Capecitabine-induced adverse events: a pharmacogenetic study beyond DPYD

M. de With^{1,2}, L. van Doorn¹, D. Maasland¹, T. Mulder², S. El Bouazzaoui², R.H.J. Mathijssen¹, R.H.N. van Schaik², S. Bins¹

1] Dept. of Medical Oncology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Rotterdam, The Netherlands. 2] Dept. of Cinical Chemistry, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

Erasmus MC University Medical Center Rotterdam

INTRODUCTION

- About 25-75% of patients treated with capecitabine develop hand-foot syndrome (HFS)¹
- HFS can limit activities of daily living and can seriously impact patients quality of life²
- Occurrence of HFS during capecitabine often results in treatment interruptions (26%) or treatment discontinuations (17%)¹
- Screening for DPD deficiency by testing for common single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in *DPYD*, the gene encoding DPD, followed by a dose reduction significantly reduced the incidence of fluoropyrimidine-related toxicity³
- However, the overall incidence of HFS is still high in patients treated with capecitabine

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE

To investigate whether SNPs in genes encoding for capecitabine metabolizing enzymes (*CES1*, *CES2*, and *CDA*) can be used to predict the occurrence of HFS in patients treated with capecitabine.

METHODS

- 446 patients treated with capecitabine at the Erasmus MC Cancer Institute were included for analysis
- Prospectively collected blood samples were genotyped for 8 SNPs in 3 genes:
 - CES11165-33 C>A (rs2244613)
 - *CES1* 1165-41 C>T (rs2244614)
 - CES1 690+129delC (rs3217164)
 - CES21613-108G>A (rs2241409)
 - CES2-823C>G (rs11075646)
 - *CDA* -79A>C (rs2072671)
 - *CDA -*205C>G (rs603412)
 - *CDA* 266+242A>G (rs10916825)
- HFS was graded according to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events version 5.0
- Associations between SNPs or baseline factors (age, sex, performance status) and HFS with $P \leq 0.10$ were tested multivariably by logistic regression and internally validated by bootstrapping

RESULTS

Characteristics	Total study cohort	Patients with HFS	
	N = 446 patients	(all grades)	
	it – 440 patients	n=146	
Sex (%)			
Male	249 (55.8)	72 (49.3)	
Age (years, median, [IQR])	62 [54-69]	60 [52-69]	
ECOG performance status (%)	<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	
1	302 (67.7)	1 (0.7)	
2	10 (2.2)	0	
3	1 (0.2)	0	
BSA (median, [IQR])	1.92 [1.77-2.06]	1.89 [1.68-2.06]	
Primary tumor type (%)	<u> </u>		
Colorectal	295 (66.1)	95 (65.1)	
Esophagus/Gastric	80 (17.9)	18 (12.3)	
Breast	53 (11.9)	27 (18.5)	
Neuro-endocrine ^A	8 (1.8)	2 (1.4)	
Other ^B	10 (2.2)	5 (3.4)	
Metastatic disease (%)	182 (40.8)	72 (49.3)	
Treatment regimen			
Capecitabine monotherapy	80 (17.9)	40 (27.4)	
Capecitabine + radiotherapy	96 (21.5)	20 (13.7)	
Capecitabine + oxaliplatin	170 (38.1)	50 (34.2)	
Capecitabine + bevacizumab	16 (3.6)	12 (8.2)	
Capecitabine + epirubicin + oxaliplatin	15 (3.4)	3 (2.1)	
Capecitabine + epirubicin + cisplatin	52 (11.7)	13 (8.9)	
Capecitabine + temozolomide	7 (1.6)	2 (1.4)	
Other ^C	10 (2.2)	6 (4.1)	
Capecitabine cumulative daily dose (%)			
≥ 4000 mg	86 (19.3)	41 (28.0)	
3500 mg	217 (48.7)	74 (50.7)	
≤ 3000 mg	143 (32.0)	31 (21.2)	
Capecitabine adjustment/discontinuation (%)		
Due to adverse events	126 (28.3)	59 (40.4)	
Occurrence of hand-foot syndrome			
CTCAE grade 1	69 (15.5)	69 (47.3)	
CTCAE grade 2	62 (13.9)	62 (42.5))	
CTCAE grade 3	15 (3.4)	15 (10.3)	

