7–24.2)	7.4 (5.1–19.4)

BRCAm, BRCA mutant; BRCAunk, BRCA unknown; BRCAwt, BRCA wild-type; IDS, interval debulking surgery; mOS, median overall survival; mPFS, median progression-free survival; NR, not reached; PDS, primary debulking surgery; VRD, visible residual disease.

Conclusion This real-world analysis of patients with OC from 5 European countries demonstrated that higher numbers of RFs were associated with shorter median PFS and OS. This analysis provides real-world data relating to 1L treatment outcomes for patients with OC; if validated in clinical trials, the number of RFs could be a stratification factor for future 1L OC trials.

2022-RA-1515-ESGO

IMPACT OF SURGICAL STAGING ON SURVIVAL OF LOW GRADE ENDOMETRIOID OVARIAN CANCER APPARENTLY CONFINED TO THE OVARY

¹Nicolò Bizzarri, ²Majdi Imterat, ³Robert Fruscio, ⁴Anna Myriam Perrone, ⁵Rosanna Mancari, ²Alexander Traut, ¹Andrea Rosati, ²Andreas du Bois, ³Debora Ferrari, ⁴Pierandrea de Iaco, ¹Raffaella Ergasti, ²Beyhan Ataseven, ³Silvia Volontè, ⁴Marco Tesi, ¹Maria Teresa Perri, ²Florian Heitz, ²Nicole Concin, ¹Francesco Fanfani, ⁵Enrico Vizza, ¹Giovanni Scambia, ²Philipp Harter, ¹Anna Fagotti. ¹UOC Ginecologia Oncologica, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli, IRCCS, Dipartimento per la Salute della Donna e del Bambino e della Salute Pubblica, Rome, Italy; ²Department of Gynecology and Gynecologic Oncology, Ev. Kliniken Essen-Mitte, Essen, Germany; ³Clinic of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Milan Bicocca, San Gerardo Hospital, Monza, Italy; ⁴Division of Oncologic Gynecology, IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Bologna, Italy; ⁵Gynecologic Oncology Unit, IRCCS – Regina Elena National Cancer Institute, Rome, Italy; ⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany; ⁷Department for Gynecology with the Center for Oncologic Surgery Charité Campus Virchow-Klinikum, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, Berlin, Germany

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.733