A Neuro-endocrine tumor: bronchus (n=5), jejunum (n=2), pancreas (n=1), and thymus (n=1)
^B Other tumor types: appendix (n=2; n=2), duodenum (n=2; n=1)), goblet cell (n=1; n=0), jejunum (n=2; n=0), pancreas (n=1;
n=0), papilla of Vater (n=1; n=1)), and pseudomyxoma peritonei (n=1; n=0).
$^{\circ}$ Other treatment regimen: capecitabine + trastuzumab (n=4; n=3), capecitabine + lapatinib (n=2; n=1), capecitabine +
bevacizumab + paclitaxel ($n=2$; $n=1$), capecitabine + vinorelbine ($n=1$; $n=0$), and capecitabine + cisplatin + pembrolizumab
(n=1; n=0).
Abbreviations: IQR: interquartile range; CTCAE: common terminology criteria for adverse events.

Abbreviations: HFS: Hand-foot syndrome.

Investigated single nucleotide polymorphisms									
Gene	SNP ID	Variant	MAF	No. of WT	No. of HET	No. of HVAR	HWE <i>P-</i> value		
CES1	rs2244613	1165-33C>A	19%	298	130	18	0.42		
CES1	rs2244614	1165-41C>T	58%	82	214	150	0.71		
CES1	rs3217164	690+129delC	51%	111	217	117	0.60		
CES2	rs2241409	1613-108G>A	18%	297	133	15	0.98		
CES2	rs11075646	-823C>G	10%	361	81	4	0.82		
CDA	rs2072671	-79A>C *2	35%	197	185	64	0.06		
CDA	rs603412	-205C>G	42%	155	205	85	0.24		
CDA	rs10916825	266+242A>G	35%	187	206	53	0.74		

Abbreviations: MAF: minor allelic frequencies; WT: wild types; HET: heterozygous variants; HVAR: homozygous variants; HWE: Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

- Carriers of *CES1* 1165-33C>A and *CDA* 266+242A>G polymorphisms are at higher risk of developing HFS ≥ grade2 during capecitabine treatment. This is in line with previous research.⁴
- Prospective studies should investigate if preemptive screening for these SNPs can be used to individualize systemic cancer treatment.
- Additionally, CES2 -823C>G was associated with a reduced risk on developing HFS. Replication of this association is needed.

References

- 1] Kwakman *et al.*, Oncol Rev, 2020. 2] Urakawa *et al.*, J Cancer, 2019.
- 3] Henricks *et al.*, Lancet Oncol, 2018
- 4] Hamzic *et al.*, Clin Pharmacol Ther, 2017

Associations of selected single nucleotide polymorphisms with HFS								
Endpoint	Factor	Comparison	Univariable OR (95% CI)	P	Multivariable OR (95% CI)	Bootstrap 95% CI	P	
HFS All grades	Sex CES2 -823C>G	Female vs. Male GG + CG vs. CC	,		1.385 (0.926-2.073) 0.432 (0.240-0.777)	(-0.081-0.728) (-1.5420.278)	0.113 0.005	
HFS	Sex		•		2.161 (1.293-3.610)	(1.293-3.610)	0.003	
≥ grade 2	CES1 690+129delC CES1 1165-33C>A	-/- + C/- vs. CC AA + CA vs. CC	2.015 (1.222-3.321)	0.005	0.758 (0.415-1.384) 1.888 (1.075-3.315)	(0.415-1.384) (1.075-3.315)	0.367 0.027 0.024	
	CDA 266+242A>G	GG + AG vs. AA	· ·		1.865 (1.087-3.200)	(1.087-3.200)		







Mirjam de With m.dewith@erasmusmc.nl 0031 10 70 407 99 M. de With has no conflicts of interest